

Sirje Kree
Tartu Linnavalitsus
Raekoda
Tartu 50089

05.07.2016
WD reg-nr: 36.3-2/3727/2016

Erasmus+ programmi strateegilise koostöö projektid
Taotlus nr **2016-1-EE01-KA204-017337**

Lugupeetud Piret Väljaots,

Sihtasutus Archimedes on tuginedes ekspertide poolt taotlusele antud hinnangutele ja Erasmus+ programmi valikukomisjoni ettepanekule otsustanud jätta rahuldamata Teie asutuse taotluse „**Staff Training at Children Hospice Care**” (valikukomisjoni protokoll nr 36.3-1/490; SA juhatuse käskkiri nr 1-5/234/2016).

Tähtajaks laekus 8 taotlust, millest piiratud eelarve tõttu toetati 3. Teie taotlus jäi punktisummaga 19,5 pingereas 8. kohale.

Projekti mitterahastamise peamiseks põhjuseks oli taotluse madal kvaliteet. Ekspertide kommentaarid ja soovitusel taotluse parendamiseks on toodud ära kirja lisas.

Projekti kontaktisikuks on Teie asutuses vastavalt taotlusele Piret Väljaots (piret.valjaots@raad.tartu.ee) ja sihtasutuses Archimedes Hannelore Juhtsalu (hannelore.juhtsalu@archimedes.ee).

Tuletame meelde, et Teie taotluse number on **2016-1-EE01-KA204-017337** ning me palume Teil seda kasutada kõigis taotlusega seotud kirjades ja dokumentides.

Erasmus+ programmi menetlusotsuse vaidlustamine ning vaidemenetlus toimub haldusmenetluse seaduses sätestatud korras.

Parimate soovidega,

Made Kirtsi
Üld-, kutse- ja täiskasvanuhariduse büroo juhataja

/allkirjastatud digitaalselt/

Lisa: Hindajate tagasiside taotlejale

Lisa: Tagasiside taotlejale Tartu Linnavalitsus
 Taotlus number 2016-1-EE01-KA204-017337

FINAL SCORE (max 100 points):	19,5
Overall comments to applicant:	
<p>This project is not relevant according to Erasmus+ programme priorities, as the “end-users” of this project are children and target-group are specialists (medical and social workers) and the project supports their professional development. Project does not address adult educators nor trainers of adult educators. Project does not address strategical cooperation, nothing had been created. Proposal describes merely the exchange of experiences including study visits only for Estonian partner members.</p> <p>Project is focusing on vocational training/job shadowing of few people from Estonia and hold no wider goal nor impact. Project preparation and management description is vague and not clear. The role of each partner is described weakly or not at all. Description of dissemination activities is not clear, it's not possible to understand how the results will be disseminated. Impact limits only to Estonian partners, dissemination plan is not reasonable. Project impact is limited to only Estonian partners and wider impact is missing.</p>	

Relevance of the project (max 30 points)	4,5
<p>Project relevance to policy priorities is weakly explained, there are no concrete connections between the choice of priorities and selected priorities (section C). Project aim is vaguely described and is not based on thorough analysis. Project focuses on potential adult learners in only one city (Tartu), the focus of adult learners is also very specific involving only few people from Estonia. Project is focusing on vocational training/job shadowing of few people from Estonia and hold no wider goal nor impact.</p> <p>The idea of this project is not targeting the KA2 priorities - the project aims to offer the in-service training for very direct target-group (socialworkers and healthcare specialists), indirect target group of the project is children hence the project should not be submitted under Erasmus+ Adult Education programme.</p>	
Quality of the project design and implementation (max 20 points)	5
<p>Proposal foresees the trainings only to Estonian partners and three short-term joint staff trainings all in total 8 participants from Estonia. Project preparation and management description is vague and not clear. It's not clear how this project beneficiates from transnational activities, not if the international cooperation is necessary for this project. It is unclear in the budget why Tartu Linnavalitsus as the coordinator is attending 5 transnational meetings as 2 meetings are described and a final meeting in Tartu.</p> <p>This is not a strategical partnership project - nothing is created; exchange of best practices includes only Estonian partner and the activities carried out are study visits.</p>	

Quality of the project team and the cooperation arrangements (max 20 points)	5
<p>Leading partners competencies of partners and it's relations to project aim is not identified (partner D.1), Partner D.2 has the competencies complementing the project. D.3 has experience in childcare, as well as partner D. 4 and D.5. Although, the role of each partner is described weakly or not at all.</p> <p>Three partners of five are from Estonia. Key persons skills/expertise has not been described thus it is difficult to see the appropriateness of the project team. The exchange of practices is meant only for Estonian partners, the division of roles between partners is not balanced.</p>	
Impact and dissemination (max 30 points)	5
<p>Description of dissemination activities is not clear, it's not possible to understand how the results will be disseminated. Impact limits only to Estonian partners, dissemination plan is not reasonable. Project impact is limited to only Estonian partners and wider impact is missing.</p>	