



Open call for proposals

Strengthening STEM skills in primary schools and development of Regional Science Centres for STEM education in primary schools

Component A: Development of STEM skills through equipping school classrooms with STEM equipment

Grant application	
Applicant	
Partner institutions (i/a)	
Evaluator	

Quality Assessment Form

AWARD CRITERIA	POINTS		SOURCE OF VERIFICATION
1. Relevance of the grant application to expected Output and Outcomes of the Call			
Project contributes to the realization of the Outcome 2 of the Call: <i>Enhanced STEM skills</i> <i>Methodology of assessment:</i> 4 – entirely	/4	/10	Section 2.3. „Project description“, 2.5.

<p>3 – with minor deficiency 2 – partially 1 – insufficiently 0 – does not contribute</p>			<p>„Expected results of the project“ and 2.6. „Contribution to expected outcomes and outputs of the Call“ of the Application form</p>
<p>Project contributes to the realization of the Output 2.1.: <i>Classroom infrastructure and equipment for development of functional STEM classrooms upgraded</i></p> <p><i>Methodology of assessment:</i> 3 – entirely 2 – partially 1 – insufficiently 0 – does not contribute</p>	/3		
<p>Project contributes to the realization of the Output 2.3.: <i>STEM skills of professionals in primary education upgraded</i></p> <p><i>Methodology of assessment:</i> 3 – entirely 2 – partially 1 – insufficiently 0 – does not contribute</p>	/3		
<p>Score argumentation: <i>When determining the contribution of a project to expected Output and Outcomes of the Call, the evaluator determines the formulation of project results, connection with the Output and Outcomes of the Call and their validity in project activities and, if applicable, explains partial, insufficient or no contribution in this section of quality assessment. If evaluator determines that grant application does not contribute to some of the Outputs, he will suggest to the Programme Operator the termination from the award procedure of such grant application.</i></p>			
<p>2. Contribution to the Call indicators</p>			
<p>Project contributes to the indicator 2.1. <i>Share of professionals self-reporting on improved ability in STEM teaching.</i></p>	/1	/10	<p>Section 2.7 „Contribution to call indicator“ and</p>
<p>Project contributes to the indicator 2.2. <i>Share of pupils self-reporting on improved STEM skills</i></p>	/1		

Project contributes to the indicator 2.1.1. <i>Number of schools introducing STEM classrooms</i>	/1		sheet „Activities“ of the Application form
Project contributes to the indicator 2.1.2. <i>Number of schools with improved services</i>	/1		
Project contributes to the indicator 2.3.1. <i>Number of educational programmes (TOT) for STEM skills, ICT, entrepreneurship and active citizenship for professionals implemented</i>	/1		
Project contributes to the indicator 2.3.2. <i>Number of educational programmes for STEM skills, ICT, entrepreneurship and active citizenship for pupils implemented</i>	/1		
Project contributes to the indicator 2.3.3. <i>Number of staff participating in development and testing of teaching models, practices and education activities for STEM-based skills, ICT, entrepreneurship and active citizenship</i>	/1		
Project contributes to the indicator 2.3.4. <i>Number of pupils enrolled in STEM programmes/courses</i>	/1		
Project contributes to the indicator 2.3.5. <i>Number of pupils participating in extracurricular classes</i>	/1		
Project contributes to the indicator B.1. <i>Number of projects involving cooperation with a partner from the donor country</i>	/1		
<p>Score argumentation: <i>When determining the contribution of the project to an indicator, the evaluator determines target values of the contribution to the indicators from section 2.7. of Application form and the validity of reaching the target value in the proposed project activities. If the evaluator finds that the planned contribution is not based on the planned project activities, the evaluator may reduce points to the project for each indicator (assign half the evaluation amount), which should be explained in this section of the Quality Assessment Form. At the same time, evaluator may propose to the Programme Operator a reduction of the target value of indicators under the Grant Contract, if the project is selected for funding.</i></p>			
3. Contribution to inclusive education			
Project contributes to improving the quality of primary education for pupils with special educational needs, in accordance with Art. 62 of the Law on Education. <i>Methodology of assessment:</i>	/10	/10	Section 2.3. „Project description“ and Section 2.7.1.

<p>10 – entirely 8 – with minor deficiency 6 – partially 4 – with major deficiency 2 – insufficiently 0 – does not contribute</p>			<p>„Contribution to special categories of Call indicators“ and sheet „Activities“ of the Application form</p>
<p>Score argumentation: <i>In determining the contribution of the project to inclusive education, the evaluator determines whether the project envisages the participation of pupils with special educational needs and whether it carries out special activities for pupils with special educational needs. It also determines the validity of the contribution to improving the quality of education for the pupils involved and the validity of such contribution in project activities. If applicable, evaluator explains the deficiencies or lack of input in this section of the Quality Assessment Form.</i></p>			
<p>4. Capacities of applicant and / or partners (if applicable) for project implementation</p>			
<p>The applicant or partner has previous experience in implementing at least one project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) financed from EU / international funding sources b) equal or greater financial coverage c) purposes appropriate to the proposed project (aimed at the same target groups, the same thematic area, etc.) <p><i>Methodology of assessment:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5 – entirely in all 3 criteria 3 – fulfills 2 criteria 1 – fulfills 1 criteria 0 – does not contribute 	<p>/5</p>	<p>/10</p>	<p>Section 4.2. „List of previously implemented projects“ of the Application form</p>
<p>Score argumentation: <i>The evaluator determines the previous experience of the applicant in the implementation of projects of similar value, coverage and purpose by reviewing the data on previously implemented project proposals in the Application Form. If applicable, the assessor justifies failure to meet one of the above criteria.</i></p>			

<p>The applicant has provided adequate professional, administrative and financial capacity to implement the proposed scope of activities.</p> <p><i>Methodology of assessment:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5 – entirely 4 – with minor deficiency 3 – partially 2 – with major deficiency 1 – insufficiently 0 – does not contribute 	/5		<p>Section 4.1. „Description of the professional and administrative capacities of the applicant and (if applicable) of the project implementation partner“, sheet „Activities“ and Budget Summary“ of the Application form</p>
<p>Score argumentation: <i>The evaluator assesses the adequacy of the professional, administrative and financial capacities to the proposed scope of activities, including own co-financing. If applicable, explain the deficiencies and partial or absence of contributions in this section of the Quality Assessment Form.</i></p>			
<p>5. Project sustainability</p>			
<p>The applicant explained the institutional sustainability of the project results (institutional support for the implementation of activities after the completion of the project, in accordance with point 4.4 of the Call)?</p> <p><i>Methodology of assessment:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10 - entirely 8 - with minor deficiency 6 - partially 4 - with major deficiency 2 – insufficiently 0 – does not contribute 	/10	/20	<p>Section 7. „Sustainability of the project“ of the Application form</p>

Score argumentation: <i>The evaluator assesses the institutional sustainability of the project by reviewing Application form and explains the identified deficiency and partial or absence of contributions in this section of the Quality Assessment Form.</i>			
The applicant explained the financial sustainability of the project (financing of activities after the implementation of the project, in accordance with section 4.4 of the Call)? <i>Methodology of assessment:</i> 10 - entirely 8 - with minor deficiency 6 - partially 4 - with major deficiency 2 – insufficiently 0 – does not contribute	/10		
Score argumentation: <i>The evaluator assesses the financial sustainability of the project by reviewing Application form and explains the identified deficiency and partial or absence of contributions in this section of the Quality Assessment Form.</i>			
6. Design and preparedness of the project			
Project activities are meaningfully connected and contribute to the fulfillment of expected project results. <i>Methodology of assessment:</i> 10 - entirely 8 - with minor deficiency 6- partially 4 - with major deficiency 2 - insufficiently 0 - does not contribute	/10	/25	Section 2.5. „Expected results of the project“, sheet „Activities“ of the Application form

<p>Score argumentation: <i>The evaluator assesses the meaningfulness and connection of project activities and the reality of their contribution to the stated and expected results of the project. If applicable, explain the deficiencies and partial or absence of contributions in this section of the Quality Assessment Form.</i></p>		
<p>The proposed plan for the implementation of activities is realistic, i.e. the activities are feasible in proposed period of time and with available organizational / financial / institutional / human resources?</p> <p><i>Methodology of assessment:</i> 5 - entirely 4 - with minor deficiency 3 - partially 2 - with major deficiency 1 - insufficiently 0 – does not contribute</p>	/5	<p>Section 4.1. „Description of the professional and administrative capacities of the applicant and (if applicable) of the project implementation partner“, Section 5. „Legal issues“, sheet „Activities“ of the Application form</p>
<p>Score argumentation: <i>The evaluator assesses the feasibility of the project activities regarding the proposed implementation schedule plan and the described capacities of the applicant and partners. If applicable, explain the deficiencies and partial or absence of contributions in this section of the Quality Assessment Form.</i></p>		
<p>Taking into account the plan for the implementation of activities and available organizational / financial / institutional / human resources, the applicant has correctly identified the risks and offered the answers which guarantee the feasibility of project activities.</p> <p><i>Methodology of assessment:</i> 5 - entirely 4 - with minor deficiency 3 - partially 2 - with major deficiency 1 – insufficiently 0 – does not contribute</p>	/5	<p>Section 4.1. „Description of the professional and administrative capacities of the applicant and (if applicable) of the project implementation partner“, Section 5. „Legal issues“,</p>

<p>Score argumentation: <i>The evaluator assesses did the applicant identify the adequate risks and did the applicant offer the answers which guarantee the feasibility of project activities. If applicable, explain the deficiencies and partial or absence of contributions in this section of the Quality Assessment Form.</i></p>		<p>Section 6. „Risk assessment”, sheet „Activities“ of the Application form</p>
<p>Partner(s) is / are relevant and meaningfully involved in the project activities.</p> <p><i>Methodology of assessment:</i> 5 - entirely 4 - yes, with minor deficiency 3 - yes, with major deficiency 2 - partnership is envisaged, but not relevant for the proposed project activities 1 - partnership is envisaged, but partners are not actively involved in the implementation 0 - the project does not envisage a partnership</p>	<p>/5</p>	<p>Section 3. „Partnership“, sheet „Activities“ of the Application form</p>
<p>Score argumentation: <i>The evaluator determines the involvement of the partner and his relevance and role in the project. In doing so, it assesses the feasibility of involvement in project activities with regard to its area of activity / expertise. If applicable, explain the deficiencies and partial or absence of contributions in this section of the Quality Assessment Form.</i></p>		
<p>7. Project budget quality</p>		
<p>The budget of the project is harmonized with the project activities and realistic considering the planned results of the project? Does it represent the best value for money?</p> <p><i>Methodology of assessment:</i> 10 - entirely 8 - with minor deficiency 6 - partially 4 - with major deficiency 2 - insufficiently</p>	<p>/10</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">/10</p> <p>Sheet „Activities“ and „Budget“ of the Application form</p>

0 – does not contribute			
Score argumentation: <i>If the evaluator identifies certain deficiencies in the proposed budget, evaluator shall explain the deficiencies and the partial or absence of contributions in this section of the Quality Assessment Form. It may also reduce scores of the project and propose to the Programme Operator to reduce / correct / exclude individual budget items in the next phase of the award procedure (Eligibility check of proposed activities and expenses).</i>			
If applicable, budget items proposed for exclusion / correction / reduction at the stage of eligibility check of proposed activities and expenses:			
8. Bilateral partnership			
The project includes a partnership with an organization from the donor country.	/10	/10	Section 3. „Partnership“ of the Application form
Score argumentation: <i>If the evaluator determines that the project involves a partnership with an organization from the donor country, project is awarded 10 points.</i>			
9. Contribution to balanced regional development			
The project is awarded with points according to the methodology as follows: 15 - The project is implemented in the local self-government from the I. group from the Decision on classification 13 - The project is implemented in the local self-government from II. groups from the Classification Decision 12 - The project is implemented in the local self-government from III. groups from the Classification Decision 10 - The project is implemented in the local self-government from IV. groups from the Classification Decision and / or the Project is implemented in the local self-government with the status of a mountainous area or local self-government on the islands that are part of the local self-government located in groups V. and VI. from the Classification Decision	/15	/15	Section 1.7. „Location data“ of the Application form

<p>9 - The project is implemented in local self-government with the status of a mountainous area or local self-government on the islands that are part of the local self-government located in VII. and VIII. group from the Classification Decision</p> <p>7 - The project is implemented in JLPS(R)S from V. group from the Classification Decision</p> <p>6 - The project is implemented in JLPS(R)S from VI. group from the Classification Decision</p> <p>4 - The project is implemented in JLPS(R)S from VII. group from the Classification Decision</p> <p>3 - The project is implemented in JLP(R)S from VIII. groups from the Classification Decision</p> <p>The evaluation is performed according to the Decision on the classification of local and regional self-government units according to the level of development (OG 132/17), the Hill and Mountain Areas Act (OG 118/18) and the Islands Act (OG 116/18, 73/20).</p>			
<p>Score argumentation: <i>The evaluator determines whether the applicant carries out project activities in the areas of regional self-government units with a lower development index in accordance with it and assigns the project points in accordance with the methodology as specified. If project activities are carried out in several JLP(R)Ss, points are awarded in accordance with which JLP(R)Ss carries out most of the project activities.</i></p>			
<p>10. Contribution to horizontal principles from the point 2.1. of the Call</p>			
<p>The project earns one point for contributing to one horizontal principle:</p> <p>a) good governance</p> <p>b) sustainable development</p> <p>c) long-term economic growth</p> <p>d) social cohesion</p> <p>e) environmental protection</p>	/5	/5	<p>Section 8. „Horizontal themes“ i sheet „Activities“ of the Application form</p>
<p>Score argumentation: <i>The evaluator awards one point to the project for its contribution to one of the horizontal principles. When determining the contribution of the project proposal to an individual indicator, the evaluator considers the contribution to the horizontal principles from section 7 of the Application Form and the justification for reaching the target value in the proposed project activities.</i></p>			
<p>TOTAL POINTS</p>			/125
<p>Grant applications that do not achieve <u>at least 75 points</u> will not be considered for funding.</p>			
<p>General evaluator's comment:</p>			

Evaluator's signature:
If applicable, the comment of the employee in charge of technical verification of Form at the Programme Operator:
Signature of the employee in charge of technical verification at the Programe Operator:
If applicable, comment from the Chairperson of the Project Selection Committee:
Signature of the Chairperson of the Project Selection Committee: