

**Erasmus+: Higher Education - International Capacity Building**

Brussels,  
EACEA.A.4/ARES(2020)

Francesco Svelto  
UNIVERSITA DEGLI STUDI DI PAVIA  
STRADA NUOVA 65  
PAVIA  
IT - 27100

Programme	EPPKA2 - Cooperation for innovation and the exchange of good practices
Action	CBHE-JP - Capacity Building in higher education - Joint Projects
Proposal	Call for Proposals 2020 - EAC-A02-2019-CBHE
Application No	619173-EPP-1-2020-1-IT-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP
Title	INstruments to Connect Academia to Society
Decision	REJECTED

Dear Applicant,

You have submitted an application to the Erasmus+ programme, 2020 call for proposals of the action specified above. The call for proposals closed on 05/02/2020. The Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA) received 1005 eligible applications for this call.

I am writing to inform you about the selection decision taken by the Head of Department of the Agency, acting in her capacity as authorising officer, based on the recommendations of an Evaluation Committee assisted by external experts.

The selection decision is based on the quality of the application, its relative position in comparison to the other applications submitted and the budget available. Applications were assessed on a scale from 0 to 100 and were ranked by Region according to merit.

In addition, the selection decision took into account the geographical balance within a Region in terms of the number of projects per country (within the limits of the available budget), the need to ensure that the overall results of the selection guarantees a sufficient coverage of the priorities of the Action and the respect of the condition that an applicant organisation cannot receive more than three grants under a CBHE call.

**I regret to inform you that your application has not been selected for EU co-funding.**

The table below provides you with an indication where your proposal was situated. Your application was considered as Group III.

Groups		Number 1005 (100%)
I	Applications of very good quality (score higher than 75 points out of 100)	132 applications (13,13%)
II	Applications of good quality (score between 60 and 75 points out of 100)	539 applications (53,63%)
III	Applications of weak quality (score less than 60 points)	334 applications (23,24%)



## EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency

### Erasmus+: Higher Education - International Capacity Building

For your information, out of the 1005 applications submitted 164 have been selected for funding and 20 have been placed on a reserve list.

The list of all selected projects and success rates by Regions will be published on the website of the Executive Agency when all applicants have been notified about the selection results:

[http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus-plus/selection-results\\_en](http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus-plus/selection-results_en)

Attached to this letter you will find an evaluation report of the Evaluation Committee.

We thank you for the interest you have shown in the Programme and the time and effort you have invested in preparing your application. This decision is in no way a negative reflection on the value and importance of your proposal.

For information on future Calls for proposals under the Erasmus+ programme, please refer to the web page:

[http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus-plus/funding\\_en](http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus-plus/funding_en)

Yours sincerely,

**Ralf RAHDERS**  
Head of Unit

#### Information on legal remedies

You will find information on the available means of redress for challenging this decision under the following link:

[https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/about-eacea/legal-remedies-0\\_en](https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/about-eacea/legal-remedies-0_en)

Should you experience problems accessing the link, please contact the Agency at [EACEA-REDRESS@ec.europa.eu](mailto:EACEA-REDRESS@ec.europa.eu)

Appendix: Annex 1 - Evaluation report

Contact: [eacea-eplus-cbhe-projects@ec.europa.eu](mailto:eacea-eplus-cbhe-projects@ec.europa.eu)



Annex 1

619173-EPP-1-2020-1-IT-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

	Award Criteria	Evaluation Comments
1	Relevance of the project	<p>The project aims to strengthen the capacities of Latin American Higher Education institutions to research results transfer, thus contributing to specific objectives of the Capacity-Building action. The application clearly addresses the regional priority of “Development of research and innovative capacities” through the setting-up or development of university centres for research and technology transfer. The target groups are broadly identified, ranging from students of different levels to academic and professional staff. The proposal highlights satisfactorily the relevance of strengthening technology transfer activities in respect to modernisation policies both at the national and institutional level.</p> <p>Nonetheless, the project objectives, mainly related to improving the capability of universities to adapt to local and global change, are overly generalised. They stem from a very general needs analysis showing diverse needs mostly germane to technology transfer, social impact of research and internationalisation. This lack of a community of views minimises the meaningful of the proposal. Furthermore, there are some inconsistencies in different parts of the proposal regarding to target universities expectations and this, together with insufficient information on the design of institutional plans raises some reserves on the adequacy of the objectives and activities to the needs. The lack of concreteness when it comes to needs, makes it also difficult to comment on the actual level of innovativeness of the project in the described context. In addition, the level of European added value is not overtly significant, because by making the thematic focus of the proposal broad and unrelated to a specific academic field or area in which knowledge transfer is to be explored, it does not make clear what particular knowledge it is expected to flow from Programme Countries partners. There is no justification whatsoever for requesting European funding.</p>
2	Quality of the project design and implementation	<p>The methodology put in place to implement the project is not innovative, but certainly suitable and based on knowledge transfer from Programmes Countries’ Higher Education institutions to the Latin American partners. The content of the planned staff training is well presented. The budget breakdown by work package and by partner is properly designed. Staff costs are appropriately budgeted, subcontracting costs are reasonable, and the request for equipment is minimal and sufficiently justified.</p> <p>However, and due to the lack of focus, the objectives are broad, results are expected in too diverse directions, and training activities have to be conducted on different subjects impairing their quality. (It is unlikely to deliver in-depth knowledge with training in so many topics on different areas in a limited time). A major implementation issue is that most of the deliverables are not well explained. For instance, information on how each institution will collect data and design its own plan is insufficiently detailed, the purpose of the new or updated centres is not really made clear. The pilot events are not elaborated on and are left for members to decide. The virtual platform is left opaque. Furthermore, on-line English courses are not adequately linked to the envisaged objectives. The cost-effectiveness of the project is not convincingly demonstrated in all components of the budget. Several expensive options have been taken, such as extensive in-presence trainings, while combined travels or online training have not been considered. The budgeting of stays and travels for higher education institutions outside the consortium but members of one partner (an association of higher education institutions) is questionable. No co-financing whatsoever is planned. The overall project design does not ensure a satisfactory consistency between objectives, activities and methodology because the objectives are too broad and too diverse with regard to target partners. The work plan is also not adequately detailed and lacks deliverables: it does not demonstrate a good planning capacity, showing different activities with too long duration of or inappropriate sequencing (e.g. institutional plans drafting before the end of needs analysis). The project could have been easily planned within a shorter period of implementation. In addition, risks and mitigation measures are not properly addressed. Indicators of progress are insufficiently identified, whereas sources of verification are not specified. Therefore, quality assurance is not sufficiently addressed.</p>



Annex 1

619173-EPP-1-2020-1-IT-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

	Award Criteria	Evaluation Comments
3	Quality of the project team and the cooperation arrangements	<p>The complementarity of the overall partnership is based on the combined features of a set of European universities with expertise in technology transfer and research management, and a set of Partner Countries institutions in need of capacity building. The project interestingly builds on ongoing collaboration between the associations of universities of both regions, who are key partners in the project and hold a crucial role in activities dealing with internationalisation, regional cooperation, and dissemination. The project team appear sufficiently skilled and experienced to achieve the project objectives and most partners allocate a good number of qualified and appropriate staff. Other European non-academic partners have been included for hosting study visits. The distribution of responsibilities between partners is clear, and there are not so many mutualised activities actually. Training courses of the first round have been distributed between European partners, whilst subsequent trainings in Latin America will involve all of them. The management structure is globally satisfactory.</p> <p>Still, the partnership is not strong due to the heterogeneity of the Latin American universities expressing diverse strategic priorities. As for the European institutions, they all will equally contribute through their expertise but no complementary is evidenced. Almost no specific input is seen as flowing from their side with particular expertise often ranging from Engineering to History. The descriptions of the participating staff are inadequate, since scarce information on their related expertise is provided in some cases. In turn, the partnership management is very unbalanced and presents two dominant partners. Thus, responsibilities within the overall management structure are not sufficiently detailed as to ensure a good coordination of the project. Furthermore, communication between partners is not appropriately considered. Although Latin American universities are included in the management structure therefore involved in decision-making, not all of them take part of the conflict resolution process. There is no satisfactory involvement in the project activities of the Partner Countries institutions in the sense that they are exclusively considered as beneficiaries; therefore, it is not surprising that they do not lead any work package. Actually, the only task that some of them fulfil in the whole project is hosting coordination meetings. The methodology misses to harness the diversity of Latin American universities to promote experiences sharing. Most Partner Countries institutions have already benefited from support for Capacity Building in the past.</p>
4	Impact and sustainability	<p>The project will very likely assist the development of Partner Countries higher education institutions, particularly of those who do not have any technology transfer centre yet, but the extent of the impacts will depend on the quality of the institutional plans to be produced. Relevant and appropriate impact indicators are indicated and will be followed-up by the institutions. The proposal has the potential to produce multiplier effects in other universities thanks to the Latin American association of universities which co-leads the project and the virtual platform to be implemented, and all the more so as non-partners participate in training sessions and dissemination events. The dissemination plan during and after the project lifetime includes a basic but satisfactory combination of online presence, brochures and a relevant virtual platform. The sustainability of the generated knowledge, training content, policy documents, and even the platform and the centres, is to be seen as assured though their planned integration into the systems of the participating institutions. Some services are intended to produce revenues.</p> <p>Conversely, the proposal does not consider the follow-up of eventual multiplier effects. The dissemination plan does not take advantage of more efficient means of communication to better reach the target groups, while there is insufficient information on how each target institution will perform their outreach activities both internally and toward its local industries and society.</p>