



Table of contents

Table of contents	1
Evaluation criteria	2
Project details	4
Budget	5
Activities	6
Participants' feedback	10
European Language Label	19
Consortium members	20
Hosting organisations	21
Feedback	23
Annexes	24
Checklist	25



Evaluation criteria

The following evaluation criteria will be used to assess your final report on a scale of 100 points. The evaluation result will be used as part of the scoring for your future grant applications with your accreditation.

A large part of the assessment is based on the Erasmus quality standards, which you have committed to as part of your accreditation process. Before completing your report, we recommend that you read the standards again to understand the evaluation criteria fully. You may access the quality standards on the Europa web:

here

0

The extent to which:

Delivering targets and coherence with Erasmus Plan (50 points)

- the awarded funding has been absorbed by the beneficiary organisation (or sufficient justification has been provided for a lower absorption)
- the beneficiary has managed their grant effectively and efficiently, by taking into account the indicative targets defined in the grant agreement and adapting them to maximise the impact of implemented activities
- evolution that has taken place between the indicative targets and implemented activities is well explained in relation to the implementation circumstances and the beneficiary's Erasmus Plan
- the beneficiary has given appropriate priority to activities and categories of participants that have been marked as a priority at application stage

The extent to which:

Compliance with Erasmus quality standards (50 points)

- the implemented activities and participants' feedback show that the beneficiary has integrated basic principles of inclusion and diversity, digital education, and environmental sustainability and responsibility in the implementation of their activities
- the beneficiary has ensured sufficient participant report submission rates (in case of low submission rates, the beneficiary's explanation will be taken into account)
- participants' feedback shows that the quality of the implemented activities and support provided to the participants have been in line with the quality standards

Project details

Applicant organisation:	
Applicant organisation OID:	
Project code:	
Action type:	KA121-SCH
Field:	School Education
Project start date:	01-06-2022
Project end date:	31-08-2023
Accreditation code:	
Accreditation type:	APPLYING-MOBILITY-CONSORTIUM-COORDINATOR
Number of Consortium Members:	8
Grant awarded:	40 485,00 €
National Agency receiving the report:	DK01 - Danish Agency for Higher Education
Language used to fill in the form:	EN



Budget

Budget category	Grant reported	Grant awarded
Organisational support	5 450,00 €	0,00 €
Travel	6 615,00 €	0,00 €
Individual support	24 000,00 €	0,00 €
Linguistic support	0,00 €	0,00 €
Course fees	4 320,00 €	0,00 €
Inclusion support for organisations	100,00 €	0,00 €
Preparatory visits	-	0,00 €
Total	40 485,00 €	40 485,00 €
Absorption rate	100%	



Activities

The following section summarises information about the activities you have implemented with your grant. The purpose is to compare the implemented activities with the indicative targets defined in your grant agreement, and to provide context for these figures.

Your grant agreement (Annex II) defines the rules for this exercise:

- During project implementation, the beneficiary can make changes to the indicative targets without requesting an amendment to the grant agreement. However, the beneficiary must always prioritise those targets that have been marked with priority status at budget allocation stage. Targets for accompanying persons and preparatory visits are the lowest priority.
- At the final report stage, the beneficiary will explain any changes that took place during implementation. These explanations will be evaluated as part of the final report assessment, as described in Annex III.

These rules reflect key principles of accredited grants: flexibility and trust. As an accredited Erasmus+ organisation, you are entrusted to manage your grant in a responsible way, adapting your actions to changing circumstances and your organisation's needs. In this process, results and quality are more important than any numerical targets. In addition, flexibility is needed because budgetary restrictions can make it impossible to deliver figures exactly as planned before the start of the implementation.

Therefore, it is normal and expected that your implemented targets will not perfectly match the indicative targets estimated at application stage.

You should use questions in this section to show to the evaluators that you have been carefully managing your grant. The key figures are provided for you automatically based on the data you have already provided. In your replies, you should focus on providing a context for these figures. Your goal should be to show that implementation decisions were made in the best interest of your organisation and the participants, that you have kept your Erasmus Plan objectives in mind, and that you have done your best to use the available budget to the maximum.

Please pay particular attention to explanations linked to priority activities.

Priority activities are those that have carried additional points at the application stage. Priority activities can differ between countries and

therefore it is not possible to present here a full list. To check which activities fall in the priority category, please consult the rules of budget allocation applicable to the call year of your grant application. You can find this information on the website of your National Agency.

Activity Type	Number of participants		Duration in days Total(average)		Number of accompanying persons		Duration in days for accompanying persons Total (average)		Number of persons in preparatory visits	
	Indicative target	Implemented	Indicative target	Implemented	Indicative planning	Implemented	Indicative planning	Implemented	Indicative planning	Implemented
Job-shadowing	18	13 72,00%	90 (5,00)	57 (4,38 63,00%)	0	0 0,00%	0 (0,00)	0 (0,00) 0,00%	3	0 0,00%
Courses and training	6	9 150,00%	36 (6,00)	54 (6,00 150,00%)	0	0 0,00%	0 (0,00)	0 (0,00) 0,00%	0	0 0,00%
Total	24	22 91,67%	126	111 88,10%	0	0 0,00%	0	0 0,00%	3	0 0,00%

Activity Type	Number of participants with fewer opportunities		Number of participants in blended activities		Number of participants using sustainable means of transport (green travel)	
	Indicative target	Implemented	Indicative target	Implemented	Indicative target	Implemented
Job-shadowing	0	1 0,00%	0	0 0,00%	0	5 0,00%
Courses and training	0	0 0,00%	0	0 0,00%	0	0 0,00%
Total	0	1 0,00%	0	0 0,00%	0	5 0,00%

Based on the information in the tables above, please compare your indicative targets and the implemented activities.

You should focus your replies on the most significant changes that took place, in particular:

- changes in priority activities;
- activities where the number of participants or the total duration is lower than 80% of the indicative target.

If you have implemented your activities almost exactly as planned, it is sufficient to state so in a short reply.

With reference to the tables above, which targets did you need to adjust during implementation, and why?*

The consortium decided to change the target numbers and use fewer mobilities for job shadowing and more mobilities for courses and training during this second year of the accreditation. This was due to the fact that we wanted for teachers and managerial teams to gain more theoretical knowledge about the field of education of students with special educational needs and inclusion of students with special educational needs and learn about other countries' approach to this prior to the job shadowings. Furthermore, the participants in the courses were taught the English vocabulary associated with the field of special education through conversation with other participants and the course staff of various nationalities, which will make a difference when they are working with our partners during job shadowings in the years to come. The consortium has also started an intended use of green travel which was not planned originally. It takes longer, but it gives the participants a possibility to share expectations, thoughts and ideas about the job shadowing both on route to the job shadowing mobilities and more importantly on the journey back. Furthermore, a course mobility is generally more expensive than a job shadowing mobility due to the fact that the consortium pays 80 Euros per day for a course in addition to the other expenses. Hence the discrepancy between the indicative targets and the implemented targets for mobilities.

How were your decisions during implementation guided by your Erasmus Plan?*

The decision to make the changes mentioned above is aligned with the consortium's ERASMUS plan objective 1 and 2: Objective 1: Qualifying management through collaboration with European partners and experts within the special education field (managerial and administrative level). Objective 2: Qualifying professionals (teachers and pedagogues) through cooperation with European partners and experts in the field of special education (school level). With these objectives in our ERASMUS plan, we wanted to address several of our challenges, e.g., to strengthen respectively the professional quality of teaching, the final exams and the inclusion of children and young people with special needs. The challenges require development of management, as management is a decisive factor in positive change in a school. We therefore intend that the development should take place at both school and administrative level, in order to obtain the same knowledge within staff and management. In order to develop the quality of our education for students with special needs, we need to achieve renewed perspectives, inspiration, and professional development through collaboration. This can be accomplished to a large extent by taking a broad European view, where different cultures and professionals can be inspirations for a development of our practice in xxx. Not only through job shadowing, but also through courses where networks are formed and through exchange of ideas. This creates better schooling for our students with special needs, so they get the best prerequisites for lifelong learning.



The increasing level of comorbidities creates complex target groups (the students with special educational needs). We therefore have to develop our teaching of these students as well as the way in which we approach the field of special education. This is an additional reason for the decision to use part of the ERASMUS grant on courses abroad. All courses attended by consortium members were focused on the education of students with special needs.

Participants' feedback

This section contains feedback gathered from participant reports, presented per type of activities. For individual learner and staff activities, a report is requested from each individual participant. For group activities, one participation report is submitted by the group's lead accompanying person on behalf of the entire group.

The following table presents an overview of participant report submission rates across different activity types. The submission rate is calculated as the percentage of received reports out of the total expected.

Before submitting this report, please make sure that sufficient participant reports have been submitted to allow evaluators to make their assessment. Ensuring that participant reports are completed is part of your duties defined in the grant agreement and the Erasmus quality standards. For individual staff and learner activities, at least 80% submission rate is expected, while the submission rate for group participation reports should be 100%.

Please be aware that submitting your report with lower submission rates is likely to affect your evaluation score negatively. To improve the submission rate, we advise that you send reminders to participants who have not yet submitted their report, and that you instruct the lead accompanying persons to complete their group activity reports.

Participant reports submission rate	
Activity Type	Submission rate
Job-shadowing	100,00%
Courses and training	100,00%
Overall for individual activities	100%
Overall for group activities	Not applicable



Job-shadowing

Job-shadowing – Participants' feedback part 1: Satisfaction

Participant reports submission rate 100,00%

General satisfaction	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
How satisfied are you with your Erasmus+ mobility experience?	76.92% (10 / 13)	23.08% (3 / 13)	0% (0 / 13)	0% (0 / 13)

Satisfaction with specific arrangements

Were you satisfied with overall organisation of the activity in terms of logistics and practical arrangements?	100% (13 / 13)
Were you satisfied with travel arrangements?	84.62% (11 / 13)
Were you satisfied with accommodation?	100% (13 / 13)
Were you satisfied with insurance coverage and information about insurance?	100% (13 / 13)
Were you satisfied with how your questions (or complaints) were addressed?	100% (13 / 13)

Job-shadowing – Participants' feedback part 2: Preparation and hosting arrangements



Preparation arrangements

Before departing for your mobility activity, did you receive any preparation, training or information about the destination country and the hosting organisation?		92.31% (12 / 13)
If yes, was this preparation and information useful to you?	Yes, I felt well prepared	91.67% (11 / 12)
	Yes, but I needed more preparation	8.33% (1 / 12)
	No, I did not find it useful	0% (0 / 12)
Before departing, I knew what to expect during my mobility period (what I was going to do and what I was expected to learn)		84.62% (11 / 13)
I have signed a learning agreement or a similar document defining the expected learning outcomes of my mobility period		92.31% (12 / 13)

Hosting arrangements

The teaching / training at the hosting organisation was of good quality and relevant for me		100% (13 / 13)
I felt well received and well integrated at my hosting organisation		100% (13 / 13)
At the hosting organisation, I had a mentor or a similar person who was following my learning progress and results.		76.92% (10 / 13)
I have received contact information of someone at the sending organisation to contact in case of an emergency		100% (13 / 13)
I have received contact information of someone at the hosting organisation to contact in case of an emergency		92.31% (12 / 13)

Job-shadowing - Participants' feedback part 3: Results

Participants indicating they have benefited from their Erasmus+ activity		92.31% (12 / 13)
--	--	--------------------

Results of implemented activities

I have learned or improved practical skills relevant for my current job and for my professional development.	84,62 % (11 / 13)
I have improved my knowledge of the subject I am teaching and of my professional field.	38,46 % (5 / 13)
I have improved my organisational, management and leadership skills.	53,85 % (7 / 13)
I have improved my career opportunities.	15,38 % (2 / 13)
I have learned more about environmental, climate and sustainability issues.	7,69 % (1 / 13)
I have changed my habits to become more sustainable.	0,00 % (0 / 13)
I have a better understanding of the diversity in my society.	69,23 % (9 / 13)
I am more committed to work against discrimination, intolerance, xenophobia and racism.	23,08 % (3 / 13)
I am more interested in participating in elections, in other democratic processes, and in the life of my local community.	7,69 % (1 / 13)
I have learned more about Europe, the European Union and European values.	76,92 % (10 / 13)
I have learned more about new and useful ways to apply digital technology.	23,08 % (3 / 13)
I am eager to use more digital technologies in my studies or work.	7,69 % (1 / 13)

Certification of learning outcomes	Number of participants
Erasmus+ Learning Agreement complement	13
No certification issued	0

Job-shadowing - Participants' feedback part 4: Language learning



Linguistic support

	Number of participants	Number of participants receiving language support grant
Danish	1	0
English	12	0

Language learning

I think I have improved my skills in the main language used during my mobility period 53.85% (7 / 13)

I have received support to improve my language skills before or during my mobility period (for example: a language course, language learning materials, language coaching or similar) 11.11% (1 / 9)

Note: the figures in this table exclude participants who were already fluent in the main language used during their mobility period.

Job-shadowing - Participants' feedback part 5: Comments

Please comment on the participants' feedback summarised in parts 1 to 4 above. You should identify strong and weak points and explain them. In this context, figures indicating less than 80% of positive replies are considered as quite weak results. If there are any figures in this range, make sure to address them in your reply.*

First and foremost: it is of uttermost importance to the consortium that all participants in mobility activities submit their participant's report. Data shows that there is a submission rate of 100% which provides evidence to the consortium that participants are aware of the importance of feedback. Generally, participants were rather satisfied with the job shadowing arranged by the consortium coordinator. Part of the reason for this is the personal relationship the consortium coordinator has with the host organizations. This ensures that the quality of the job shadowing mobilities is rather high. Prior to all job shadowings, the participants are invited to a meeting where information about job shadowing is given, and participants have the opportunity to ask questions and the coordinator can address participants' concerns. The participants have all signed the learning agreement required, although one participant states that he or she hasn't. In terms of the Results of implemented activities the answers vary substantially. It is, however, nice that some of the questions which the consortium considers important, have a rather high positive feedback rate. This is an example: I have learned or improved practical skills relevant for my current job and for my professional development, which has a positive feedback rate of almost 85%. Additionally, we need to ensure that the participants know exactly who their mentor is at the hosting organisation, who would follow their learning progress and results, as this seems not to be the case for all participants. A reason for this could be the fact that when a smaller group is on a job shadowing mobility they have less contact individually with the organizing mentor, but more on a group level. In the years to come the consortium will have an increased focus on the

implemented activities results in order to ensure higher positive feedback numbers and qualify the dialogues with participants in job shadowing mobilities. This will be put on the agenda for the first meeting of the new project year 2023- 2024 between the consortium member schools and the consortium coordinator. There is however a rather large number of activities results which are not relevant to our consortium hence a reason for some low numbers.

Courses and training

Courses and training – Participants' feedback part 1: Satisfaction

Participant reports submission rate	100,00%			
General satisfaction	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
How satisfied are you with your Erasmus+ mobility experience?	44.44% (4 / 9)	55.56% (5 / 9)	0% (0 / 9)	0% (0 / 9)
Satisfaction with specific arrangements				
Were you satisfied with overall organisation of the activity in terms of logistics and practical arrangements?	100% (9 / 9)			
Were you satisfied with travel arrangements?	100% (9 / 9)			
Were you satisfied with accommodation?	88.89% (8 / 9)			
Were you satisfied with insurance coverage and information about insurance?	100% (9 / 9)			
Were you satisfied with how your questions (or complaints) were addressed?	100% (9 / 9)			



Participants' rating of attended courses and training	5 - Very good quality	4 – Good quality	3 – Acceptable quality	2 – Low quality	1 – Very low quality
Information and transparency	44.44% (4 / 9)	22.22% (2 / 9)	0% (0 / 9)	33.33% (3 / 9)	0% (0 / 9)
Content and pedagogy	55.56% (5 / 9)	11.11% (1 / 9)	33.33% (3 / 9)	0% (0 / 9)	0% (0 / 9)
European dimension	22.22% (2 / 9)	33.33% (3 / 9)	44.44% (4 / 9)	0% (0 / 9)	0% (0 / 9)
Services and facilities	44.44% (4 / 9)	11.11% (1 / 9)	22.22% (2 / 9)	22.22% (2 / 9)	0% (0 / 9)
Follow-up	22.22% (2 / 9)	44.44% (4 / 9)	33.33% (3 / 9)	0% (0 / 9)	0% (0 / 9)
Overall course rating (average)	1.3555555555555556				

Courses and training – Participants' feedback part 2: Preparation and hosting arrangements

Preparation arrangements

Before departing for your mobility activity, did you receive any preparation, training or information about the destination country and the hosting organisation?	88.89% (8 / 9)	
If yes, was this preparation and information useful to you?	Yes, I felt well prepared	62.5% (5 / 8)
	Yes, but I needed more preparation	25% (2 / 8)
	No, I did not find it useful	12.5% (1 / 8)
Before departing, I knew what to expect during my mobility period (what I was going to do and what I was expected to learn)	100% (9 / 9)	
I have signed a learning agreement or a similar document defining the expected learning outcomes of my mobility period	0% (0 / 0)	

Hosting arrangements

I have received contact information of someone at the sending organisation to contact in case of an emergency	100% (9 / 9)
I have received contact information of someone at the hosting organisation to contact in case of an emergency	88.89% (8 / 9)

Courses and training - Participants' feedback part 3: Results

Participants indicating they have benefited from their Erasmus+ activity	88.89% (8 / 9)
---	-------------------------

Results of implemented activities

I have learned or improved practical skills relevant for my current job and for my professional development.	77,78 % (7 / 9)
I have improved my knowledge of the subject I am teaching and of my professional field.	66,67 % (6 / 9)
I have improved my organisational, management and leadership skills.	11,11 % (1 / 9)
I have improved my career opportunities.	11,11 % (1 / 9)
I have learned more about environmental, climate and sustainability issues.	0,00 % (0 / 9)
I have changed my habits to become more sustainable.	0,00 % (0 / 9)
I have a better understanding of the diversity in my society.	77,78 % (7 / 9)
I am more committed to work against discrimination, intolerance, xenophobia and racism.	33,33 % (3 / 9)
I am more interested in participating in elections, in other democratic processes, and in the life of my local community.	11,11 % (1 / 9)
I have learned more about Europe, the European Union and European values.	77,78 % (7 / 9)
I have learned more about new and useful ways to apply digital technology.	44,44 % (4 / 9)
I am eager to use more digital technologies in my studies or work.	11,11 % (1 / 9)

Certification of learning outcomes	Number of participants
Europass Certificate Supplement	9
No certification issued	0

Courses and training - Participants' feedback part 4: Language learning



Linguistic support

	Number of participants	Number of participants receiving language support grant
English	9	0

Language learning

I think I have improved my skills in the main language used during my mobility period 66.67% (6 / 9)

I have received support to improve my language skills before or during my mobility period (for example: a language course, language learning materials, language coaching or similar) 0% (0 / 7)

Note: the figures in this table exclude participants who were already fluent in the main language used during their mobility period.

Courses and training - Participants' feedback part 5: Comments

Please comment on the participants' feedback summarised in parts 1 to 4 above. You should identify strong and weak points and explain them. In this context, figures indicating less than 80% of positive replies are considered as quite weak results. If there are any figures in this range, make sure to address them in your reply.*

This year 2022-2023 the consortium has had participants participating in courses by the same course provider that has a number of courses in various cities. The consortium members have generally been satisfied with the quality of the courses except in one case where the academic level of the course provider left a lot to be desired - both in terms of content, class management and language skills. It is rather difficult to find an excellent course provider who can cater to all participants' academic needs and a course content often comes across as not being of a high quality if the participants' expectations are not what is being delivered. Prior to a course mobility all participants are invited to a meeting with the consortium coordinator to ensure that questions are addressed, and information is given. In one case it seems that a participant hasn't been invited to such a meeting which is in fact incorrect. As stated above The Results of the Implemented activities - feedback varies to a large extent. This is again due to the fact that some statements seem irrelevant to the participants as they are not a part of the aims and goals for the project i.e. "I have changed my habits to become more sustainable", which has a score of 0.0 Percent.



European Language Label

The European Language Label is an award set up by the European Commission as part of the Erasmus+ programme. Its objectives are to recognise excellent projects in the area of multilingualism, to help sharing their results, and to promote public interest in language learning.

European Language Labels are awarded in each EU member state and in third countries associated to Erasmus+. The labels are awarded either on annual or biannual basis, depending on the country. You can learn more about the European Language Label on the Europa web, here:

here

0

Thanks to having completed a Key Action 1 mobility project, your organisation has the opportunity to apply for the European Language Label.

Please note that applying for the European Language Label will not influence the evaluation of your final report in any way. All the information provided in replies to questions in this section will be used exclusively in the selection procedures for the European Language Label.

Would you like to apply for the European Language Label?

NO



Consortium members

Consortium member	Organisation Type	Number of participants				
		Total	Staff	Learners	Hosted teachers or educators in training	Invited experts
(E10165678)	School/Institute/Educational centre – General education (primary level)	0	0	0	0	0
(E10270015)	School/Institute/Educational centre – General education (primary level)	0	0	0	0	0
(E10237681)	School/Institute/Educational centre – General education (primary level)	2	2	0	0	0
(E10086012)	School/Institute/Educational centre – General education (primary level)	0	0	0	0	0
(E10286223)	School/Institute/Educational centre – General education (primary level)	0	0	0	0	0
(E10116295)	School/Institute/Educational centre – General education (primary level)	3	3	0	0	0
(E10304791)	Other type of organisation	10	10	0	0	0
(E10284852)	Other type of organisation	2	2	0	0	0
Total		17	17	0	0	0



KA121-SCH Accredited projects for mobility of learners and staff in school education

Form ID 2022-1-DK01-KA121-SCH-000051628

Deadline (Brussels Time) 30/10/2023

Hosting organisations



Activity Type	Hosting organisation	Organisation Type	Number of persons participating in the preparatory visits	Number of participants
Courses and training	EUROPASS SRL (E10166501)	Other type of organisation	0	4
Courses and training	Converzum Tudomány Nyelviskola Zrt. (E10037065)	Other type of organisation	0	3
Courses and training	European Academy of Creativity (E10247545)	Other type of organisation	0	2
Job-shadowing	Stedelijk College Eindhoven (E10059321)	Other type of organisation	0	5
Job-shadowing	Nicosia Provincial Office of Primary Education Ministry of Education, Sports and Youth ()	National Public body	0	4
Job-shadowing	CPEE SEGEDA (E10159815)	Other type of organisation	0	2
Job-shadowing	REGIONE AUTONOMA VALLE D'AOSTA (E10187739)	Other type of organisation	0	1
Job-shadowing	De Accolade Waas & Dender ()	Regional Public body	0	1
Total	-	-	0	22



Feedback

The following question represents your feedback to the European Commission about application, implementation and reporting procedures for your Erasmus+ project. When answering this question, please take into account the opinion of organisations involved in your project.

Do you consider that the procedures applicable to your project were proportionate and simple?*

YES



Annexes

The maximum size of a file is 15 MB and the maximum total size is 100 MB.

The maximum number of all attachments is 100.

Declaration on honour

Please download the declaration on honour, print it, have it signed by the legal representative and attach.

Other documents

Please attach any other relevant documents.

If you have any additional questions, please contact your National Agency. You can find their contact details here: [List of National Agencies](#) 0

List of documents

No	Name	File size (kB)	Type of document
0	dec on honour.pdf	0647	Declaration on honour
	Total size (kB)	647	



Checklist

Before submitting your report form to the National Agency, please make sure that:

- All necessary information on your project has been encoded in Beneficiary Module;
- The report form has been completed using one of the mandatory languages specified in the Grant Agreement;
- All the relevant documents are annexed:
- Declaration on Honour, signed by the legal representative of the beneficiary organisation;
- The necessary supporting documents as requested in the grant agreement;
- You have saved or printed the copy of the completed form for your records.

Conditions for the Final report submission

Final report can only be submitted if:

- All mandatory fields in the report have been filled in
- Reported Budget is greater than zero, see Budget 0
- All mobility activities and group activities in the project are in status Complete, see List of mobility activities - List of group activities 00
- Declaration on Honour has been uploaded
- Checklist has been fulfilled

PROTECTION OF PERSONAL DATA

Please read our privacy statement to understand how we process and protect

your personal data

0