



### CALL FOR PROPOSALS - SMALL GRANT SCHEME

#### Improved Skills and Competencies of Teachers and Other Educational Workers in Primary Education

<b>Grant application</b>	
<b>Applicant</b>	
<b>Partner institutions (i/a)</b>	
<b>Evaluator</b>	

#### Quality Assessment Form

AWARD CRITERIA	POINTS		SOURCE OF VERIFICATION
<b>1. Relevance of the grant application to expected Output and Outcomes of the Call</b>			
Project contributes to the realization of the Outcome 1 of the Call: <i>Improved skills and competencies of teachers and other professionals in primary education.</i>  <i>Methodology of assessment:</i> 4 – entirely 3 – with minor deficiency 2 – partially	/4	/10	Section 2.3. „Project description“, 2.5. „Expected results of the project“ and 2.6.

<p>1 – insufficiently 0 – does not contribute</p>			<p>„Contribution to expected outcomes and outputs of the Call“ of the Application form</p>
<p>Project contributes to the realization of the Output 1.1.: <i>Approaches and practices in promoting skills and competences for STEM area, ICT, entrepreneurship and active citizenship 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 1.2.: <i>Institutional cooperation in sharing knowledge and good practices on skills and competencies at all levels of education.</i></p> <p><i>Methodology of assessment:</i> 3 – entirely 2 – partially 1 – insufficiently 0 – does not contribute</p>	/3		
<p><b>Score argumentation:</b> <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><b>2. Contribution to the Call indicators</b></p>			
<p>Project contributes to the indicator 1.1. <i>Share of teachers and other professionals in primary education who declare improved skills/competences in areas of STEM, ICT, entrepreneurship and active citizenship</i></p>	/1	/10	<p>Section 2.7 „Contribution to call indicator“ and sheet „Activities“</p>
<p>Project contributes to the indicator 1.2. <i>Level of satisfaction with the quality of enhanced competences.</i></p>	/1		

Project contributes to the indicator 1.1.1. <i>Number of intellectual outputs generated by improving skills and competences (teaching models, methods and strategies, learning and teaching resources, didactical tools)</i>	/2		of the Application form
Project contributes to the indicator 1.1.2. <i>Number of professionals trained on the use of teaching models, methods, strategies upgraded</i>	/2		
Project contributes to the indicator 1.2.1. <i>Number of institutions involved in cooperation activities (established inter-institutional cooperation in the exchange of knowledge and good practice, which contributes to the development of skills and competencies at all levels of education)</i>	/2		
Project contributes to the indicator B.1. <i>Number of projects involving cooperation with a donor project partner</i>	/2		
<p><b>Score argumentation:</b>  <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>			
<b>3. Contribution to inclusive education</b>			
<p>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.</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	/5	Section 2.3. „Project description“ and Section 2.7.1. „Contribution to special sub-categories of Call indicators“ and sheet „Activities“ of the Application form

<p><b>Score argumentation:</b>  <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><b>4. Capacities of applicant and / or partners (if applicable) for project implementation</b></p>			
<p>The applicant or partner has previous experience in implementing at least one project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) financed from EU / international funding sources</li> <li>b) equal or greater financial coverage</li> <li>c) purposes appropriate to the proposed project (aimed at the same target groups, the same thematic area, etc.)</li> </ul> <p><i>Methodology of assessment:</i>  5 – entirely in all 3 criteria  3 – fulfills 2 criteria  1 – fulfills 1 criteria  0 – does not contribute</p>	/5	/10	Section 4.2. „List of previously implemented projects“ of the Application form
<p><b>Score argumentation:</b>  <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> <p>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“, sheet „Activities“ and Budget Summary“ of the Application form</p>
<p><b>Score argumentation:</b>  <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><b>5. Project sustainability</b></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> <p>10 - entirely  8 - with minor deficiency  6 - partially  4 - with major deficiency  2 – insufficiently  0 – does not contribute</p>	/10	/20	<p>Section 7.  „Sustainability of the project“ of the Application form</p>

<b>Score argumentation:</b> <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)?	<b>/10</b>		
<i>Methodology of assessment:</i> 10 - entirely 8 - with minor deficiency 6 - partially 4 - with major deficiency 2 – insufficiently 0 – does not contribute			
<b>Score argumentation:</b> <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>			
<b>6. Design and preparedness of the project</b>			
Project activities are meaningfully connected and contribute to the fulfillment of expected project results.	<b>/5</b>	<b>/20</b>	Section 2.5. „Expected results of the project“, sheet „Activities“ of the Application form
<i>Methodology of assessment:</i> 5 - entirely 4 - with minor deficiency 3- partially 2 - with major deficiency 1 - insufficiently 0 - does not contribute			

<p><b>Score argumentation:</b>  <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“, sheet „Activities“ of the Application form</p>
<p><b>Score argumentation:</b>  <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. „Risk</p>

<p><b>Score argumentation:</b>  <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>			assessment”, sheet „Activities“ of the Application form	
<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>	<b>/5</b>		Section 3. „Partnership“, sheet „Activities“ of the Application form	
<p><b>Score argumentation:</b>  <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>				
<b>7. Project budget quality</b>				
<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  0 – does not contribute</p>		<b>/10</b>	<b>/10</b>	Sheet „Activities“ and „Budget“ of the Application form



<b>Score argumentation:</b> <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>			
<b>If applicable, budget items proposed for exclusion / correction / reduction at the stage of eligibility check of proposed activities and expenses:</b>			
<b>8. Bilateral partnership</b>			
The project includes a partnership with an organization from the donor country.	<b>/10</b>	<b>/10</b>	Section 3. „Partnership“ of the Application form
<b>Score argumentation:</b> <i>If the evaluator determines that the project involves a partnership with an organization from the donor country, project is awarded 10 points.</i>			
<b>9. Contribution to balanced regional development</b>			
<i>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 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 7 - The project is implemented in JLPS(R)S from V. group from the Classification Decision</i>	<b>/15</b>	<b>/15</b>	Section 1.6. „Location data“ of the Application form

<p>6 - The project is implemented in JLPS(R)S from VI. group from the Classification Decision  4 - The project is implemented in JLPS(R)S from VII. group from the Classification Decision  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><b>Score argumentation:</b>  <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><b>10. Contribution to horizontal principles from the point 2.1. of the Call</b></p>			
<p>The project <b>earns one point for contributing to one horizontal principle:</b>  a) good governance  b) sustainable development  c) long-term economic growth  d) social cohesion  e) environmental protection</p>	/5	/5	<p>Section 7.  „Horizontal themes“ i  sheet „Activities“ of  the Application  form</p>
<p><b>Score argumentation:</b>  <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><b>TOTAL POINTS</b></p>			<b>/115</b>
<p><b>Grant applications that do not achieve <u>at least 65 points</u> will not be considered for funding.</b></p>			
<p><b>General evaluator's comment:</b></p>			
<p><b>Evaluator's signature:</b></p>			

**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:**