

**QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM**  
**Development of Polish Higher Education Institutions**  
Scholarship and Training Fund

Number of the Application Form:
Name of the Applying Institution:
Project Title:

**PROJECT QUALITY ASSESSMENT**

**Remarks concerning the assessment scoring:** Every criterion should be assessed according to the scoring presented at each question. Grades awarded for particular sections sum up, giving the maximum number of 100 points. Every application form will be assessed by two experts. Application form that will be graded a score of less than 60 points will be considered as not meeting quality criteria.

**I. Objectives of the project, work programme and methodology (0-50 points)**

**1. Objectives of the project (0-10 points)**

**Assessed elements:**

Objectives of the project are clearly described, realistic and coherent with the objectives of the Scholarship and Training Fund. General objectives and specific objectives of the project are enumerated and described. Planned project activities are coherent with the specific objectives of the project. It is depicted how the project will refer to the actual needs of the Applicant (or participating institutions – if project is implemented in partnership) and target groups. It is explained to what extent the cross-cutting issues (good governance, gender equality, sustainable development – economic, social and environmental aspect) are respected during project implementation and planned project results.

In case of projects referring to the new field of study/ specialisation/ course/ module/ study programme it is described what will be the target group to whom the new offer will be addressed; the number of students/ listeners is indicated and the assumptions for the creation of the new field of study/ specialisation/ course/ module/ study programme (market demand, predicted number of students, programme assumptions and qualifications' framework etc.) is described. It is also depicted how the sustainability of the new field of study will be provided after the Scholarship and Training Fund co-financing would have ceased.

**ATTENTION** – *project proposal which is not in accordance with the purposes of the STF will be rejected at this stage and given 0 points in the quality assessment.*

**8-10 points** – *proposal shows very high level of accordance with the issues assessed;*

**6-7 points** – *proposal shows pretty good level of accordance with the issues assessed;*

**4-5 points** – *proposal shows good enough level of accordance with the issues assessed;*

**1-3 points** – *proposal shows poor level of accordance with the issues assessed;*

**0 points** – *proposal does not show any accordance with the issues assessed.*

Comments

--

**2. Roles and tasks of particular persons and participating institutions (0-10 points)**

**Assessed elements:**

Roles and tasks of project participants are divided appropriately to their experience, specialisation and competence. Project coordination is appropriately planned, the applying institution employs staff with

appropriate qualifications and competence adequate for the proposed project (employees, external experts). The choice of external experts is adequately explained (if anticipated in the project).

**If the project is implemented in partnership, the elements below should be additionally assessed:**

The distribution of tasks between the project partners is appropriate and clearly determined; it is also reflected in the technical and human resources of the institutions. The choice of partners is explained in the context of planned project objectives. The distribution of tasks between participating institutions and detailed scope of responsibilities of each of them is described, the involvement of each partner institution during the successive stages of project implementation is described. Project description and planned work programme presented in the *Letter of Agreement* is coherent with description presented in the application form. Partner institution declares willingness and notices benefits resulting from future cooperation with the Applicant. Benefits for the Applicant resulting from the participation of partner institution in the implementation of common project is clearly described.

**8-10 points** – proposal shows very high level of accordance with the issues assessed;

**6-7 points** – proposal shows pretty good level of accordance with the issues assessed;

**4-5 points** – proposal shows good enough level of accordance with the issues assessed;

**1-3 points** – proposal shows poor level of accordance with the issues assessed;

**0 points** – proposal does not show any accordance with the issues assessed.

Comments

### 3. Work programme (0-10 points)

**Assessed elements:**

Work programme is planned for the whole time of project implementation and it is coherent with project objectives. Planned activities and mobilities (if anticipated) are coherent with project assumptions. Work programme includes activities of all participating project partners, in accordance with their role in the project (if the project is implemented in partnership). Work programme is consistent with project budget. Project duration is adequate and consistent with planned activities and allows for achieving planned project objectives.

**8-10 points** – proposal shows very high level of accordance with the issues assessed;

**6-7 points** – proposal shows pretty good level of accordance with the issues assessed;

**4-5 points** – proposal shows good enough level of accordance with the issues assessed;

**1-3 points** – proposal shows poor level of accordance with the issues assessed;

**0 points** – proposal does not show any accordance with the issues assessed.

Comments

### 4. Management and communication (0-10 points)

**Assessed elements:**

It is described how the project would be managed; it is also clearly described how the project group will measure the level of realization of project activities and results. Project group planned adequate activities that should lead to successful communication and cooperation between persons/groups engaged in project implementation and between participating institutions (if applicable), i.e.: meetings, seminars, regular correspondence and other forms of communication.

- 8-10 points** – proposal shows very high level of accordance with the issues assessed;
- 6-7 points** – proposal shows pretty good level of accordance with the issues assessed;
- 4-5 points** – proposal shows good enough level of accordance with the issues assessed;
- 1-3 points** – proposal shows poor level of accordance with the issues assessed;
- 0 points** – proposal does not show any accordance with the issues assessed.

Comments

### 5. Monitoring and evaluation (0-5 points)

**Assessed elements:**

The method of assessing whether project objectives would be achieved, and planned project impact would occur, is clearly depicted in project description. Methods of monitoring and internal and/or external evaluation (if applicable) are planned on participants' level and on the project level. Planned evaluation methodology is clearly described and includes such aspects as: analysis of progress and results of activities, participants' level of satisfaction, achievement of planned project objectives and their evaluation. It is also depicted how, in what way, and by whom the evaluation results will be used.

- 5 points** – proposal shows very high level of accordance with the issues assessed;
- 3-4 points** – proposal shows pretty good level of accordance with the issues assessed;
- 2 points** – proposal shows good enough level of accordance with the issues assessed;
- 1 point** – proposal shows poor level of accordance with the issues assessed;
- 0 points** – proposal does not show any accordance with the issues assessed.

Comments

### 6. Risk management (0-5 pkt.)

**Assessed elements:**

The mechanisms of problem resolution that may occur during project implementation are foreseen and planned, potential threats/ difficulties and appropriate countermeasures (mechanisms) are defined.

- 5 points** – proposal shows very high level of accordance with the issues assessed;
- 3-4 points** – proposal shows pretty good level of accordance with the issues assessed;
- 2 points** – proposal shows good enough level of accordance with the issues assessed;
- 1 point** – proposal shows poor level of accordance with the issues assessed;
- 0 points** – proposal does not show any accordance with the issues assessed.

Comments

## II. Results and project impact, innovative character, dissemination of results (0-30 points)

### 1. Results (0-10 points)

#### Assessed elements:

Planned results are in accordance with project assumptions and adequate with thematic scope of the project.

**8-10 points** – proposal shows very high level of accordance with the issues assessed;

**6-7 points** – proposal shows pretty good level of accordance with the issues assessed;

**4-5 points** – proposal shows good enough level of accordance with the issues assessed;

**1-3 points** – proposal shows poor level of accordance with the issues assessed;

**0 points** – proposal does not show any accordance with the issues assessed.

Comments

### 2. Impact and innovative character (0-12 points)

#### Assessed elements:

Perceived benefits resulting from participation in the project and project impact (short- and long-term) and its results upon the participating institutions, target group(s) is clearly determined and described. It is shown how the Applicant and partner institutions (where applicable) will benefit from the project. Is it clearly described in the project description that activities undertaken in the project will be continued in the future, after the STF co-financing ceases? If the project is considered as innovative, how this innovative character can be described (measured as creating new value, e.g. in a field of education). To what extent the activities planned within the project may constitute an example/ model/ standard and be used by other institutions in the future?

**10-12 points** – proposal shows very high level of accordance with the issues assessed;

**7-9 points** – proposal shows pretty good level of accordance with the issues assessed;

**4-6 points** – proposal shows good enough level of accordance with the issues assessed;

**1-3 points** – proposal shows poor level of accordance with the issues assessed;

**0 points** – proposal does not show any accordance with the issues assessed.

Comments

### 3. Dissemination of results (0-8 points)

#### Assessed elements:

Planned dissemination of project activities and project results is clearly depicted and provides optimal use of “final products” by all institutions participating in the project. The project group is interested in dissemination of results and experience to a wider audience (e.g. on the international level, presentation during a conference or seminar). If the project provides for the development of materials whose dissemination requires intellectual property issues to be regulated, it is described how this issue will be addressed during project implementation.

**7-8 points** – proposal shows very high level of accordance with the issues assessed;

**5-6 points** – proposal shows pretty good level of accordance with the issues assessed;

**3-4 points** – proposal shows good enough level of accordance with the issues assessed;

**1-2 points** – proposal shows poor level of accordance with the issues assessed;

**0 points** – proposal does not show any accordance with the issues assessed.

Comments

### III. Project budget (0-20 points)

**Assessed elements:**

The rationality of planned budget: is it coherent with project objectives, assumptions and work programme and in what way is it adequate to planned project activities? Project costs (especially remuneration and fees, costs of fixed assets (teaching equipment) – if planned) are appropriate and rationally calculated, based on the market demand. Planned expenses refer logically to planned activities and budget items in particular, budget categories are reflected in the work programme. Planned expenses are rationally extended in time (project does not include expenses that are dispensable or strained in time). Budget includes costs that will be incurred by partners (if applicable), which are adequate to activities undertaken within the project implementation. In case of subcontractor costs (if planned) it is explained and justified in detail why project activities cannot be implemented by the project group's own resources.

**16-20 points** – proposal shows very high level of accordance with the issues assessed;

**11-15 points** – proposal shows pretty good level of accordance with the issues assessed;

**6-10 points** – proposal shows good enough level of accordance with the issues assessed;

**1-5 points** – proposal shows poor level of accordance with the issues assessed;

**0 points** – proposal does not show any accordance with the issues assessed.

**Comments for the budget**

Questioned budget items, questioned limit of expenses along with justification, proposed changes in the budget which result from the content-related (quality) scope of the project, along with justification.

Attention: Please fill the table below if construction of the project budget, particular budget items and/or their limits arise your doubts.

Budget category	Budget item (number)	Short description of cost	Suggestions for correction (e.g. cost ineligible, unjustified, overestimated at the amount of..., underestimated)
1			
2			

**TOTAL NUMBER OF POINTS – QUALITY ASSESSMENT: 0-100 points**

## V. JUSTIFICATION OF ASSESSMENT

*Below remarks will be sent as feedback to the Applicant.*

Please give the general assessment, provide the summary of findings/ remarks of the project proposal as a whole, and give justification of your assessment. Please indicate the project strengths/ weaknesses and areas that – in your opinion – could be improved.

In your justification please refer to all elements of the assessment, and in particular to:

- project objectives, methodology and work programme;
- results and impact, innovative character;
- dissemination of results;
- budget.

## DECLARATION

Having been informed about criminal responsibility pursuant to art. 271 and 272 of the penal code I hereby declare that:

- 1) I am not an applicant and I have not drafted project documentation;
- 2) I am not joined in matrimony or bound by blood relationship or linear affinity, blood relationship or affinity on one side up to the second degree, and I am not bound by adoption, custody or guardianship relationship with the applicant/ partner/ partners, their legal representatives or members of managing or supervisory bodies of the applicant/ partner;
- 3) For the past 3 years as of the date of announcing the Call for Proposals, I have not been in the employment relationship or have not entered into freelance work agreements with the applicant and I have not been a member of managing or supervisory bodies of the applicant;
- 4) I am not in legal or real relationship with any applicant, which may cause justified doubts concerning my impartiality;
- 5) I undertake to keep confidentiality of information and documents disclosed to me or drafted or prepared by me during or as a result of project assessment and I confirm that such information should be used only for the purpose of assessment and should not be disclosed to any third parties.

**Should such a relationship be identified, I undertake to immediately inform about such fact in the form of a written request to be excluded from the assessment procedure.**

\_\_\_\_\_

Date

\_\_\_\_\_

Signature of the evaluator