



EUCIS-LLL Erasmus+ assessment – June 2014

First phase – ownership of the programme and applications

GETTING TO KNOW ERASMUS+

SURVEY ITEM	POSITIVE FEEDBACK	NEGATIVE FEEDBACK	SUGGESTION FOR IMPROVEMENT
New programme architecture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 71% of respondents very much/more or less satisfied A majority thinks the structure in Actions/activities is clear 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concealment of former sectors' brand names despite Parliament decision (EAC website, users' guide) Not always clear for beneficiaries where to apply, especially those with a scope of more than one sector 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restore brand names' visibility and communication on them for coherence and continuity towards beneficiaries Improve communication and guidance on activities' target groups ("What's in it for me" type)
New programme objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 89% of respondents think programme objectives are very much/more or less adapted to their reality Various and wide objectives covering many sectors and responding to current societal needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some sectors feel spoiled (i.e. adult education reduced to basic skills challenge) Some objectives are on the contrary too restrictive for some sectors (entrepreneurship) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure all sectors can identify to programme objectives Ensure they remain broad/flexible enough for beneficiaries to work on truly innovative topics while respecting EU political priorities
Innovation compared to LLP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 60% of respondents believe Erasmus+ is very much/more or less innovative compared to LLP 	<p>Regret for disappearance of successful actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> actions clearly focused on languages Roma multilateral projects Grundtvig in-service trainings Grundtvig networks study visits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Re-assess in partnership with beneficiaries the impact and success of LLP actions that disappeared; envisage reintroducing some features of the most regretted Better communicate on actions that give equivalent opportunities to LLP ones that have disappeared

APPLYING FOR ERASMUS+

SURVEY ITEM	POSITIVE FEEDBACK	NEGATIVE FEEDBACK	SUGGESTION FOR IMPROVEMENT
Programme guide		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too dense, lacking clarity, not user-friendly for newcomers to the programme 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Separating guide by actions or by activity • Avoid splitting information with annexes • Avoid EU jargon
General information on applications and collaboration with Agencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 62% found their Agency very or rather helpful (73% for Belgian Agencies); often available and ready to help 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spread among different sources • Financial guidelines not clear in particular • Divergent interpretations according to languages • Lack of infodays and occasion to network/find partners • Huge variations in quality, support and understanding among NAs; often consequent lack of trust also due to contradictory information • Fear of national priorities prevailing/different political approaches from one NA to another • Decentralisation still seen as a mistake, especially by European NGOs (not Belgian NAs' primary target group, fear of being discriminated, no extra resources received...) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better gather information on administrative and financial guidelines; better communicate on where it is • Ensure coherence otherwise (i.e. among NAs) including in translations • Be transparent on number of actions funded/budget available • Set up standard rules for information among NAs (i.e. yearly infodays and contact seminars, national databases) • More capacity-building for young NAs • Accompany decentralisation with transfer of expertise and additional human/financial resources • Assess together with EU NGOs' and Belgian NAs effects of decentralisation (need more capacity-building? Budget?)
Actions practicalities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most respondents satisfied with eligibility criteria 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frustration on the end of individual applications; hindering participation • Feeling of spoliation towards large consortia (heavy forms, small management budget) • Too long eligibility periods for KA1 projects; too hard to plan mobilities such in advance • Frustrations on intellectual outputs (KA2): confusing, hindering a global vision of the work plan; excluding many good products 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reconsider application modalities to make sure all individuals interested can apply/communicate better towards legal representatives (school heads, CEOs...) on added value of staff mobility • Adapt administrative/financial aspects of the application to large consortia • Adapt KA1 length to beneficiaries' reality • Reconsider eligible project outputs and better communicate on intellectual ones

Dissemination and exploitation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> respondents trust the potential of (re)new(ed) platforms in place (Erasmus+ platform, EPALE, eTwinning) to contribute to greater visibility, synergies and improved partner search 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> despite the fact that dissemination/exploitation is an important programme feature: no extra funding allocated in projects to that purpose disappearance of Grundtvig/Comenius catalogues seen as a disaster for visibility and quality of trainings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> include all former projects in new databases/make them interactive and enable coordinators' contributions Ensure systematic dissemination of projects by National Agencies Ensure proper funding for dissemination Reintroduce specific dissemination actions (former LLP KA4, funding for follow-up actions of successful projects) Reintroduce actions catalogues
Applications procedures/forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Smart time laps between KA1 and KA2 deadlines to enable organisations to apply for both Truly innovative PIC system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Problem of deadlines during Easter holiday Lack of transparency regarding dates for selection procedures Only 60% of respondents found application forms easy to handle (rigid, heavy, time-consuming) eForms contents: still redundancies, lack of logic connections, questions not always clear eForm budget not really user-friendly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure proper application periods falling out of work/school holiday Clear timeline on selection results Provide systematic and user-friendly guidelines on PIC system (French NA model); use it for other parts of the eForm; more flexibility on signatures (mandates from legal representatives) Reflect on a better format for application forms that would avoid technical difficulties and ease collaborative partner work (track changes, file sharing...); enable images, charts, bold text Avoid "thousands of clicks" for activities and intellectual outputs Design more flexible application forms in order not to denature project ideas Provide an only budget tool (French NA)
Budgetary issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lump sums: easier calculations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unrealistic estimations especially for travel costs Unclear reporting guidelines Insufficient management budget (especially if dissemination and quality assurance) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reassess travel costs; make travel costs eligible among partners within the same country More transparent and user-friendly guidelines on what is eligible and how to

		included), not taking into account country standards of living	justify it <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow differenced calculation for management according to country level and project size • Smarter budget structuration (i.e. clear line for dissemination/quality; rethink intellectual outputs budget)
--	--	--	--

EUROPEAN NGOs AND ERASMUS+ (CIVIL SOCIETY COOPERATION)

SURVEY ITEM	POSITIVE FEEDBACK	NEGATIVE FEEDBACK	SUGGESTION FOR IMPROVEMENT
New programme objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear, broad enough and relevant to current context 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spoiled sectors in objectives i.e. adult education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concert stakeholders for modalities of a three-years framework agreement to enable genuine impact/reaching objectives
Application procedure/forms		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Periods of application/annual report submission/KA1 and KA2 deadlines overlapping • Lack of transparency on selection timeline • Still some redundant and overlapping questions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflect on proper application timeline and period/improve transparency on selection results and timeline (harmonise within DG) • Provide a commented application form (like for decentralised actions) • Provide more space for describing activities; enable images, charts, bold text
Budgetary issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Realistic amount for grants • Introduction of lump sums welcome 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amounts still low compared to other sectors • Still many concerns on staff costs calculation • Lack of communication on in-kind contributions • Not covering costs for non EU-residents impedes democratic functioning of NGOs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revision of the contributions in kind system; should be formally recognised i.e. by reducing co-financing to 0% or 10% (see other Europe for Citizens) • Make non-EU residents travel and subsistence costs eligible