



Raision kaupunki  
Juha-Pekka Lehmus  
Nallinkatu 2  
21200 Raisio  
TIEDOKSI: Seppo Ryösä, seppo.ryosa@outlook.com

ILMOITUS PÄÄTÖKSESTÄ  
31.7.2018

**Erasmus+ yleissivistävälle koulutukselle  
KA2 Strategiset kumppanuushankkeet  
Hakukierros 21.3.2018**

Hankenumero: **2018-1-FI01-KA201-047303**

Hankkeen nimi: **Improving Children's Learning Outcomes and Well-being**

Hyvä vastaanottaja,

Opetushallitus on käsitellyt hakemuksenne hakukierroksella 2018 (21.3.2018) ja päättänyt myöntää yllä nimetyille hankkeelle tukea enintään **123 065** euroa.

Lopullinen tuki määräytyy loppuraportin tarkistuksen perusteella.

Hankesopimus astuu voimaan, kun kumpikin osapuoli on allekirjoittanut sen.

Päätökseen ei saa hakea muutosta valittamalla (valtionavustuslaki 688/2001; § 34). Päätökseen tyytymätön asianosainen voi hakea oikaisua 30 päivän kuluessa päätöksen tiedoksisaannista. Tarkempi oikaisuvaatimusosoitus osoitteessa: [www.cimo.fi/oikaisuvaatimus](http://www.cimo.fi/oikaisuvaatimus)

Tuetuille hankkeille järjestetään koulutusta, tilaisuuksista lähetetään erillinen kutsu ja ohjeet ilmoittautumiseen:

- Tiistai 4.9.18 verkkokoulutus (skype) klo 13-15.30
- Keskiviikko 5.9.18 verkkokoulutus (skype) klo 13-15.30
- Tiistai 18.9.18 Helsingissä klo 9.30-16.00.

Lisätiedot:

KA2-tiimi, Erasmus+ yleissivistävälle koulutukselle, Opetushallitus  
[comenius@oph.fi](mailto:comenius@oph.fi), 0295 338 652

Tytti Vuottilainen

Vastaava asiantuntija, Erasmus+ KA2 yleissivistävälle koulutukselle  
Kansainvälistymispalvelut, Opetushallitus

LIITE1: Assessment Feedback

LIITE2: Eritelty hanketuki

# Assessment Sheet

## Erasmus+ Call for proposals

Name of the Organisation:	Raision kaupunki
Title of the proposal:	Improving Children's Learning Outcomes and Well-being
Reference No:	2018-1-FI01-KA201-047303
Signed on:	19.06.2018

### I. ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION

Criteria	Score
Impact and dissemination	19
Quality of the project design and implementation	13
Quality of the project team and the cooperation arrangements	14
Relevance of the project/strategy	23
<b>Total:</b>	<b>69</b>

### II. ASSESSMENT

<b>Impact and dissemination</b>	19
<p>The project assessment plan is fairly modest when compared to the scope of objectives set for the project. The dissemination plan is merely a draft in its current form, it should have been much more elaborated – again compared with the project objectives. The dissemination and the results of the project needed to be more concrete with an indication of the persons in charge if possible.</p> <p>The potential impact of the project is described to some extent, but there is no proper link how this project would benefit the students and teachers in the participating schools as they do not appear being part of the project as equal participants. The project might benefit a wider audience later on, depending on its results, but also this remains rather sketchy in the proposal. Regarding the sustainability of the project, the proposal indicates merely the sustainability of the cooperation between partners, not so much the sustainability of the project results contentwise.</p>	
<b>Quality of the project design and implementation</b>	13
<p>The proposed project has a very clear structure which is easy to understand. The project schedule is also clear and meticulously drafted. However, there could have been more justification about the transnational project meetings (TPM) as they are the core of this project: currently the description remains in such a general level that it is not easy to see how the contents and work done in TPM translates into reaching the project objectives. The TPMs seem to operate quite detached from the schools' realities and the "starting query" addresses topics which appear to be quite vast to be dealt with within the time reserved for them. The existence of a control group is very good, but there could have been more information about the management and cooperation methods throughout the project. It is not clear why nothing seems to happen between the project weeks, especially bearing in mind that the objectives of the project are very ambitious, and it seems unrealistic to think that all work could be done only during them. The proposal gives no indication why there are no LTT activities planned, as it seems they would fit in very well with the project objectives.</p>	
<b>Quality of the project team and the cooperation arrangements</b>	14
<p>The proposal gives basic information about the participating schools and individuals but could be much more explicit when explaining why these schools wish to cooperate together and what kind of expertise do the individual participants bring to the project. It is good to have a lot of newcomers in the project, but in hindsight it might have been a good idea to have also someone more experienced to share their expertise for the others. The role of the external coordinator is not sufficiently justified in the proposal, especially as his proposed fee represents a remarkable portion of the project budget. There is no clear explanation why the University of Turku is mentioned as a partner in the proposal text, but not otherwise marked as a partner. The communication is many-sided including webpage, What's App and video conferencing. The risks are considered with the control group.</p>	
<b>Relevance of the project/strategy</b>	23
<p>The proposal is well linked with the Action objectives and priorities, although this link is not defined or justified directly in the proposal. The background analysis for the project is impressive and describes very well the need for this kind of cooperation and development work. A lot of effort has clearly been put in defining the project objectives, which are represented in a very</p>	

comprehensive way. This comprehensive approach is a definite strength in the proposal, but there is also a danger that the project becomes too fragmented and lost in detail. To some extent, the objectives are also defined very strongly from the headmaster's point of view and one doesn't necessarily hear the voice of teachers very much in them. The justification for the innovativeness is satisfactory, as is the justification why this project should be carried out transnationally.

### **Overall comments to the applicant**

The overall goal of this proposal is very good, to increase the well-being of pupils at schools. However, the proposal succeeds only partially in describing how the project aims to reach this goal. The biggest question mark of this proposal is its methodology: why the partnership hasn't included LTT activities which would suit the objectives very well, and at the same time, ensure that the viewpoints and opinions of teachers and pupils would also be heard. Currently a lot of effort is being put into organizing the transnational project meetings, but they seem to be quite distant from the reality of schools. In other words, the proposal is very headmaster oriented. The role of the external coordinator remains unclear in the proposal, and there is unfortunately not proper justification for including his fee in the project budget.

## Project 2018-1-FI01-KA201-047303

### Project

Project Code	2018-1-FI01-KA201-047303
Submission ID	1477132

The beneficiary will implement the Project as described in the grant application with the aforementioned submission code.

### Budget Summary

*Budget allocation per budget heading as indicated in this section can be modified by the beneficiary, except in the cases requiring an amendment approved by the National Agency, as specified in the article I.3.3 of the Special Conditions of this Grant Agreement.*

Budget Items	Total Grant
Project Management and Implementation	45 000,00
Transnational Project Meetings	78 065,00
Total Granted	123 065,00

### Budget Details

#### Transnational Project Meetings

Total Number of Participants	Distance Band	Total Grant
49	>= 2000 km	37 240,00
71	100 - 1999 km	40 825,00
Total		78 065,00

## Participating Organisation(s)

### Raisio kaupunki

Latin Legal Name	Raisio kaupunki
Organisation Role	Coordinator
Registration Number	FI02044285
Legal Form	UNKNOWN
Address	Nallinkatu 2 PL100 - 21200, Raisio - Finland
Country	Finland
VAT	0204428-5
PIC	906649689

### COLEGIO SALESIANO NUESTRA SEÑORA DEL ROSARIO

Latin Legal Name	COLEGIO SALESIANO NUESTRA SEÑORA DEL ROSARIO
Organisation Role	Partner Organisation
Registration Number	11004830
Legal Form	ENTIDAD RELIGIOSA
Address	MARÍA AUXILIADORA, 2 - 11520, ROTA - Spain
Country	Spain
VAT	R1100118G
PIC	913206307

## Eastfield Primary School

Latin Legal Name	Eastfield Primary School
Organisation Role	Partner Organisation
Legal Form	UNKNOWN
Address	Eastfield Primary School, Eastfield Road - LE4 8FP, LEICESTER - United Kingdom
Country	United Kingdom
PIC	913418834

## VAASAN KAUPUNKI

Latin Legal Name	VAASAN KAUPUNKI
Organisation Role	Partner Organisation
Registration Number	02096026
Legal Form	UNKNOWN
Address	. 3 - 65101, VAASA - Finland
Country	Finland
VAT	FI02096026
PIC	947285317

## Budget details per Participating Organisations

Budget allocation per organisation as indicated in this section is not obligatory and may be modified by the beneficiary under the condition that the activities and outputs of the project are realised and delivered in accordance with this Grant Agreement and the work plan presented in the corresponding application form.

### Raision kaupunki

Budget Items	Total Grant
Project Management and Implementation	18 000,00
Transnational Project Meetings	18 690,00
<b>Total Calculated</b>	<b>36 690,00</b>

### Transnational Project Meetings

Total Number of Participants	Distance Band	Total Grant
14	>= 2000 km	10 640,00
14	100 - 1999 km	8 050,00
<b>Total</b>		<b>18 690,00</b>

## COLEGIO SALESIANO NUESTRA SEÑORA DEL ROSARIO

Budget Items	Total Grant
Project Management and Implementation	9 000,00
Transnational Project Meetings	19 410,00
Total Calculated	28 410,00

## Transnational Project Meetings

Total Number of Participants	Distance Band	Total Grant
21	>= 2000 km	15 960,00
6	100 - 1999 km	3 450,00
Total		19 410,00



## Eastfield Primary School

Budget Items	Total Grant
Project Management and Implementation	9 000,00
Transnational Project Meetings	17 250,00
Total Calculated	26 250,00

## Transnational Project Meetings

Total Number of Participants	Distance Band	Total Grant
30	100 - 1999 km	17 250,00
Total		17 250,00

**VAASAN KAUPUNKI**

Budget Items	Total Grant
Project Management and Implementation	9 000,00
Transnational Project Meetings	22 715,00
Total Calculated	31 715,00

**Transnational Project Meetings**

Total Number of Participants	Distance Band	Total Grant
14	>= 2000 km	10 640,00
21	100 - 1999 km	12 075,00
<b>Total</b>		22 715,00