



GUIDE FOR EXPERTS ON QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF ERASMUS+ ACTIONS

PART II

ACTION-SPECIFIC INFORMATION

**KA1 – ERASMUS MUNDUS JOINT MASTER DEGREES**

**CALL FOR PROPOSALS 2019 (EAC/A03/2018)**

## Part II Action-Specific Information

### Table of contents

#### Annexes:

<i>Annex 1a- Criteria to assess an application submitted under KA1 – Erasmus Mundus Joint Master Degrees.....</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Annex 1b- Description of the specific selection process and methodology for KA1 – Erasmus Mundus Joint Master Degrees.....</i>	<i>5</i>
Assessment of EMJMD proposals .....	5
<i>Annex 2- Template of the declaration of absence of conflict of interests and of confidentiality .....</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>Annex 3- Reference documents on policy priorities in the field of education.....</i>	<i>15</i>
I. Transversal policy priorities for education, training and youth.....	15
II. Policy priorities for higher education.....	16
III. Reference documents for joint masters courses.....	17
IV. Joint, multiple/double master degrees in the Erasmus+ Programme Countries.....	17
<i>Annex 4. individual and consolidated assessment form template for KA1 – Erasmus Mundus Joint Master Degrees.....</i>	<i>18</i>

*Action-specific annexes contain detailed information on the selection and assessment procedures of this action insofar that they differ from the general framework laid out in the general part of the guide*

*They must be read in conjunction with the general part of the guide to gain complete overview of the respective selection procedure.*

## **Annex 1a- Criteria to assess an application submitted under KA1 – Erasmus Mundus Joint Master Degrees**

Criteria used to assess an application submitted under **KA1 Erasmus Mundus Joint Master Degrees** are found in the call for proposals and the Erasmus+ Programme Guide.

Eligibility Criteria: Please refer to the [call for proposals 2019 - EAC/A03/2018](#) and the [Erasmus+ Programme Guide](#).

Award Criteria: Please refer to the [call for proposals 2019 - EAC/A03/2018](#) and the [Erasmus+ Programme Guide](#).

## **Annex 1b- Description of the specific selection process and methodology for KA1 – Erasmus Mundus Joint Master Degrees**

### **Assessment of EMJMD proposals**

KA1 Erasmus Mundus Joint Master Degree proposals will be selected through a competitive process based on their overall quality and organised in accordance with the following selection procedure:

- 1) Appointment of the Evaluation Committee members
- 2) Selection of external experts
- 3) Verification of eligibility, exclusion and selection criteria
- 4) Briefing of experts
- 5) Assessment of applications against the award criteria - individual experts' assessments
- 6) Assessment of applications against the award criteria - consolidated assessments
- 7) Final expert panel for consolidation, ranking of applications in order of merit and debriefing and concluding remarks (in the presence of the Evaluation Committee members)
- 8) Consultation of the Erasmus + National Agencies to confirm the accreditation of the national components on the basis of which the EMJMD proposal is set up
- 9) Final Evaluation Committee meeting to establish the list of proposals proposed for funding
- 10) Feedback to Applicants
- 11) Publication of results in the Agency's website

## 1) Appointment of the Evaluation Committee members

The Evaluation Committee is designated by the EACEA Head of Department (Authorising Officer) and is made up of at least three persons representing the Erasmus+ **KA1 – Erasmus Mundus Joint Master Degrees** operational unit at the Agency (EACEA.A.3) and the mirror unit at Directorate General EAC.C.3, with no hierarchical link between them. Considering that under the EMJMD call for proposals selected projects can benefit from additional Heading 4 & EDF scholarships, the composition of the Evaluation Committee is extended with representatives from the Commission DGs responsible for the implementation of the relevant EU external funding instruments [Development Cooperation Instruments (DCI), European Neighbourhood Instrument (ENI), Partnership instrument (PI), European Development Fund (EDF)].

The Chairperson is the Head of Unit of EACEA.A.3.

Each member of the Evaluation Committee, its chairperson, and the EACEA.A.3 staff performing checks of the eligibility and exclusion criteria have to sign a declaration on the absence of conflict of interest and confidentiality. The declarations are annexed to the Evaluation Report.

## 2) Selection of external experts

Experts are recruited through an open call for expression of interest and the Unit EACEA.A.3. creates a list of experts based on the number of expected proposals and on the basis of experts' expertise using the Agency's EMI tool.

Experts are then contacted for checking their availability, informing them on the conditions of work including the timetable of the Erasmus+ **KA1 – Erasmus Mundus Joint Master Degrees** assessment exercise.

In the next step, among those experts which have confirmed their availability, the Agency will compose the list of experts (including a reserve list) that is proposed to the Evaluation Committee members.

As a result, experts are appointed by the Evaluation Committee on the basis of their expertise in the specific thematic field related to the Erasmus+ **KA1 – Erasmus Mundus Joint Master Degrees** in which they are asked to assess applications. However, other criteria like language competencies, gender balance, the coverage of nationalities and geographical balance will also be taken into account in the final composition of an expert panel.

Once the Evaluation Committee members have validated the list of selected experts, the list is presented for approval to the Head of Department (Authorising Officer). After the decision of the Head of Department (Authorising Officer), experts are informed about their participation in the assessment exercise and a contract is signed between them and the Agency. Moreover, all experts have to sign a declaration on the absence of conflict of interest and confidentiality.

## 3) Verification of eligibility, exclusion and selection criteria

### *Eligibility criteria*

Under the supervision of the Evaluation Committee, the Executive Agency checks the compliance of the applications with the eligibility criteria indicated in the Erasmus+ Programme Guide. Although the eForm is configured to ensure that most of the eligibility criteria are automatically checked, the verification of the eligibility criteria is done by Agency staff, in consultation with the Erasmus + National Agencies to confirm the accreditation of the national components on the basis of which the EMJMD proposal is set up.

Upon recommendation from the Evaluation Committee, applicants that did not comply with the eligibility criteria are notified by the Agency.

## ***Exclusion criteria***

As concerns the exclusion criteria, the Declaration of Honour, which must be signed by the legal representative of the applicant organisation, is considered as part of the application and the validity of its signature is verified. Any information received during or after the selection process that may contradict the statements provided in the Declaration will be assessed by the Evaluation Committee and can lead to the rejection of the proposal.

## ***Selection criteria***

Through the selection criteria, the Evaluation Committee verifies if applicants have sufficient and stable technical and financial capacities in order to implement the project. The task will be completed by the Evaluation Committee before or after the evaluation of award criteria. Public bodies are not subject to verification of their financial capacity.

For more detailed information on the eligibility, exclusion and selection criteria please consult Part C of the [Erasmus+ Programme Guide](#).

### **4) Briefing of experts**

Experts are invited to participate to an online briefing where the role of experts, the assessment procedure and its timetable, the Erasmus+ **KA1 – Erasmus Mundus Joint Master Degrees** award criteria and its scoring and the online assessment tool will be explained. Including a guided practical exercise to ensure that all experts reach the same understanding of the award criteria, the scoring system and the assessment mechanism.

### **5) Assessment of applications against the award criteria - individual experts' assessments**

Following the online briefing exercise, experts will work in remote. Before starting the assessment of the applications received, experts need to check all their proposals and ensured they have no conflict of interest with any of them. Each application will be assessed independently by three different experts against the award criteria published in the [Erasmus+ Programme Guide](#). Each expert will record their assessment comments and scores in the online assessment tool (OEET) including their opinion under the field "**Decision**" in accordance with the instructions below:

- proposals with a score of 80 points or higher should be noted "*Highly recommended*";
- proposals with a score lower than 80 but at least 70 points should be noted "*Recommended*";
- proposals with a score lower than 70 points should be noted "*Not recommended*".

### ***Steps***

Experts will save their draft assessment and send it by email to the lead experts for quality check. Experts are required to submit their individual assessments to their lead expert on a regular basis, in accordance with the timetable proposed by the Agency.

On the basis of the observations provided by their lead expert experts will revise their individual assessment and, after a final proofreading, will "submit/endorse" their individual assessment in the online assessment tool (OEET).

In addition to the above, experts will send by email to the lead expert and their Agency contact person(s), the submitted/endorsed version of their individual assessment form.

## Comments

The nature and characteristics of the comments expected from the experts will be specified during the experts' briefing. Nevertheless, experts must provide a thorough analysis of the application highlighting its relative strengths and weaknesses.

## Score and thresholds

The proposal is assessed against the 4 award criteria. An application can receive a maximum of 100 points for all criteria relevant for the action. To be considered for funding, proposals must score at least 70 out of 100 points. Furthermore, they must score 75% of the maximum allocated points set for the award criterion "Relevance of the project" (minimum 30 points out of 40).

Only those projects that have passed the above mentioned thresholds and have requested additional scholarships for students from targeted regions of the world will be assessed against the additional award criterion "Relevance of the project in the targeted region(s)". The pertinence in this respect will be evaluated on a "Yes/No" basis and will not influence the final score of the proposal.

No half points are used during individual assessments.

For details on individual assessment form template see Annex IV.

The table below shows the relative weightings of each criterion:

<b>Award criteria</b>	<b>Weightings of the award criteria</b>	
Relevance of the project	<i>maximum 40 points</i>	<i>Threshold 30 points</i>
Quality of the project design and implementation	<i>maximum 20 points</i>	<i>No threshold</i>
Quality of the project team and the cooperation arrangements	<i>maximum 20 points</i>	<i>No threshold</i>
Impact and dissemination	<i>maximum 20 points</i>	<i>No threshold</i>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100 points</b>	<b>Funding threshold 70 points</b>

The table below shows the ranges of scores for the individual quality standards depending on the maximum score of the award criterion.

Maximum number of points for an award criterion	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Weak</i>
	<b>40</b>	<i>34-40</i>	<i>28-33</i>	<i>20-27</i>
<b>20</b>	<i>17-20</i>	<i>14-16</i>	<i>10-13</i>	<i>0-9</i>



### ***Quality assurance***

Some experts with a longstanding experience are appointed as "lead-experts" to assist the Evaluation Committee and Agency staff with the quality control of the experts' assessments.

Although lead experts may be asked to assess a limited number of proposals themselves, their main role will be to provide quality assurance, guarantee coherence and monitor progress of individual and consolidated assessments performed by independent experts.

### **6) Assessment of applications against the award criteria - consolidated assessments**

Once an application has been assessed by three experts, the Agency puts the experts in contact to consolidate remotely their views on the application and to produce an agreed score and comments for each of the award criteria.

#### ***Steps***

One of the experts, so-called expert 1, will be requested to prepare a consolidated assessment in terms of scores and comments, based on the three already completed individual assessments and in agreement with the three involved experts.

After finalising the draft consolidated assessment, Expert 1 will send a copy of it to the lead expert with Expert 2 and Expert 3 and to the EACEA contact persons in Cc. The lead expert will "Quality Check" the consolidated assessment and will send its comments to all three experts to be taken into account for the final version of the consolidation.

Following that, Expert 1 will submit the consolidated assessment in the online assessment tool (OEET). Preferably, consolidated assessment should not exceed 3-4 pages.

Consolidation will be finalized at the Agency premises.

The consolidated assessment is considered the final assessment of a given application. The consolidated assessment forms the axis for ranking each application on the list of eligible grant applications.

#### ***Comments***

The nature and characteristics of the comments expected from the experts will be specified during the experts' briefing. Nevertheless, experts must provide a thorough analysis of the application highlighting its relative strengths and weaknesses.

#### ***Score and thresholds***

Only the final consolidated score may include half points. The same thresholds as mentioned above apply to the consolidated assessments.

#### ***Quality assurance***

During the consolidation phase, lead experts will collaborate closely with the three individual experts in order to facilitate consensus discussions and ensure the quality, coherence and completeness of the consolidated assessment comments and scores.

In case of a big discrepancy between experts' assessments, the Agency with the lead expert will intervene to discuss thoroughly between the involved experts in view of reaching convergence.

## **7) Final expert panel for consolidation, ranking of applications in order of merit and debriefing and concluding remarks (in the presence of the Evaluation Committee members)**

After the assessment in remote, all experts will be invited to finalise the consolidated assessments and submission at the premises of the Agency.

### **Steps**

In the presence and under the supervision of the Evaluation Committee members, the consolidated assessments will be discussed, completed and submitted on-line by the experts present at the final meeting in Brussels.

When finalising the consolidation, experts should not forget to update the "Decision" ("not recommended" / "recommended" / "highly recommended") in accordance with the instructions mentioned above.

This final endorsed version (.pdf with "submitted" watermark on it) is then sent for information to the lead expert, Expert 2, Expert 3 and EACEA.

## **8) Consultation of the Erasmus + National Agencies to confirm the accreditation of the national components on the basis of which the EMJMD proposal is set up**

The validity of the degree(s) intended to be awarded will be cross-checked with the Erasmus+ National Agencies of the countries concerned.

## **9) Final Evaluation Committee meeting to establish the list of proposals proposed for funding**

At the end of the evaluation procedure the Evaluation Committee proposes to the Agency's to the Head of Department (Authorising Officer) the final list of projects to be granted considering:

- the ranking list resulting from the assessment against award criteria, and the feedback from the consultation process;
- the budget available including the budget for additional scholarships for students from targeted regions of the world

Additional scholarships for students from targeted regions of the world will be allocated to the EMJMD selected for funding according to their ranking in descending order, and taking into account the available budget. Starting from the first ranked proposal, the requested total number of additional scholarships will be allocated pro-rata the regional budgetary envelopes and within the limit of the available funds.

The Head of Department (Authorising Officer) takes the award decision based on the Evaluation Committee's recommendation.

## **10) Feedback to Applicants**

All applicants are informed in writing about the selection results once the award decision is signed. The notification letter will include an individual evaluation report for each eligible application.

## **11) Publication of results in the Agency's website**

The publication of the projects recommended for funding will be published on the Agency's website after all applicants have been informed in writing.

## Annex 2- Declaration of absence of conflict of interests and of confidentiality



Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency

Erasmus+: KA1 Learning mobility of individuals – Erasmus Mundus Joint Master Degrees

Title of call for proposals: **Erasmus+ Programme**

Reference of call for proposals: 2019 - **EAC/A03/2018**

I, the undersigned [Forename, SURNAME], having been appointed as an expert for the above-

### 1. PERFORMING THE WORK

1.1. The expert must work independently, in a personal capacity and not on behalf of any organisation.

1.2. The expert must:

- (a) evaluate each proposal in a confidential and fair way, in accordance with the Erasmus+ Programme Guide and the Instructions for Applicants.
- (b) perform his/her work to the best of his/her abilities, professional skills, knowledge and applying the highest ethical and moral standards;
- (c) follow the instructions and time-schedule given by the Agency.

1.3. The expert may not delegate the work to another person or be replaced by another person.

1.4. If a person or entity involved in a proposal(s) approaches the expert before or during the evaluation, s/he must immediately inform the Agency.

1.5. The expert may not be (or become) involved in any of the actions resulting from the proposal(s) that s/he evaluated (at any stage of the procedure, including for two-stage calls).

### 2. IMPARTIALITY

2.1. The expert must perform his/her work **impartially** and take all measures to prevent any situation where the impartial and objective implementation of the work is compromised for reasons involving economic interest, political or national affinity, family or emotional ties or any other shared interest (**'conflict of interests'**).

The following situations will **automatically** be considered as **conflict of interest**:

(a) **for a proposal(s) s/he is requested to evaluate**, if s/he:

- (i) was involved in the preparation of the proposal(s);
- (ii) is a director, trustee or partner or is in any way involved in the management of any of the partner organisations (or linked third party or other third party involved in the action);

<sup>1</sup> Experts' Contract Annex 1- Code of conduct

- (iii) is employed or contracted by one of the partners (or linked third parties, or other third parties involved in the action) ;
- (iv) has close family ties (spouse, domestic or non-domestic partner, child, sibling, parent etc.) or other close personal relationship with the key staff involved in the proposal s/he is requested to evaluate;
- (v) has (or has had during the last five years) a scientific collaboration with the key staff involved in the proposal;
- (vi) has (or has had) a relationship of scientific rivalry or professional hostility with the key staff involved in the proposal;
- (vii) has (or has had), a mentor/mentee relationship with the key staff involved in the proposal.

In this case, the expert must be excluded from the evaluation of the proposal(s) concerned. Part(s) of an evaluation to which the expert already participated must be declared void. Comments and scores already given must be discounted. If necessary, the expert must be replaced and the proposal(s) concerned must be re-evaluated.

However, in exceptional and duly justified cases, the Evaluation Committee/Agency staff may decide to nevertheless invite the expert to take part in the evaluation.

**(b) for a proposal(s) s/he is requested to evaluate AND for all EMJMD submitted proposal(s), if s/he:**

- (i) was involved in the preparation of any proposal(s);
- (ii) would benefit if any proposal(s) is accepted or rejected;
- (iii) has close family ties (spouse, domestic or non-domestic partner, child, sibling, parent etc.) or other close personal relationship with a person (including linked third parties or other third parties) involved in the preparation of any proposal(s), or with a person which would benefit if such a proposal(s) is accepted or rejected.

In this case, the expert may not evaluate any proposal in the call concerned. Part(s) of an evaluation to which the expert already participated must be declared void. Comments and scores already given must be discounted. If necessary, the expert must be replaced and the proposal(s) concerned must be re-evaluated.

**(c) for ALL proposal(s) under the Erasmus+ call in question, if s/he:**

- (i) is a member of an advisory group set up by the Commission to advise on the preparation of EU or the Erasmus+ work programme in an area related to the call in question;
- (ii) is a member of an Erasmus+ National Agency/ or National Erasmus+ Office (NEO);
- (iii) is a member of a programme committee;
- (iv) has submitted a proposal as project coordinator or belongs to the key staff involved in the proposal under the same call;
- (v) has close family ties (spouse, domestic or non-domestic partner, child, sibling, parent etc.) or other close personal relationship with key staff of any proposal submitted.

In this case, the expert may not evaluate any proposal in the call concerned. Part(s) of an evaluation to which the expert already participated must be declared void. Comments and scores already given must be discounted. If necessary, the expert must be replaced and the proposal(s) concerned must be re-evaluated.

The following situations **may be** considered as **conflict of interest** if the Evaluation Committee/Agency staff, in view of the objective circumstances, the available information and the potential risks mentioned below:

(a) employment of the expert by one of the applicants (or linked third parties or other third parties involved in the action) in the last three years;

(b) involvement of the expert in a contract, grant, prize or membership of management structures (e.g. member of management or advisory board etc.) or research collaboration with a partner, a linked third party or another third party involved in the action in the last three years;

(c) any other situation that could cast doubt on his/her ability to participate in the evaluation impartially, or that could reasonably appear to do so in the eyes of an outside third party.

In this case, the Evaluation Committee/Agency staff may decide to exclude the expert from the evaluation (and on the scope, i.e. only for the proposal(s) concerned or also for competing proposal(s) or the entire call) and, if necessary, to replace him/her and organise a re-evaluation.

2.2. The expert will be required to **confirm** — for each proposal(s) s/he is assessing — that there is no conflict of interest, by endorsing the assessment in the electronic tool.

If the expert is (or becomes) aware of a conflict of interest, s/he must immediately **inform** the responsible Agency staff and stop working until further instructions.

2.3. If the expert breaches any of his/her obligations under Points 2.1 and 2.2, the Evaluation Committee/Agency staff may apply the measures set out in Chapter 5 of the Contract, and in particular terminate the Contract.

### 3. CONFIDENTIALITY

3.1. During implementation of the Contract and for five years after the date of the last payment, the expert must keep confidential all data, documents or other material (in any form) that is disclosed (in writing or orally) and that concerns the work under the Contract (**'confidential information'**).

Unless otherwise agreed with the responsible Agency staff, s/he may use confidential information only to implement the Contract.

The expert must keep his/her work under the Contract strictly confidential, and in particular:

(a) not disclose (directly or indirectly) any confidential information relating to proposal(s) or applicants, without prior written approval by the Agency;

(b) not discuss proposal(s) with others (including other experts or Agency staff that are not directly involved in the assessment of the proposal(s)), except during evaluation meetings and with prior approval by the responsible Agency staff;

(c) not disclose:

- details on the assessment process or its outcome, without prior written approval by Agency;
- details on his/her position/advice;
- the names of other experts participating in the assessment.

(d) not communicate with applicants (including linked third parties or other third parties involved in the action) nor with the key staff involved in the proposal or potential team members or persons linked to them during the evaluation or afterwards — except in cases approved by the Agency staff.

If the Agency makes documents or information available electronically for remote work, the expert is responsible for ensuring adequate protection and for returning, erasing or destroying all confidential information after the end of the evaluation (if so instructed).

If the expert works on Agency premises, the expert:

(a) may not remove from the premises any documents, material or information on the proposal(s) or on the evaluation;

(b) is responsible for ensuring adequate protection of electronic documents and information and for returning, erasing or destroying all confidential information after the end of the evaluation (if so instructed).

If the expert uses outside sources (for example internet, specialised databases, etc.) for his/her evaluation, s/he:

(a) must respect the general rules for using such sources;

(b) may not contact third parties, without prior written approval by the Agency.

The confidentiality obligations no longer apply if:

- the Agency agrees to release the expert from the confidentiality obligations;
- the confidential information becomes public through other channels;
- disclosure of the confidential information is required by law.

3.2. If the expert breaches any of his/her obligations under Point 3.1, the Agency may apply the measures set out in Chapter 5 of the Contract.

## Annex 3- Reference documents on policy priorities in the field of education

### I. *Transversal policy priorities for education, training and youth*

#### ▪ **Education and Training 2020 in EUROPE 2020**

- Europe 2020:  
[http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/index_en.htm)
- Europe 2020 targets:  
<http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/targets/eu-targets/>
- Country-specific recommendations 2013:  
[http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/making-it-happen/country-specific-recommendations/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/making-it-happen/country-specific-recommendations/index_en.htm)
- Education and Training 2020 (ET 2020):  
[http://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/strategic-framework/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/strategic-framework/index_en.htm)
- Council conclusions on the role of education and training in the implementation of the 'Europe 2020' strategy:  
[http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?qid=1424196412291&uri=CELEX:52011XG0304\(01\)](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?qid=1424196412291&uri=CELEX:52011XG0304(01))
- Council conclusions of 26 November 2012 on education and training in 'Europe 2020' - the contribution of education and training to economic recovery, growth and jobs:  
[http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?qid=1424196274109&uri=CELEX:52012XG1219\(02\)](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?qid=1424196274109&uri=CELEX:52012XG1219(02))
- Council conclusions on investing in education and training - a response to 'Rethinking Education: Investing in skills for better socio-economic outcomes' and the '2013 Annual Growth Survey':  
[http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?qid=1424195979923&uri=CELEX:52013XG0305\(01\)](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?qid=1424195979923&uri=CELEX:52013XG0305(01))
- 2012 Joint Report of the Council and the Commission on the implementation of the Strategic Framework for European Cooperation in Education and Training (ET 2020):  
<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex:52012XG0308%2801%29>
- Rethinking Education: Investing in skills for better socio-economic outcomes:  
[http://ec.europa.eu/education/news/rethinking\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/education/news/rethinking_en.htm)
- Commission Communication - European higher education in the world:  
<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52013DC0499>

#### ▪ **Quality assurance, recognition and transparency**

- European Qualifications Framework:  
<https://ec.europa.eu/ploteus/>
- EQAR - European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education:  
<http://www.eqar.eu/>
- ENQA - European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education:  
<http://www.engq.eu/>
- Europass:  
<https://europass.cedefop.europa.eu/en/documents/european-skills-passport/diploma-supplement>

▪ **Entrepreneurship education:**

- A Guide for Educators:  
[http://ec.europa.eu/education/news/20130923\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/education/news/20130923_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:

▪ **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>
- Commission Communication - Opening up Education: Innovative teaching and learning for all through new Technologies and Open Educational Resources  
<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex:52013DC0654>
- 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/?uri=CELEX:52012SC0372>
- Report from the thematic working group: "*Languages for Jobs*" (ET 2020) - *Providing multilingual communication skills for the labour market*:  
[http://ec.europa.eu/languages/policy/strategic-framework/documents/languages-for-jobs-report\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/languages/policy/strategic-framework/documents/languages-for-jobs-report_en.pdf)

**II. Policy priorities for higher education**

- Commission Communication - Supporting growth and jobs: an agenda for the modernisation of Europe's higher education systems (Higher Education Modernisation Agenda):  
<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?qid=1424199772606&uri=CELEX:52011DC0567>  
<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52011SC1063>
- Council conclusions on the modernisation of higher education:  
[http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52011XG1220\(07\)](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52011XG1220(07))
- Bologna Process - European Higher Education Area (EHEA):  
<http://www.ehea.info/>



### **III. Reference documents for joint masters courses**

- European University Association (EUA) - Survey of Masters Degrees in Europe:  
<http://www.eua.be/publications/>
- Good Practice Report for the Management and Administration of Joint Programmes (JOIMAN):  
<https://www.joiman.eu/ProjectResults/default.aspx>
- EACEA synthesis report: Joint international master programmes - Lessons learnt from Erasmus Mundus (The first generation):  
<http://bookshop.europa.eu/en/joint-international-master-programmes-pbEC0313346/>
- The "Joint Degrees from A to Z (JDAZ)" project: Joint Programmes from A to Z - A reference guide for practitioners:  
<https://www.nuffic.nl/en/expertise/jdaz>
- EMJMDs – The story so far:  
[https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/sites/eacea-site/files/2.\\_policy\\_paper\\_on\\_joint\\_degrees.pdf](https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/sites/eacea-site/files/2._policy_paper_on_joint_degrees.pdf)

### **IV. Joint, multiple/double master degrees in the Erasmus+ Programme Countries**

An overview of the legal framework in the Erasmus+ Programme Countries relating to the award of joint or multiple/double master degree(s) can be [found here](#).

## Annex 4. Individual and consolidated assessment form template for KA1 – Erasmus Mundus Joint Master Degrees

**Assessment Sheet**  
**Call for proposals EAC/A03/2018**  
**EPP-KA1 – Erasmus Mundus Joint Master Degrees**  
**INDIVIDUAL / CONSOLIDATED ASSESSMENT**

Name of the organisation:	.....
Title of the proposal:	.....
Reference n°:	.....
Expert name:	EXP1..... EXP2..... EXP3.....
Coordinator contact:	.....
Version:	.....
Language of the proposal:	.....

### I. ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION

<b>My scoring</b>	<i>xx</i> <i>xx</i>	<i>maximum 40 points</i> <i>maximum 100 points</i>	<i>Award criterion 1</i> <i>Overall score</i>
<b>Consolidated scoring</b>		<i>maximum 40 points</i> <i>maximum 100 points</i>	<i>Award criterion 1</i> <i>Final consolidation</i>
<b>Expert decision:</b>		<i>Highly recommended</i> <i>Recommended</i> <i>Not recommended</i>	
<b>Technical capacity:</b>		<i>Accepted</i> <i>Rejected</i>	
<b>Comments: (if rejected)</b>		<i>EXP1.....</i> <i>EXP2.....</i> <i>EXP3.....</i>	

*I hereby confirm that I am not in a position of conflict of interest with regard to this proposal.*

Signature <b>Expert 1:</b> .....	Date: .....
Signature <b>Expert 2:</b> .....	Date: .....
Signature <b>Expert 3:</b> .....	Date: .....

### Scoring Summary

<b>CRITERIA</b>	<b>SCORE</b>			
	<b>EXP1</b>	<b>EXP2</b>	<b>EXP3</b>	<b>CONS</b>
<b>Relevance of the project</b>	<i>xx</i>	<i>xx</i>	<i>xx</i>	<i>xx / 40</i>
<b>Quality of the project design and implementation</b>	<i>xx</i>	<i>xx</i>	<i>xx</i>	<i>xx / 20</i>
<b>Quality of the project team and the cooperation arrangements</b>	<i>xx</i>	<i>xx</i>	<i>xx</i>	<i>xx / 20</i>
<b>Impact and dissemination</b>	<i>xx</i>	<i>xx</i>	<i>xx</i>	<i>xx / 20</i>
<b>Total</b>	<i>xx</i>	<i>xx</i>	<i>xx</i>	<i>xxx / 100</i>
<b>Relevance of the project in the targeted region(s)</b>	<i>xx</i>	<i>xx</i>	<i>xx</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>

### Assessment Grid

Award criteria		Elements of analysis of the award criterion	Score
1.	Relevance of the project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal's elements of <b>"jointness"/integration, design and structure</b> and their relevance for the achievements of the EMJMDs objectives.</li> <li>• The <b>integration</b> of the EMJMD within the partners' degrees catalogue, its current <b>recognition/accreditation status</b> and plans towards the <b>award of a joint degree</b> (<i>where applicable</i>).</li> <li>• The cornerstones of the academic programme and learning outcomes and their contribution to the <b>attractiveness</b> of the European Higher Education Area, to the European university <b>excellence, innovation, and competitiveness</b>.</li> <li>• The <b>value added</b> of the proposed EMJMD and benefits resulting from the partnership (e.g. new partners that have not been involved in an EM project) and its contribution to the <b>internationalisation</b> in higher education.</li> <li>• The contribution of the EMJMD for the acquisition of <b>competences and skills</b> relevant for the graduates' <b>professional profiles</b>.</li> </ul>	<p><b>maximum 40 points (threshold 30 points)</b></p>
Comments			
2.	Quality of the project design and implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal's <b>excellent academic content</b> and its <b>evaluation method for monitoring and improving quality</b>.</li> <li>• The EMJMD <b>course structure</b>, the organisation of the students' mobility and its draft strategy/planning for an effective involvement of scholars/guest lecturers.</li> <li>• The EMJMD as the result of a <b>jointly developed curriculum</b> and the level of <b>participation and institutional commitment</b> of each partner to the EMJMD.</li> <li>• The <b>information and services for students/academic staff</b> before and after course enrolment e.g. support for accommodation, language training, administrative formalities (<i>such as visa support</i>) and insurance.</li> <li>• The description of the <b>course rules, student rights and obligations</b> relating to academic, administrative and financial aspects of the EMJMD implementation.</li> <li>• The envisaged activities and facilities to ensure the <b>effective integration/networking</b> of the EMJMD students within their <b>socio-cultural and professional environment</b>.</li> <li>• The <b>interaction between the EMJMD consortium and non-educational actors</b> during the course implementation.</li> </ul>	<p><b>maximum 20 points</b></p>

<b>Comments</b>			
<b>3.</b>	Quality of the project team and the cooperation arrangements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The <b>fields of expertise</b> of the involved partners/staff and how they are <b>complementary</b> and of <b>added value</b> for the EMJMD implementation.</li> <li>• The development of existing partnerships with the inclusion of new academic partners in the consortium.</li> <li>• Each partner's <b>role</b> and <b>tasks</b>, and the <b>working mechanisms</b> and <b>management tools</b> in place for an effective implementation of the EMJMD.</li> <li>• The <b>joint criteria</b> for <b>student application, selection and admission</b>, the <b>teaching/training</b> activities, <b>student examination</b> and <b>performance evaluation</b>.</li> <li>• The description of how the <b>student participation costs</b> have been calculated, and how <b>financial resources</b> including complementary funding will be <b>mobilised, allocated</b> and <b>managed</b>.</li> </ul>	<i>maximum 20 points</i>
<b>Comments</b>			
<b>4.</b>	Impact and dissemination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal's <b>mid/long-term development/sustainability strategy</b>, including realistic projections beyond the EU funding period, and ways to mobilise <b>other funding sources</b> for scholarships and self-funded students. For previously funded programmes justification of the request for additional funding .</li> <li>• How the project will generate <b>impact</b> at institutional level and how it enhances the <b>internationalisation strategy</b> of the consortium partners and facilitate their <b>outreach</b> towards relevant stakeholders at national/European/international level.</li> <li>• The description of how the proposed EMJMD encourages entrepreneurship and how <b>employers</b> will be involved in the course implementation, particularly with a view to increasing <b>employability prospects</b>.</li> <li>• The types and methods of <b>promotion/dissemination mechanisms</b>, its target groups and the tasks of the partners in the <b>awareness-raising strategy</b> of the EMJMD, including plans on how to attract excellent students worldwide.</li> <li>• The description of how the materials, documents and media produced will <b>be made freely available</b> and promoted <b>through open licences</b>, and does not contain disproportionate limitations.</li> </ul>	<i>maximum 20 points</i>
<b>Comments</b>			

<b>Comments for the Agency</b>	EXP1..... EXP2..... EXP3.....
--------------------------------	-------------------------------------

► **To be considered for funding, proposals must score at least 70 points out of a total of 100 (threshold 70%).**

*Proposals that have passed Step 1 of the selection process and have opted to apply for additional scholarships for students from targeted regions of the world will be also assessed against the following additional award criterion, which must be addressed globally for all regions proposed.*

Additional award criterion	Elements of analysis of the additional award criterion	Decision
<b>Add</b>	Relevance of the project in the targeted region(s) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The description of the methods used to <b>attract highly talented students</b> from targeted regions.</li> <li>The proposal envisions <b>cooperation</b> with HEIs and/or other eligible participating organisations from Partner Countries in the targeted region.</li> <li>The <b>added value</b> to the EMJMD of such cooperation.</li> </ul>	<b>Yes/No</b>

*Only projects proposed for funding will be considered for the award of additional scholarships for targeted regions of the world.*