

Evaluation form for project applications submitted under the T4EU Seed Funding Programme.	
Project name:	
Project Number (starting with 4.01 for the first submitted project):	
Project Coordinator & university:	
Reviewer 1 (Name, University)	
Reviewer 2 (Name, University)	

Criteria		Reached Score	Max Score	Please use this column to provide comments that explain your assessment and/or may help the project teams optimize their project plans, or, if the proposal does not pass, improve future applications accordingly.
Relevance and impact		0	12	
Contribution to the relevant KPIs of the current T4EU initiative	0= no contribution, 2= contribution to 1, 4= contribution to >1 KPI		4	
Number of students / lifelong learners benefitting from the offer (If this development step increases that number, please specify)	0= no information provided, 1= <20/year, 2= >20/year		2	
Sustainability: Integration into the institutions' regular study offer	0= no information provided, 1= ECTS awarded only in one semester at all universities involved, 2= integrated into curriculum at 1 university, 3= integrated into curriculum at all universities involved		3	
Transferability to other study programmes and / or disciplines	0= not transferable because very specific / exceptional case, 1= limited transferability because many conditions have to be met, 3= general transferability in modularised study programmes		3	

1) Governance & Agreement Frameworks	realistic, feasible and thought through planning of the development step:	#DIV/0!	8	Note on the calculation of points for the development steps: If only one development step is carried out, its score equals the final score for this category. If several development steps are carried out, each is assessed individually and receives its own score. The final score for this category is calculated as the average of the individual scores of the development steps. It is therefore important to plan only as many development steps as can realistically be planned and carried out. One single well-planned and realistic development step will consequently achieve a higher score than two less realistic, hard-to-achieve steps, or a well-planned step combined with an unrealistic one.
	Have the legal departments of all partner been institutions consulted? Are critical contract checkpoints covered? Credit recognition Grade conversion table Language of instruction Student fees Selection Admission Enrolment Certification / diploma Programme structure Mobility timeline (who goes where and when)		8	

2) Accreditation & Formal Recognition	Is accreditation required at your home university? Is there a concrete accreditation plan (including timeline and process)?		8	
3) Anchoring the Offer in Academic Portfolios	How will the learning offer be integrated into the curriculum? Is the learning offer firmly and sustainably embedded? Will it be independent of Seed Funding programme support? Have all prerequisite steps (contracts, recognition, accreditation) been completed or are they solidly planned?		8	
4) Digitalisation & Broader Accessibility	Is the target group meaningfully expanded through this programme? Have accessibility barriers been considered and addressed (e.g. language of instruction, entry requirements)?		8	
5) Integrating Additional Partners	Is the existing cooperation stable and well-established? Is the added value of bringing in additional partners clearly justified and thought through? Is there a concrete onboarding plan for the successful integration of new partners?		8	
6) Dissemination & Visibility	Does the proposal go beyond basic reporting and include replicable outputs such as toolkits, best practice write-ups, or Metacampus entry		8	
7) Other	Does the proposed development step clearly contribute to consolidating an existing collaboration or advancing a well-developed cooperation idea? Is the relevance and added value of the step explained in a way that makes it comparable to the listed steps?		8	

Quality of the proposal – project design and implementation				0	5
Clear and realistic description of the path towards a long-term offer	0–3 points		3		
Adequate personnel resources available	yes (1 point) / no (0 points)		1		
Reasonable budgeting	yes (1 point) / no (0 points)		1		
Total score	funding threshold: 20/25	#DIV/O!	25		
Comments on formal criteria, e.g. budget should be revised (optional) Other comments or recommendations for the project team (optional): Date:					