



Erasmus+

International Credit Mobility

Guidelines for Experts on Quality Assessment
2016 Call for Proposals

November 2015

Mobility between Programme and Partner Countries in the field of higher education

Before you begin

This document should be read together with the '[Do's and don'ts for applicant higher education institutions](#)' which provide guidance to the applicant on how they will be expected to fill out the application form, in particular the four quality questions.

Please note that the application process for mobility projects between Programme and Partner Countries (KA107) is different from mobility projects between Programme Countries (KA103), which are not subject to quality assessment. The quality will have been assessed in order to obtain the Erasmus Charter for Higher Education (ECHE), or when selecting a national mobility consortium.

The "Erasmus+ Guide for Experts on Quality Assessment" provides more information on the role of experts in the assessment of mobility projects between Programme and Partner Countries and other actions managed by National Agencies (e.g. Strategic Partnerships). The present guidelines present elements that are specific to KA107.

The following general principles are further explained in the "Erasmus+ Guide for Experts on Quality Assessment":

- a) The award of grants is organised on the basis of a peer review system - that is with the help of independent experts - in a fully transparent way, guaranteeing impartiality and equal treatment to all applicants.
- b) Each of the actors in the grant award process shall perform their assessment individually and independently.
- c) In view of an homogenous quality assessment and fair grant award proposal, the National Agency shall inform all actors involved in the grant award process and in particular external experts duly about the decentralised action concerned and give them adequate training and documentation/written guidelines on the applicable grant award rules.
- d) To prevent conflicts of interest, any actor involved in any stage of the grant award process shall sign a formal statement on the prevention of conflicts of interest and the disclosure of information in relation to the given selection round.

The eligibility check

a) *Budget restrictions*

The expert (or evaluator) will first assess the **eligibility** of all the mobility flows requested, taking into account all the budget rules and restrictions outlined on pages 34-40 of the Erasmus+ Programme Guide, and detailed in Annex I to the note entitled 'Managing International Credit Mobility in Erasmus+', which will have been provided by the National Agency, and has been included at the end of this document for your convenience.

b) *Secondary criteria*

In addition to the general eligibility criteria and only where the National Agency budget envelope is below 60,000 EUR, a National Agency may choose to limit demand by adding one or more of the following **secondary criteria** listed in the Programme Guide:

- a. The degree level (e.g. limiting applications to one or two cycles only – Bachelor, Master or PhD);
- b. Privileging only staff or student mobility;

- c. Limiting the duration of mobility periods (e.g. limiting student mobility to 6 months or staff mobility to 10 days)

c) *Heading 1 complementary funding*

The expert will also take into account whether the National Agency has decided to make available **funds from the Heading 1 budget** in order to fund outgoing short cycle, first and second cycle students to higher education institutions in Partner Countries covered by the DCI and EDF budget envelopes (see Annex 1). These flows would otherwise not be eligible under Heading 4 budget rules. Applicants are asked to mention these flows, if any, under Question 3: Quality of the activity design and implementation.

The expert must carefully consider any secondary criteria and use of Heading 1 funds when proceeding with the eligibility check. The National Agency is expected to detail any secondary criteria and use of Heading 1 funds during the expert briefing session.

The quality assessment

After completing the eligibility check, the expert will undertake a single assessment **per Partner Country**, against the quality questions (award criteria) set out in the table below. The expert will be required to separately assess each set of mobility flows per Partner Country on the basis of the answers provided to the four quality questions for that Partner Country.

The expert will give the answer to each question a mark out of 20 or 30. The minimum for "relevance of the strategy" must be at least 15 points, and the total score for the four questions must be at least **60/100** in order for the mobility with that Partner Country to be considered for funding. In other words, no set of mobility flows with a Partner Country scoring below 60 can be funded.

According to the assessment of the award criteria, the expert may recommend to the National Agency to select only mobilities with certain Partner Countries, or only some mobility flows within a given Partner Country (see example below).

Based on the expert's assessment, an evaluation committee will then decide which projects are ultimately selected for funding. In keeping with the goals for geographical balance, the committee can modify the ranked order of projects within a given region in order to ensure better geographical spread.

Example

University X in Finland envisages mobility with a number of Albanian universities based on previous experience with these partners. These mobilities foresee incoming Albanian student mobility and outgoing Finnish staff mobility for teaching and training. The experts may give a range of advice to the Finnish National Agency such as:

- Recommend retention of all the mobility flows requested.
- Recommend retention of only certain mobility flows (e.g. only incoming student and outgoing staff training).
- Recommend reduction of some or all mobility flows (e.g. recommend retention of only X% of incoming students and only Y% staff; etc.)
- Recommend rejection of all the mobility flows.

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

Award Criteria

| | Elements of analysis under award criteria | Interpretation of award criteria for HE between Programme and Partner Countries |
|--|---|---|
| <p>Relevance of the strategy (maximum 30 points)</p> | <p>The extent to which the planned mobility 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> | <p>a) The evaluator should assess how the chosen Partner Country fits the applicant's internationalisation strategy.</p> <p>b) The evaluator should assess to what extent the planned mobility reinforces the capacities and international scope of the participant organisations. Applicants should be specific about which Partner Country higher education institution(s) they will work with and demonstrate how mobility fits the internationalisation strategy of these partner organisation(s).</p> <p>c) The evaluator should assess the justification provided for the choice of flows requested, with respect to the internationalisation strategies of the institutions involved.</p> |
| <p>Quality of the cooperation arrangements (maximum 30 points)</p> | <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> | <p>a) The evaluator should assess the planned cooperation arrangements. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who offers which courses and when? • Who provides support for visa/insurance/accommodation? • Who is in charge for the selection and/or evaluation of participants? • What will the students/staff have to do? • If applicable, how the finances will be split between the applicant and its partner(s) (i.e. organisational support grant). • How will communication channels work? <p>b) The evaluator should take into account previous experience in implementing credit mobility in general (between Programme Countries or between Programme and Partner Countries). A previous mobility project with the chosen Partner Country should be considered an advantage. The existence of previous or running cooperation agreements between the applicant institution and the institution in the Partner Country, setting out respective roles and tasks, is also an advantage. However, solid applications for projects with little or no similar previous experience should not be penalised purely on those grounds.</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>Quality of the activity design and implementation (maximum 20 points)</p> | <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"> a) The clarity, completeness and quality of all the phases of the mobilities (preparation, implementation and follow-up). b) The appropriateness of measures for selecting participants. Special attention should be given by the expert to measures planned by the applicant and its partner organisation(s) for ensuring equal opportunities, social equity and promoting participation of disadvantaged persons. c) The information and support provided prior to the mobility, e.g. accommodation services, language training, learning/mobility agreements and administrative support (insurance, visa, etc.). d) The mechanisms envisaged for recognition of student learning outcomes (e.g. ECTS or other mechanisms). e) The way in which the HEIs will recognise and reward the outcomes of outgoing staff mobility. |
| <p>Impact and dissemination (maximum 20 points)</p> | <p>The potential impact of the mobility 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 projects at faculty and institution level (and beyond, where applicable), in both the Programme and Partner Countries.</p> | <p>The evaluator will assess the impact and dissemination of the planned mobility in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The potential impact of the mobility on individuals and HEIs, at local, regional and national level during and after the project lifetime. b) How the results of the mobility will be disseminated at faculty and institution level in both the Programme and Partner Countries. The evaluator will consider the dissemination activities described and the channels mentioned for this. c) The strategy for monitoring and evaluating the outcomes of the mobility: how will the outcomes be measured and evaluated by the applicant and its partner(s) to know whether they have achieved the desired and expected impacts. d) The stated impact should be assessed considering the number and type of activities planned. |

ANNEX 1: ERASMUS+ ELIGIBLE COUNTRIES FOR INTERNATIONAL CREDIT MOBILITY IN 2016

Programme Countries

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| EU Member States | Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom |
| Non-EU Programme Countries | Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey |

Instrument for Pre-Accession

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| IPA Western Balkans | Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, Montenegro, Serbia |
|------------------------|---|

European Neighbourhood Instrument

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| ENI Eastern Partnership | Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova, Territory of Ukraine as recognised by international law |
| ENI South-Mediterranean | Algeria, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Palestine, Syria, Tunisia |
| ENI Russian Federation | Territory of Russia as recognised by international law |

Development Co-operation Instrument

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| DCI Asia | Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, China, DPR Korea, India, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Maldives, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Sri Lanka, Thailand and Vietnam |
| DCI Central Asia | Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan |
| DCI Latin America | Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela |
| DCI South Africa | South Africa |

Partnership Instrument

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| PI Industrialised Americas | Canada, United States of America |
| PI Industrialised Asia | Australia, Brunei, Hong Kong, Japan, (Republic of) Korea, Macao, New Zealand, Singapore, Taiwan |

European Development Fund

| | |
|---|--|
| EDF African, Caribbean and Pacific states | Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Congo, Congo (Democratic Republic of the), Cook Islands, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Kenya, Kiribati, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mozambique, Namibia, Nauru, Niger, Nigeria, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Rwanda, Saint Kitts And Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent And The Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Timor Leste (Democratic Republic of), Tanzania, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tuvalu, Uganda, Vanuatu, Zambia, Zimbabwe. |
|---|--|

ANNEX 2: RULES LINKED TO HEADING 4 BUDGETS IN 2016 CALL FOR ERASMUS+ INTERNATIONAL CREDIT MOBILITY

| Budget Envelope | Rule | Responsibility European Commission (EC) | Responsibility National Agency (NA) | Responsibility Higher Education Institution (HEI) |
|-------------------------|---|--|--|---|
| ENI Eastern Partnership | Minimum 90% incoming mobility | Yes EC will follow annual expenditure of each NA & dialogue if necessary | Yes Rule to be respected over each 3-year planning period & publicised on NA website | No but HEIs should be aware that NAs will have budget limitations for outgoing mobility |
| ENI South-Med | | | | |
| Russian Federation | No rule for incoming vs outgoing mobility | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| DCI Asia | No outgoing short, 1 st or second cycle mobility from DCI budget | Yes | Yes Ineligible flows identified & rejected in evaluation | Yes HEIs to check with their NA whether intra-EU funds have been made available to compensate |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – at least 25% for Afghanistan Bangladesh, Cambodia, Laos, Nepal, Bhutan & Myanmar – maximum 30% for India & China combined – 45% for DPR Korea, Indonesia, Malaysia, Maldives, Mongolia, Pakistan, Philippines, Sri Lanka, Thailand & Vietnam | Yes Rule to be respected over each 3-year planning period | No but NAs to aim for widest possible geographic balance | No but HEIs to aim for widest possible geographic balance |
| DCI Latin America | No outgoing short, 1 st or second cycle mobility from DCI budget | Yes | Yes Ineligible flows identified & rejected in evaluation | Yes Check with NA whether intra-EU funds have been made available to compensate |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – at least 25% for Bolivia, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras & Paraguay) – maximum 35% for Brazil & Mexico combined – 40% for Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Uruguay, & Venezuela | Yes Rule to be respected over each 3-year planning period | No but NAs to aim for widest possible geographic balance | No but HEIs to aim for widest possible geographic balance |
| DCI Central Asia | No outgoing short, 1 st or second cycle mobility from DCI budget | Yes | Yes Ineligible flows identified & rejected in evaluation | Yes Check with NA whether intra-EU funds available to compensate |

| Budget Envelope | Rule | Responsibility EC | Responsibility NA | Responsibility HEI |
|---------------------------------------|---|-------------------|--|---|
| DCI South Africa | No outgoing short, 1 st or second cycle mobility from DCI budget | Yes | Yes Ineligible flows identified & rejected in evaluation | Yes Check with NA whether intra-EU funds have been made available to compensate |
| EDF ACP countries | No outgoing short, 1 st or second cycle mobility from EDF budget | Yes | Yes Ineligible flows identified & rejected in evaluation | Yes Check with NA whether intra-EU funds have been made available to compensate |
| IPA Western Balkans | No rule for incoming vs outgoing mobility | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| PI Industrialised Americas | No rule for incoming vs outgoing mobility | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| PI Industrialised Asia | No rule for incoming vs outgoing mobility | N/A | N/A | N/A |

In addition to the rules listed in the table, **geographical balance is a general rule for all multi-country envelopes** which will be enforced at Commission level and for which National Agencies will have the possibility to take corrective measures during the evaluation process in order to spread the available budgets as widely as possible. If geographical balance is not achieved at the level of the 33 Programme Countries, the Commission will be forced to withdraw the most popular countries in future.