

Beograd, 8. jul 2019.
gđa Mirjana Nešić
OŠ "Branko Radičević", Bujanovac
mirabujanovac@gmail.com
majaanticjov@gmail.com

Predmet: Opšti poziv za podnošenje prijava za Erasmus+ projekte za 2019. godinu - rezultati odabira projekata za finansiranje; Vaša projektna prijava ref. broj 2019-1-RS01-KA229-000866

Poštovani,

Vaša škola je podnela prijavu za Erasmus+ projekat strateških partnerstava za *oblast školska partnerstva za razmene* (KA229) na konkursnom roku koji je bio otvoren do 26. marta 2019. godine.

Sa zadovoljstvom Vas obaveštavamo da je Vaš projekat odabran za finansiranje.

Odluku o odabiru projekata za finansiranje donosi Fondacija Tempus na osnovu pravila programa Erasmus+, uzimajući u obzir, kao dva glavna kriterijuma, rang listu formiranu prema broju poena koje su projektnim prijavama dodelili spoljni ocenjivači tokom ocenjivanja ispunjenosti kriterijuma kvaliteta i raspoloživa sredstva za ovaj konkursni rok.

Spisak projekata odabranih za finansiranje biće objavljen na veb sajtu Fondacije Tempus www.erasmusplus.rs, kada svi podnosioci prijave budu obavješteni o rezultatima konkursa.

U nastavku ovog dopisa nalazi se dokument u kojem su rezimirani nalazi i zaključci spoljnih ocenjivača projekata o kvalitetu Vaše projektne prijave. Fondacija Tempus nije u mogućnosti da dalje elaborira pomenute nalaze i zaključke.

Zahvaljujemo se na Vašem interesovanju za program Erasmus+ I želimo Vam uspešan početak projektnih aktivnosti.

Pozivamo Vas da pratite naš sajt www.erasmusplus.rs za više informacija o budućim konkursnim rokovima programa Erasmus+.

Srdačan pozdrav,
Fondacija Tempus

Informacija o mogućnosti žalbe

Ako smatrate da ste na neki način oštećeni zbog greške ili nepravilnosti koja je nastala u procesu odabira projekata za finansiranje, možete se žaliti na odluku Fondacije Tempus.

Rok za podnošenje žalbe je 15 kalendarskih dana od dana slanja ovog elektronskog pisma.

Žalba se podnosi u pisanom obliku, putem pošte na adresu Fondacije Tempus ul. Ruže Jovanović br. 27a, 11000 Beograd.

Žalbu može podneti isključivo zakonski zastupnik žalioca.

Žalba koju je podnela neovlašćena osoba ili je neblagovremena neće biti uzeta u razmatranje.

Obrazac žalbe možete preuzeti na sledećem linku:

<http://erasmusplus.rs/informacija-o-mogucnosti-zalbe/?langkl=lat>

Erasmus+ Programme for the action mobility in the field of School Exchange Partnerships (KA2)
Call for Proposals 2019

EVALUATION REPORT

Proposal number: 2019-1-RS01-KA229-000866

Proposal title: MOTIVATION III – THE 21ST-CENTURY STUDENTS

Applicant organisation: Elementary school “Branko Radičević”, Bujanovac

PIC number: 914499123

Award criteria**Total number of points: 72****Relevance of the project (24)**

The proposal was submitted by the elementary school “Branko Radičević” from the town of Bujanovac, at the far south of Serbia. There are five partners planned for the project partnership, three primary schools and two secondary schools. Partners come from Serbia, Turkey, Poland, Spain and Romania. The main topic of the project, according to the proposal, is tackling the issues of early school leaving, while the main horizontal priority is social inclusion (from the standpoint of equity). Furthermore, the proposal refers to a field specific priority of strengthening the profiles of the teaching profession. Thus far, the project addresses objectives and the priorities of the Action. The presented specific objectives are in correlation with the selected priorities and, bearing in mind the structure and size of the partnership, one can assert that defined objectives can contribute to the achievement of the selected priorities. It is not clear, though, why the project is named as “Motivation III”. It gives an impression that the project proposal is continuing on some previous projects as its third edition, but nothing similar is mentioned in the application.

The proposed project partners have one specific thing in common: these are all the schools which face particular issues regarding the children’s social and economic status, as well as the lack of opportunities for the pupils to engage in various activities their peers in urban areas often take for granted. From that standpoint, one can assert that the issue of early school leaving is indeed burdening the aforementioned institutions and thus poses a genuine need with the respect to this particular proposal. Although one can discern necessary information from the individual description of each partner institution, it would be good for future reference to point out such significant information in the section dealing with needs analysis and motivation. The proposal, however, does state that the main issue which the project tackles is early school leaving which has its roots in the fact that partner schools are mainly located in rural areas and attended by underprivileged children.

The proposal presents five mobility events which have been designed to address the needs of the involved schools. Each mobility activity has a separate subject but they are all oriented towards the instalment of new after-school clubs which will offer interesting topics to their pupils in order to boost their motivation and bring them closer to school. It appears that this particular project is complementary with activities which take place within after-school clubs. However, the proposal is somewhat ambiguous regarding this issue since one is at a loss whether there was some previous project termed “After School Club”, or if this is to be an eTwinning project within this KA2. Bearing in mind the structure of the partnership, the common

problems they are facing, as well as their previous experience and practice one can assert that the project is likely to provide schools and participants with new experiences.

Since partner schools from various countries face the same issue of truancy, or early school leaving from various perspectives one can assert that individual experiences within the project could be highly beneficial for each partner, which is an added value that could hardly be achieved without a transnational project of this kind.

Quality of the project design and implementation (16)

The proposal offers a detailed description of project activities which seem to be planned in a methodical and perspicuous fashion. From the presented timetable one can discern all important activities which are planned to take place during the project, as well as project management activities and practical arrangements. The schedule of planned activities appears to be realistic and feasible.

Bearing in mind the schedule of each planned Learning, Teaching and Training Activity (hereinafter: LTTA) and the topics they cover, one can safely assert that the planned activities are appropriate for the achievement of project objectives. Each of five LTTAs has been described and the precise schedule has been offered. Likewise, the proposal states the expected results. Though the presented results are most welcome, it would be good to have some results which are explicitly related to the decrease of early school leaving and boosted motivation. Namely, while students who are to participate in the mobility activities will build bridges and connections with their peers abroad one would also expect to see results which could enable them to create such environment at home and help themselves and their peers by motivating them to maintain good communication at their home institutions, thus decreasing the truancy rate.

In explaining how the planned activities are to contribute to the achievement of project objectives the proposal tends to be rather general. It would be most welcome to have more concrete descriptions of how the newly acquired approaches and realised activities are to be applied in home institutions for the purposes of obtaining project results. As to the methodology of LTTAs, the proposal mentions various methodologies depending on the type of activity and its topic. The respective approaches have been described in a rather general fashion. Activities are mostly based on various workshops and lessons which should introduce the students and staff to the manners in which various after-school clubs can be organised. Regarding project management, the proposal offers clear presentation of relevant activities. Namely, local project teams are to be created in each partner institution. Regular online meetings are foreseen for the purposes of managing the partnership and monitoring project activities.

Likewise, the proposal foresees activities which are intended to prepare the mobility participants for LTTAs. Among other things, prior to each mobility the proposal foresees the selection process, the necessary teaching material, travel arrangements, dissemination after each mobility, etc.-Students chosen for the mobility are planned to have various forms of support: psychological, economical. Participants will be placed in the host families. In this manner they will increase their intercultural competencies. Meetings are to be held with parents/guardians and their safety is to be secured. Generally speaking, the proposal states persons who are to be involved on behalf of each partner. However, in case of mobility activities one is at a loss as who precisely is to be in charge of practical arrangements.

Bearing in mind that the project gathers institutions which face the issue of early school leaving, poor economic conditions of children, as well as poor conditions due to locations of those schools in rural areas, the proposed project might indeed prove to be beneficial in tackling the stated issues. The five proposed mobility events tackle with different issues, from the standpoint of students as well as from the standpoint of the staff. The results expected from the mobility activities could prove to be rather useful since the proposal clearly states that mobility participants are expected to share their acquired experience with the entire school. Likewise, it is planned to involve various project results in the practice of partner institutions

to the extent which will not overburden the students. Thus, one can say that project may bring good value for the grant requested.

Regarding the virtual platforms, the proposal states that eTwinning platform was used to find project partners. The proposal does not state explicitly whether this particular project is building on previous eTwinning projects. After the project approval, its TwinSpace will be created. It will serve for communicating, managing and disseminating purposes. It is strongly recommended to exploit more possibilities that are offered by eTwinning platform. It could be used for virtual co-operation of partner schools during the whole project. Two schools with eTwinning label could help in designing good quality eTwinning project. Also, blended learning as a combination of physical mobility and virtual activities could be employed. Likewise, if the project is approved, the platform shall be used for sharing results and online meetings. Furthermore, the Erasmus + Project Results Platform is to be used for the purposes of dissemination.

The proposal envisages five mobility events which are planned to take place in each institution/country engaged on the project. During five mobility events, students and staff will have both joint and separate activities. Students will be engaged on workshops which aim to introduce them to various methodologies regarding different kinds of after-school clubs: photography, ICT, environment, drama club, etc. On the other hand, the staff will be attending workshops and lectures dealing with methodologies of improving communication between parents, teachers and students, increasing personal aptitudes, strengthening students' sense of commitment, developing children's identity, motivating students' awareness of self-esteem and safety, etc. The issue of students' motivation to stay in the scope of formal education is tackled from two different perspectives during the mobility activities, and it is commendable. One can safely assert that activities thus devised can indeed be beneficial for all participants. Bearing this in mind, the proposal could have been more concrete on the expected results as they have been described in a general fashion and even presented as almost identical for all five activities.

The proposal offers a description of a selection process of student participants. It is commendable that the precedence will be given to those students who are in real need of motivation and support and are at ESL risk. The selection process is described in a satisfactory manner since it takes care of students' linguistic, emotional, economic, and psychological readiness to participate in such a project. Likewise, the proposal tends to take students' particular interests into consideration when allocating them for particular mobility. Furthermore, practical arrangements have also been described in a proper fashion, as well as students' preparation for the mobility. It would be good to know, however, who will be the persons in charge of the aforementioned activities. Some sort of certification is predicted at the end of each mobility event. It is stated that participants will receive Certificates of Attendance. It would be useful to consider using recognised European tools, such as Europass mobility document and Europass CV. Also, all participating teachers and students could be rewarded by national instruments of each country, such as teachers' and students' portfolios and internal certificates on professional development.

Quality of the project team and the cooperation arrangements (14)

The proposal introduces five potential partners from Serbia (co-ordinator), Romania, Poland, Spain and Turkey. On the basis of the presented introductions one can conclude that these institutions are located in rural areas, that they educate a large number of students with fewer opportunities (immigrants, the underprivileged, children without parental care, etc.). As a result, they face with absenteeism and consequently early school leaving. Thus, one can assert that partners have a common ground for being motivated to participate on the project at hand. The proposed partners have different levels of experience with respect to international projects, as well as with respect to methodologies they resort to tackle the main priority of the project – the ESL. As to particular tasks and roles assigned to each partner, it appears

that a large number of activities implemented on the project are to be equally shared among the partnership. Each partner will be in charge of organising the mobility which is to take place in the respective country, while all other duties are to be carried out on equal terms. Regular online meetings are to be held at the beginning and end of the project, as well as prior to every mobility event for the purposes of co-ordinating and sharing activities. On the basis of the selected partners and their profiles, as well as on the basis of activities presented in the project proposal, one can assert that it is highly likely that the chosen partnership could effectively implement the project in question.

According to the proposal, the project does involve newcomers to the action and those are organisations from Serbia and Turkey. The proposal states that the more experienced schools from Poland, Spain and Romania will be of significant help to the more inexperienced partners with respect to various aspect of the project (p 43).

The proposal involves three partners which hold the valid eTwinning label. However, it does not present one with particular activities which the eTwinning schools could perform to put such label to good use regarding this project.

The proposal is rather clear and methodical when it comes to communication and co-ordination on the project. Namely, meetings among partners are to be held online, by means of virtual platforms. Seven such meetings have been planned, and the proposal leaves place for additional meetings if necessary. Likewise, co-ordination meetings are to be held even during mobility activities. The eTwinning platform is to be used throughout the project for the sake of dissemination of project results, communication and improvement of communication among students.

Impact and sustainability (18)

The proposal offers the manner of assessment of each project objective, which is commendable. Various forms of evaluation are foreseen: questionnaires, interviews, observation, as well as long-term evaluation. The applicant states that assessment reports are to be produced which will become an integral part of the final report. Though it is commendable that the applicant foresees various measuring tools one would expect more details regarding those tools: what will be the main indicators of a successfully realised activity, i.e. how will the partnership decide if particular objective has been met? In other words, there are some quantitative indicators given in the application (such as number of clubs started in other schools during and after the project), but there should be more qualitative and quantitative indicators described. All partners are equally responsible for evaluation of the activities and the whole project.

The proposal clearly states that the desired impact is mostly to affect the participating schools and their students and staff. Namely, new after-school clubs are to be implemented in the second project year which is expected to have a positive impact on the staff and students. Likewise, the project intends to involve parents in newly established activities and create stronger bonds between families and school. Through dissemination processes, the proposal professes a bigger impact on the local community. The planned long-term programme is to secure the project results sustainability. Though the aforementioned expected impact does not appear to be altogether vague, it would be good to have a more detailed description of activities which are meant to lead to the desired impact.

According to the proposal, it is expected that both students and the staff participants in mobility activities are to disseminate their newly acquired experience among their peers and colleagues by means of meetings, round tables, discussions, etc. Likewise, it is expected that project results are disseminated on project website, eTwinning, Facebook and other usual media used for the purposes of dissemination. Bearing in mind that the partners are mostly located in villages and rural areas, (local) television is not mentioned as a dissemination option.

Although appropriate ways of disseminating the project outcomes are predicted, the application is missing qualitative and quantitative indicators that are going to be used for this purpose.

Overall comments

The proposal was submitted by an elementary school “Branko Radičević” from the town of Bujanovac, at the far south of Serbia. The main topic of the project, according to the proposal, is tackling the issues of early school leaving, while the main horizontal priority is social inclusion (from the standpoint of equity). Furthermore, the proposal refers to a field specific priority of strengthening the profiles of the teaching profession. Thus far, the project addresses objectives and the priorities of the Action.

The proposal has more strengths than weaknesses. The prospective partners all come from mostly rural areas and they all face the issue of early school leaving. Thus, one can assert that a project such as this one might be beneficial in helping them tackle some of their most painful issues. According to the proposal, there are five planned LTTAs. Each of five LTTAs has been described, the precise schedule has been offered and the proposal states the expected results. Though the presented results are most welcome, it would be good to have some results which are explicitly related to the decrease of early school leaving and boosted motivation. In explaining how the planned activities are to contribute to the achievement of project objectives the proposal tends to be rather general. It would be most welcome to have more concrete descriptions of how the newly acquired approaches and realised activities are to be applied in home institutions for the purposes of obtaining project results.

Furthermore, the five planned LTTAs are to include eight participants per mobility event (6 students and 2 accompanying persons). However, partner student and staff structure in terms of numbers differs significantly from one institution to another. Namely, the school in Bujanovac, Serbia educates 1200 students, for instance, while schools in Romania and Spain educate 480 and 400 students, respectively. Bearing this in mind, perhaps it would be advisable to revise the number of mobility participants per each partner institution. Should that be possible, the grant amount would consequently have to be revised as well.

The proposal offers the manner of assessment of each project objective, which is commendable. Various forms of evaluation are foreseen: questionnaires, interviews, observation, as well as long-term evaluation. Though it is commendable that the applicant foresees various measuring tools one would expect more details regarding those tools: what will be the main indicators of a successfully realised activity, i.e. how will the partnership decide if particular objective has been met? In other words, it would be good to have some quantitative indicators.

As to concrete project outcomes, one can discern that the initiation of new after-school clubs based on the exchange of good practice and new approaches presented by different partners is to be the main tangible outcome of this partnership. However, it would be most welcome if such information could be provided explicitly and followed by a more detailed elaboration so as to avoid unnecessary vagueness.

Bearing in mind the overall grant requested, which is indeed quite considerable, as well as the number of activities, one may conclude that 24 months may be necessary to realise project activities. However, there are numerous activities the scope of which allows one to cluster them, thus reducing the time for project realisation and rendering the project more cost-effective. It is, therefore, recommended, that the project realisation time be shortened from 24 months to 18 months and that the project grant be reduced accordingly.

Grant reduction

There are five LTTAs planned within this particular project. It is to include eight participants per mobility event (6 students and 2 accompanying persons). However, having in mind that the activities are dedicated to students in the first place, only one accompanying person per activity is approved. Also, since the first day of each activity is planned for the welcome and the last day for evaluation, the number of days is reduced from 7 to 5.

Likewise, bearing in mind the overall grant requested, which is indeed quite considerable, as well as the number of activities, one may conclude that 24 months may be necessary to realise project activities. It is, therefore, decided that the project realisation time be shortened from 24 months to 18 months and that the project grant be reduced accordingly.