



Education and Culture DG

Lifelong Learning Programme

Name of evaluator: Sabine Inführ

**PREPARATORY VISITS**  
**COMMON EUROPEAN QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM**  
**2011**

**Reference N°/Submission ID: LLP/AT-**

**Name of the applicant  
institution/organisation:**

**Note on the points system:** The ratings of the award criteria result in a total number of points out of a maximum of 100. National Agencies may add 15 points for national award criteria.

Each main criterion is given a total maximum number of points.

Please note that grant applications scoring less than 60 points in the quality assessment should not be selected for funding.

**Section E of the grant application: Visit content**

<b>Question in the grant application</b>		<b>Points</b>	<b>Max.</b>
<b>D.1 and the draft agenda</b>	<b>1. Content and duration</b>		<b>50</b>
	1.1. The future cooperation idea to be developed during the preparatory visit/contact seminar is presented clearly. Reference is made to the type of the future project/partnership/network, its theme, main aims and possible partner countries.		
	1.2. There is a clear planning of the activities to be developed during the preparatory visit. <b>N.B.: Not applicable for contact seminars</b>		
	1.3. The social and work activities programmed in the agenda of the visit are balanced. <b>N.B.: Not applicable for contact seminars</b>		
	1.4. The duration of the visit is sufficient to accomplish the proposed activities. <b>N.B.: Not applicable for contact seminars</b>		
<b>C.1, C.1.4, C.3.1, C.3.1.2, D.1, E.1, F1, G.1, H.</b>	<b>2. Relevance</b>		<b>50</b>
	2.1. There is a clear link between the specificity of the applicant's home organisation (type of organisation, activities and strategy), the proposed partnership/project/network and the purpose and content of the preparatory visit/contact seminar.		
	2.2. The activities proposed are realistic, reasonable and may contribute to draft the future project/partnership given the time frame of the visit. <b>N.B.: Not applicable for contact seminars</b>		
	2.3. The qualifications and the professional background of the participant are relevant for drafting the proposed project/partnership/network.		
	2.4. In case of two staff persons from the same organisation, the role and responsibilities of the second person are relevant for drafting the proposed project/partnership/network.		
	2.5. In case of two destinations, the explanation provided by the applicant organisation is clear and relevant for drafting the proposed project/partnership/network.		

	2.6. The grant requested is realistic and coherent with the activity planned.		
	<b>TOTAL POINTS FOR THE QUALITY ASSESSMENT</b>		<b>100</b>

**National award criteria for 2011**

	<i>NAs to insert the national award criteria here (for example, priority may be given to applicant organisations without any experience in projects/partnerships/networks).</i>		<b>15</b>
--	---	--	-----------

**OVERALL COMMENTS:**

*Please be as specific and clear as possible, avoid personal judgment and use neutral language. In the case of less good quality applications, please explain points which you feel could be improved (these comments may be sent as feedback to unsuccessful applicants).*

*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 person who have 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.*

\_\_\_\_\_

Date

\_\_\_\_\_

Name and signature