

EXERCISE 1: ICE-BREAKER

ANSWERS

A. RELEVANCE OF THE PROPOSAL – 25 points

DOS:

- Concrete, realistic and clearly articulated innovation-driven objectives
- Sound and fully convincing needs analysis
- Synergies with key EU policies in the modernisation of European higher education's system
- Visible EU added value and positive outcomes for potential mobility across countries

DON'TS:

- Lack of justification for the need for transnational cooperation
- Insufficient description of the state of the art in the project area
- Unclear contributions and benefits for the partners from being a consortium member
- Lack of details of the expected project results

B. QUALITY OF THE PROJECT DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION – 25 points

DOS:

- Clearly defined sequence of operational steps, partner-transversal actions and measurable indicators
- Realistic and well scheduled project timeline
- Well planned internal and external evaluation
- Good value for money thanks to a correct and reasonable budget allocation among the participating institutions

DON'TS:

- Unbalanced contribution and level of participation of the partners
- Misunderstanding and inconsistency with the definition of learning mobility
- Inadequate justification of financial provisions of the consortium
- Weak monitoring structure to inform decision-making over the project lifetime

C. QUALITY OF THE PROJECT TEAM AND THE COOPERATION ARRANGEMENTS – 30 points

DOS:

- Realistic resource and task attribution
- Detailed description of the key staff personnel and their expertise relevant to the project area
- Proper and adequate decision-making and conflict resolution mechanisms
- Mutually beneficial and convincing collaboration between projects' HEIs and enterprises
- Justified added value of a third country partner

DON'TS:

- Unsatisfactory description of relevant expertise of the partners in the project area
- Unclear rationale for the consortium composition and complementarity
- Inexplicit and not inclusive protocols for communication and reporting
- Unclear added value and benefits to each partner organisation

D. IMPACT AND DISSEMINATION – 20 points

DOS:

- Convincing sustainability ambitions
- Provisions for open access to educational resources
- Concrete indicators and tools for measuring the impact on all stakeholders
- Effective tools and channels to spread the results to the stakeholders and non-participating audience

DON'TS:

- Lack of specific indicators to measure reach within project lifetime
- Poor measures to monitor progress and assess the expected impact
- Insufficient provisions on how the materials produced will be made available to the wider public
- Inadequate sustainability strategy undermining any potential long-term or replication potential of the project

HOW TO BUILD YOUR PROPOSAL

- Ensure that your proposal addresses all the **4 award criteria**
- Involve **partners** at application stage
- Set clear **mutual benefits** for the industry-academia- other stakeholders
- Set clear and formalised **cooperation arrangements**
- Ensure **coherence** between the proposal and the general strategy of the organisations involved
- Ensure **trust, confidence** and **commitment** in the partnership
- Clear **objectives** and **activities** to achieve them
- Consistent approach on **specific needs/gaps**
- Demonstrate your **statements** in your application
- Clear and measurable **impact** and **sustainability**