Mr Kent ANDERSEN
SYDDANSK ERHVERVSSKOLE
ODENSE-VEJLE
Munke Mose Allé, 9
DK – 5000 - ODENSE

Brussels, 10. 04. 2015
EACEA/A1/MH/SA/mlp 15D008764

Reference: Your project 537672-LLP-1-2013-1-DK-KA2-KA2MP / 2013-4025

Approval of Progress Report and Notification of Payment

Dear Mr Andersen,

I am pleased to inform you that we have approved the Progress Report for the project referenced above. This approval is based on an assessment undertaken by an external expert on behalf of the Agency. Enclosed you will find the Agency's comments following this assessment. Please use them as guidelines for the implementation of your project as they will be taken into account when assessing the Final Report of your project.

Please note that **the LLP logo**, recognition of Community funding and **official disclaimer** should be included in all project products and outcomes, including the different project websites. Failure to add these elements could result in the Agency being unable to accept the results of the project at Final Report stage and have an impact on the payment of the last instalment of your project's LLP Grant.

The LLP logo and a translation of the funding disclaimer in the official EU languages can be found on the following websites:
Logo: http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/about/logos_en.htm
Disclaimer: http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/publ/graphics/beneficiaries_all.pdf

Following the approval of your Progress Report, we also confirm that the payment of the second pre-financing for your project has been launched. This payment will be made in accordance with article I.4.1 of the Grant Agreement.

Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency
Office: BOU2, 01/017
Av. du Bourget 1 - BE-1049 Brussels - Belgium
Phone: direct line (32-2) 2985807. Fax: (32-2) 2921326

http://eacea.ec.europa.eu

Please be aware that the approval of the Progress Report should not be considered as an approval of the reported expenses. All expenses, including those already reported at the Progress Report stage, will be checked and the final grant will be awarded only at the Final Report stage.

International transfers can take up to two weeks to be credited to the beneficiary's account. Please, contact us if you do not receive the payment within two weeks.

Please do not hesitate to contact Simona Abbatangelo should you have any further enquiries. Yours sincerely,

Mónika HOLIK
Head of Unit

Annex: Comments and Recommendations from an independent expert

Contact: Simona Abbatangelo, telephone (32-2) 29 85 699,
Simona.Abbatangelo@ec.europa.eu

LLP PROGRESS REPORT ASSESSMENT SHEET

Project number: [number]-[year]-[country]-[LLP Action]
537672-LLP-1-2013-1-DK-KA2-KA2MP

Project title:
CLIL4U

	Score /10
1. Objectives, results and products Have the project's activities been in accordance with its aims and objectives as declared in the original application or as officially amended? Have there already been any valuable results/products achieved at Progress Report stage?	9

The Clil4U project builds on previous CLIL projects and aims to develop teaching and learning resources in three languages for school and vocational education to support the use of CLIL as a methodology. These resources are supplemented by advisory materials for parents, an online teacher course and accreditation. The list of products produced in the first half of the project is impressive. The aim was to develop 48 CLIL scenarios; in fact 54 are on the website, 27 for Primary and Secondary schools in Spanish, Italian and English and a further 27 for Vocational schools mainly in English or Danish with two in Italian. They all follow the same format and are very comprehensive. They include an introductory powerpoint, curriculum links, lesson plans, activities and links to eternal resources such as YouTube and worksheets. They are differentiated by CEFR levels. Some also have the age range identified and partners could consider doing this for all scenarios. The links from the scenario introduction work but some of the links from the lesson plans do not, but this is still a set of resources under development. The consortium should however make sure that all links work at final report stage. The sample lesson videos are useful but could be structured differently to highlight the CLIL approach and partners could consider how to improve their technical quality. The project website is linked into the other Language websites of the coordinating organisation and hosts a wealth of resources. In addition to the teaching resources, a CLIL book has been produced in six languages; there are three promotional videos, a regularly updated blog, a link to the online course, and some advisory materials for parents. Overall, the partnership has produced a lot of high quality deliverables in the first half of the project.

	Score /10
2. Coherence between workplan and activities carried out to date Have the planned activities been implemented in accordance with the project's work plan as declared in the original application, or as officially amended, and have any variations been adequately justified?	9

It is clear that all of the activities have been in line with the initial application. There have been no variations. This is evident through the confidential report and the biannual reports, which require partners to report on the local activities they have undertaken and any delays. No delays of any significance are reported. Indeed in some ways, for example the development of the resources, it appears ahead of schedule. Progress of the project has been tightly monitored. The plans for the next stage are very clear.

	Score /10
3. Partnership Are there indicators to show that the partnership is working properly? Are there clear indications of a real and effective involvement of the partners? Are there significant changes in the partnership compared to the application? If so, have these changes had any impact on the partnership?	9

This is a well-established and well-qualified partnership, and all partners have experience of international projects; most partners have already worked with the coordinating organisation. The work has been structured to maximise the expertise of the partners through, for example, the three working groups. A further incentive to positive partnership working is the use of peer review. It is clear that some partners have more experience of putting the CLIL approach into practice than others and that some of the personnel are new to the LLP programme. However there are good examples of partners learning from and supporting one another. The biannual reports demonstrate the level of activity from each partner, which is good, and the evaluation of the meetings indicates that there has been a good level of partnership working and exchange of expertise. There have been no changes to the partnership.

	Score /10
4. Management Does the project seem to be well managed on the whole? How efficient were the management and coordination arrangements? To what extent were appropriate decisions made to support effective implementation and problem resolution? Have any deviations/changes been satisfactorily justified?	9

Management of the project has been very strong. A number of management tools have been used. The biannual reports are very well structured and require all partners to report on their activity to date in terms of project implementation, management and dissemination. They are aligned to the project milestones and partners are required to report any delays. This is an excellent monitoring tool, but also enables the coordinator to intervene if necessary. To date, this has not been required. The fact that partners also have to report on management highlights the fact that management is a shared responsibility. Communication has been good, a dropbox is in use for access to documentation, and the records of the meetings indicate that they have been held in a professional manner. The evaluation of the meetings has been very positive, with indications of good support from the coordinator and good communication and constructive feedback. The minutes of the meetings are comprehensive.

	Score /10
5. Financial management Are the expenditures made so far appropriate and in line with the approved Work Plan? Are the expenditures made so far appropriate with the project's activities as described in the Progress Report? Are the expenditures made so far in line with the level of project's implementation ("best value for money" principle)?	8

There are systems in place for financial reporting. All partners have customised report templates to summarise resources used during the reporting period and this facilitates financial monitoring. Travel and subsistence costs are well within the initial budget. Equipment and subcontracting are in line with the original budget. The headsets should be accounted for under equipment rather than other. It is likely that the other costs will exceed the initial budget, given the further dissemination activities, but the original budget in this category was very low. Staffing costs are within budget for the half-way stage, although the number of days used is relatively higher. The initial budget underestimated the days to be allocated to Cat4 and the partners have used 74.7% of the anticipated Cat1 staffing and 60.5% of Cat2. Most staffing rates are below what had been initially anticipated. Given the outcomes produced, the staffing is justified, but at the final report stage would merit some explanation of the differences between planned and actual, as any deviation should be duly explained in detail to be considered justified and thus eligible. There is some variation in the number of days claimed by each partner with P6 having used many more days than other partners, including the coordinator, almost 90% of those initially planned. However, this partner appears to have had a heavier workload in the preparation of the resources. Overall the project is well within budget and expenditure has been in line with the activities undertaken.

	Score /10
6. Evaluation and/or quality assurance If evaluation activities have already taken place, are they satisfactory? How well has the project's strategy for evaluation been implemented so far? To what extent has the project considered the comments or recommendations following the project selection?	8

The systems for quality assurance are very robust. They are based on the biannual reports from partners, and these enable progress to be tightly monitored. A quality assurance board has been set up, with representation from each of the partners and this has overall responsibility for the internal evaluation. A further strategic quality control mechanism is the use of peer review, where the work of one partner is assessed by another who provides feedback and supports the development of improved outcomes. The piloting phase takes place during the second half of the project, and this is where both the resources and methodology will be tested. External evaluation is in place and two reports have been produced. There is some overlap in the reports and it is not clear why two separate reports were commissioned rather than one. Although these reports are helpful to the monitoring process, they tend to be more analytical than evaluative. A set of judgements is provided at the start of one of them, but there is no explanation on how improvements could be made. This aspect should be improved - external evaluation reports would benefit from a set of recommendations to the partnership.

	Score /10
7. Dissemination How does the project develop communication, visibility, and the dissemination of its activities and results as outlined in the original application? With reference to the original application, to what extent has the consortium addressed the issue of the exploitation of the project activities / results during the project lifetime (and beyond)?	10

Dissemination has been particularly strong. There is good evidence to demonstrate that all partners have been involved in dissemination and that they have exploited opportunities provided by attending conferences to publicise the project. Records of each partner's dissemination activities are substantial and supported by evidence. The structure of the dissemination records ensures that the target groups are identified and that numbers are recorded. The external evaluation reports that the partnership has been particularly active on dissemination and this is true. The activities have been wide ranging from the use of newsletters, a multilingual brochure, the blog, social media, to conferences and meetings. The conferences have included European events such as EDEN and EfVET and the range of those targeted is very wide. The numbers impacted from dissemination activities are substantial and this very impressive, particularly given that the numbers reported only refer to the first half of the project. Plans for the next period are very clear for both dissemination and exploitation.

Overall evaluation

Overall comment:

This is a very successful project so far. The progress report indicates that it is well on schedule and the overall quality of the teaching resources is high. They are ready for the testing phase. Most of the main products are in place. The partners have worked well together and the project has been very well managed so far. The structures in place for quality assurance are very robust. The project has already undertaken a lot of dissemination and this bodes well for the next stage. The project is well set up to produce high quality results, which have the potential to have significant impact once completed.

Strong points:

There are many strong points in this project: the quality of the teaching resources, the CLIL book, the website, the management, the range of dissemination activity and the partnership.

Weak points:

There are no evident weaknesses. Partners could look at whether they could improve the structure and quality of the pedagogical videos.

Is the public part, in your opinion, ready for publication on the Executive Agency's website? Please comment on aspects such as language and quality of content of the report	yes

The public report provides a clear description of the project, its rationale, the work undertaken so far and the further plans. It is well-written and has a comprehensive number of links to the different parts of both the project and the coordinating organisation's host website. This provides ready access to the resources that are already available. It is ready for publication.

Summary scoring sheet for Progress Report	
Criterion	**Score**
1 Objectives, results and products	9
2 Coherence between work plan and activities carried out during life of the project	9
3 Partnership	9
4 Project Management	9
5 Financial Management	8
6 Evaluation	8
7 Dissemination	10

Your global score is:	9 /10	90%

KEY TO THE SCORING SYSTEM

Score	Definition	Description of score
0	No evidence	Fails to include a minimum amount of evidence to enable the criterion to be evaluated
1 or 2	Very weak	Addresses the criterion but with significant and/or many weaknesses
3 or 4	Weak	Addresses the criterion but with weaknesses
5 or 6	Acceptable	Addresses the criterion sufficiently
7 or 8	Good	Addresses the criterion with some aspects of high quality
9 or 10	Very good	Addresses the criterion with all aspects of high quality
X	Not applicable	Activity of the criterion was not planned for the evaluated period of time