

Assessment and selection process for KA107 mobility projects

The aim of this note is to explain the assessment and selection processes for international credit mobility and the guidelines for NAs to manage the requested mobility flows.

Mobility project applications in the field of Higher Education (HE) between Programme and Partner Countries are likely to contain several sets of mobility flows with different Partner Countries. Each set of mobility flows by Partner Country may have flows for student mobility at different study cycles and flows for staff mobility involved in teaching or training; in addition mobility may be incoming to Europe and, in certain cases, outgoing from Europe. The applicant is requested to answer 4 quality questions for each set of mobility flows with a given Partner Country (e.g. China) and not for every individual flow (e.g. incoming first cycle student and outgoing second cycle student) with this Partner Country.

Eligible applicants must be accredited HEIs or accredited national consortia.

Award criteria

Award criteria	Weight of award criteria in KA1 – Mobility projects under HE between Programme and Partner Countries
Relevance of the project	30
Quality of the cooperation arrangements	30
Quality of the project design and implementation	20
Impact and dissemination	20
TOTAL	100

Threshold to consider the project for funding

- score at least 70 points in total (per set of mobility flows by Partner Country); **and**
- score at least half of the maximum points for each award criterion.

Tasks for the Experts

1. As part of the quality assessment, experts will analyse whether all mobility flows are eligible and flag those ineligible:

- Experts will take into account the general criteria regarding the flows that can be

funded (as outlined in the Programme Guide)

- If the application concerns a Partner Country for which the National Agency has applied secondary criteria, the experts will also check that the application respects the secondary criteria conditions published by the National Agency and exclude those mobility flows which fall outside the secondary criteria.
- Experts will also take into account whether the National Agency has decided to make available funds from Heading 1 budget in order to fund outgoing, short cycle, first and second cycle students to Partner HEIs from DCI countries.

2. The expert will read through the entire application and will then score each set of mobility flows with each Partner Country according to the 4 quality criteria.

3. According to their assessment of the quality criteria, experts may give a range of advice concerning each requested set of mobility flows for a given Partner Country, including one or more of the following types of advice:

- a. Recommend retention of the entire set of mobility flows by Partner Country.
- b. Recommend retention of only certain mobility flows (e.g. only incoming student first cycle and outgoing staff teaching and training).
- c. Recommend reduction of some or all mobility flows (e.g. recommend retention of only X% of incoming student first cycle and only Y% second cycle; etc.)
- d. Recommend rejection of the entire set of mobility flows by Partner Country.

For example, University X in Finland envisages a mobility project with a number of Albanian universities based on previous experience with these partners. The mobility project foresees incoming Albanian student mobility for first and second cycle and outgoing Finnish staff mobility for teaching and training. The experts may give a range of advice to the Finnish NA and include one or more of the following types of advice:

- a. Recommend retention of the entire set of mobility flows by Partner Country.
- b. Recommend retention of only certain mobility flows (e.g. only incoming student first cycle and outgoing staff teaching and training) taking into account, for instance, the described links to the internationalisation strategies.
- c. Recommend reduction of some or all mobility flows (e.g. recommend retention of only X% of incoming student first cycle and only Y% second cycle; etc.) because the expert judges that the partners involved do not have the capacity to absorb all the requested mobilities.
- d. Recommend rejection of the entire set of mobility flows by Partner Country.

The rejection of the set of mobility flows with Albania, based on the expert evaluation of the 4 award criteria, is without prejudice to the set of mobility flows involving other Partner Countries in the same application from University X. The experts may decide that the justifications given by University X for the set of Albanian mobility flows are not convincing, but the justifications provided for mobility flows with China, Brazil or South Africa are very good.

AWARD CRITERIA	Elements of analysis under award criteria	Interpretation of award criteria for mobility between Programme and Partner Countries
Relevance of the strategy (maximum 30 points)	<p>The extent to which the planned mobility project is relevant to the internationalisation strategy of the higher education institutions involved (both in the Programme and in the Partner Country) and the rationale for choosing staff and/or student mobility.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The evaluator should assess how the chosen Partner Country fits the applicant's internationalisation strategy. • The evaluator should assess to what extent the project reinforces the capacities and international scope of the participant organisations. A higher rating should be given to an applicant who already identifies (a) specific HEI(s) in the Partner Country and demonstrates how the set of mobility flows fits the internationalisation strategy of the partner(s). • The evaluator should assess the explanations given for the choice of requested incoming and outgoing mobility flows of staff (training or teaching) and/or students (different cycles) with respect to the internationalisation strategies of the HEIs involved.
Quality of the cooperation arrangements (maximum 30 points)	<p>The extent to which the applicant organisation has previous experience of similar projects with higher education institutions in the Partner Country and the clarity of the description of responsibilities, roles and tasks between partners.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The evaluator should assess the planned cooperation arrangements. A previous mobility project with the chosen Partner Country should be considered an advantage, regardless of whether this was supported by the EU (e.g. Erasmus Mundus) or other funds. • The existence of previous or running cooperation agreements between the applicant HEI and its partners setting out respective roles and tasks is also an advantage.

AWARD CRITERIA	Elements of analysis under award criteria	Interpretation of award criteria for mobility between Programme and Partner Countries
Quality of the activity design and implementation (maximum 20 points)	<p>The completeness and quality of arrangements for the selection of participants, the support provided to them and the recognition of their mobility period (in particular in the Partner country).</p>	<p>The evaluator will assess the planned practical implementation of the mobilities, in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The clarity, completeness and quality of all the phases of the mobilities (preparation, implementation of mobility activities and follow-up). • The appropriateness of measures for selecting participants including ensuring equal opportunities and promoting participation of disadvantaged persons. • The information and support provided prior to the mobility, e.g. accommodation services, language training, learning/mobility agreements and administrative support (insurance, visa, etc.). • The mechanisms envisaged for recognition of incoming and outgoing student learning outcomes (e.g. ECTS or other mechanisms). • The way in which the HEIs will recognise and reward the outcomes of outgoing staff mobility.
Impact and dissemination (maximum 20 points)	<p>The potential impact of the project on participants, beneficiaries and partner organisations at local, regional and national levels, as well as the quality of measures aimed at disseminating the results of the mobility project at faculty and institution level (and beyond, where applicable), in both the Programme and Partner Countries.</p>	<p>The evaluator will assess the potential impact and dissemination of the planned set of mobility flows with a given Partner Country in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The potential impact on individuals and HEIs, at local, regional and national level during and after the project lifetime. • How the results will be disseminated at faculty and institution level, and beyond where applicable, in both the Programme and Partner Countries. • The strategy for monitoring and evaluating the outcomes.