



Co-funded by
the European Union

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

External Evaluation Services for the ALMEX Project

Reference: RfP-ALMEX-EE-01

Project title: ALUMNI MANAGEMENT EXCELLENCE: BUILDING UNIVERSITY CAPACITY FOR SUSTAINABLE GRADUATE ENGAGEMENT

Programme: Erasmus+ Capacity Building in Higher Education

Grant Agreement No.: 101236357

Responsible beneficiary and contracting party: Ukrainian Catholic University

Responsible beneficiary for Task 2.3: UCU

1. Invitation to submit proposals

Ukrainian Catholic University invites qualified experts or legal entities to submit proposals for the provision of external evaluation services for the ALMEX project.

The assignment concerns the implementation of continuous external evaluation under Task 2.3 External Evaluation, as foreseen in the approved project documentation. The selected contractor shall provide an independent, evidence-based assessment of project implementation, performance, quality, and sustainability, and shall produce periodic review inputs and the final external evaluation report.

2. Contracting context

This assignment is foreseen in the approved ALMEX project as a subcontracted service under WP2, Task 2.3 External Evaluation.

The assignment is intended to provide objective and independent expert assessment of project implementation in a complex multi-partner environment involving several work packages, deliverables, institutions, and stakeholder groups.

The procedure shall be conducted in line with the principles of transparency, equal treatment, best value for money, and absence of conflict of interest.

3. Purpose of the assignment

The purpose of this assignment is to ensure independent and continuous external evaluation of the ALMEX project throughout its implementation period and to support project quality, learning, accountability, and sustainability.

The External Evaluator shall assess project implementation and results and provide practical recommendations that support timely improvement and informed decision-making.

4. Scope of the assignment

The selected contractor shall perform the following tasks.

4.1. Inception and operational setup

- Review the Grant Agreement, Annex I, approved application, relevant deliverables, governance documents, quality assurance documents, and the approved External Evaluation Framework.
- Prepare an Inception Note for the implementation of continuous external evaluation.
- Define the operational evaluation flow, evidence sources, reporting schedule, and review timing in line with the approved framework.
- Where needed, provide expert methodological comments and limited refinement proposals to support the effective operational application of the approved framework, without changing its ownership or approval structure.
- Apply the OECD DAC criteria, namely relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability.

4.2. Continuous external evaluation

- Monitor project implementation at agreed milestones.
- Review selected deliverables, milestones, activities, outputs, and supporting evidence.

- Assess implementation quality and consistency across relevant work packages.
- Examine performance in relation to objectives, target groups, expected results, dissemination, stakeholder engagement, and sustainability.
- Provide concise written feedback and practical recommendations at agreed intervals.
- Identify risks, gaps, delays, and possible corrective actions.

4.3. Final evaluation

- Prepare the Final External Evaluation Report.
- Assess the overall quality and performance of the project.
- Review long-term relevance, institutional value, expected continuation potential, and sustainability prospects.
- Formulate clear conclusions and recommendations for future use, institutionalisation, and scaling.

5. External Evaluation Framework

The selected contractor shall perform the assignment in line with the External Evaluation Framework developed within WP2 and approved by the consortium and the Quality Assurance Board.

The External Evaluation Framework is not part of the present call documentation and is not issued as an annex for bidders. It will be shared with the selected contractor at the start of the assignment.

Where justified, the selected contractor may provide limited methodological comments at inception stage to support the effective operational application of the approved framework. Such comments shall not alter the ownership, status, or approval structure of the Framework.

6. Key evaluation dimensions

The evaluation shall cover, as relevant:

- relevance to identified needs and project objectives;
- coherence and intervention logic;
- effectiveness of implementation and delivery of results;

- efficiency in the use of resources and project arrangements;
- quality of outputs and deliverables;
- stakeholder engagement and partnership performance;
- dissemination, outreach, and visibility;
- contribution to institutional development and capacity building;
- expected impact and sustainability.

7. Deliverables

The selected contractor shall produce at least the following deliverables, all in English.

Deliverable 1. Inception Note

The Inception Note shall include:

- understanding of the assignment;
- operational approach;
- use of the approved External Evaluation Framework;
- evidence sources;
- work plan and timeline;
- reporting schedule;
- arrangements for periodic reviews.

Deliverable 2. Periodic External Evaluation Notes

The selected contractor shall submit **at least three** short written review notes during project implementation.

For planning purposes, the notes are expected to be submitted around the following project stages:

- after Month 12;
- after Month 18;
- after Month 30.

If justified by project implementation needs, the exact timing may be refined at contract signature stage, provided that the minimum number of notes and the logic of continuous evaluation are preserved.

Each note shall include:

- brief assessment of progress;
- identified strengths and weaknesses;
- risks or concerns, if any;
- actionable recommendations.

Deliverable 3. Final External Evaluation Report

A consolidated final report in English, with an indicative length of about 60 pages, including:

- executive summary;
- methodology;
- findings by evaluation criterion;
- overall conclusions;
- recommendations;
- annexes, where relevant.

The final report shall be delivered in line with the project schedule for Deliverable D2.2.

8. Duration and indicative timeline

The contract is expected to cover the project implementation period relevant to Task 2.3 and shall remain active until completion of the assignment and acceptance of the final deliverables.

The exact timeline, milestone points, and submission dates shall be agreed at contract signature stage.

9. Working language

The working language of communication, meetings, written coordination, and reporting under this assignment shall be English.

10. Eligibility and required profile

Applicants may be individual experts or legal entities able to provide the requested service.

Applicants must demonstrate:

- an advanced university degree in education, public policy, social sciences, management, evaluation, or another relevant field;

- proven experience in external evaluation of international projects, preferably EU-funded projects;
- strong knowledge of higher education, institutional development, quality assurance, or alumni engagement related processes;
- demonstrated ability to apply structured evaluation methods and recognised evaluation criteria;
- excellent analytical and report-writing skills in English;
- full independence from the ALMEX consortium and absence of conflict of interest.

The following will be considered an asset:

- experience with Erasmus+ Capacity Building in Higher Education projects;
- experience in evaluating higher education cooperation projects;
- experience in alumni engagement systems, graduate relations, university governance, stakeholder engagement, or sustainability assessment.

11. Independence and conflict of interest

The contractor must be independent from the ALMEX consortium and must not have any actual, potential, or perceived conflict of interest in relation to this assignment.

The contractor shall not perform project coordination, internal management, or decision-making functions within the project.

12. Confidentiality and ethics

All project documents and information received within the framework of this assignment shall be treated as confidential and used only for the purposes of the assignment.

The contractor shall comply with high standards of professional ethics, impartiality, integrity, and professional discretion.

13. Type of contract

The selected applicant will be offered a **service agreement / consultancy contract** under the Responsible beneficiary and contracting party's applicable rules and procedures.

A draft contract may be shared during the procedure or after the award decision. The final contract shall define the binding terms of cooperation, including deliverables, acceptance procedure, timeline, payment conditions, confidentiality, and conflict of interest provisions.

14. Application package

Applicants shall submit a complete proposal package containing:

1. Technical Proposal in English, maximum 5 pages, including:

- understanding of the assignment;
- proposed methodology and approach;
- indicative work plan and timing;
- understanding of the deliverables;
- relevant risk considerations, if any.

2. CV of the proposed expert, or CVs of the proposed team members if the applicant is a legal entity.

3. Financial Offer in EUR, with a clear breakdown showing:

- estimated number of expert days;
- proposed daily rate;
- total price.

The total price shall include all costs related to the assignment, including taxes, fees, travel, communication, and any incidental costs, if applicable.

4. References for at least two comparable assignments.

5. Signed Declaration of Independence and Absence of Conflict of Interest.

15. Financial conditions

Applicants shall submit their best justified financial offer in EUR, based on the required scope, deliverables, and level of effort.

The financial offer shall be reasonable, proportionate to the scope of the assignment, and consistent with the principle of best value for money.

The Contracting Authority reserves the right to reject offers that are excessive in relation to the scope of the assignment and the available project resources.



16. Payment schedule

Payments shall be made in accordance with the conditions set out in the contract.

Unless otherwise agreed in the final contract, the indicative payment schedule is expected to follow this structure:

- **50%** upon contract signature and submission of the Inception Note by the agreed deadline;
- **50%** upon submission and acceptance of all remaining deliverables, including the Periodic External Evaluation Notes and the Final External Evaluation Report.

The final payment shall be subject to review and written confirmation by the Contracting Authority.

No advance payment is foreseen unless expressly agreed by the Contracting Authority in the final contract.

17. Award criteria

Proposals will be evaluated against the following criteria:

- **Delivery capability and quality of the proposal** – 50 points
- **Relevant experience and profile** – 30 points
- **Pricing** – 20 points

Applicants scoring below **70 points out of 100** shall not be considered for contract award.

17.1. Delivery capability and quality of proposal – 50 points

This criterion will assess:

- clarity of understanding of the assignment;
- relevance and quality of the proposed methodology;
- feasibility of the work plan;
- coherence of the proposed deliverables and reporting approach.

17.2. Relevant experience and profile – 30 points

This criterion will assess:

- experience in external evaluation;

- experience with EU-funded projects, preferably Erasmus+;
- experience in higher education, alumni engagement, quality assurance, or related institutional development fields;
- quality of analytical and reporting capacity.

17.3. Pricing – 20 points

This criterion will assess:

- reasonableness of the financial offer;
- clarity of the pricing structure;
- overall value for money.

18. Evaluation process

The proposals will be assessed by an Evaluation Committee appointed by the Contracting Authority, with appropriate consortium participation where relevant.

The Evaluation Committee shall be formed in a manner that ensures impartiality, professional competence, and absence of conflict of interest. Any committee member with an actual, potential, or perceived conflict of interest in relation to a given applicant shall not take part in the assessment of that applicant and, where necessary, shall be replaced or recused from the procedure.

The evaluation process shall include:

1. administrative completeness check;
2. eligibility check;
3. technical and financial evaluation;
4. scoring and ranking;
5. award recommendation.

The Contracting Authority may request clarification where needed. Any clarification shall not alter the substance of the proposal.

The Contracting Authority reserves the right to reject incomplete proposals, reject all proposals, or cancel the procedure where justified.

19. Submission of proposals



Co-funded by
the European Union



19. Submission of proposals

Proposals shall be submitted electronically in PDF format to:
almex@ucu.edu.ua, with a copy to: pasko@ucu.edu.ua

Deadline for submission: 6 July 2025, 23:59 (Kyiv time, EEST / UTC+3)

Subject line: **Proposal – External Evaluator – ALMEX**

Late submissions will not be considered.

20. Requests for clarification

Questions regarding this Request for Proposals may be submitted to:
almex@ucu.edu.ua, with a copy to: pasko@ucu.edu.ua

Deadline for questions: 27 June 2025, 23:59 (Kyiv time, EEST / UTC+3)

Responses to questions of general relevance will be shared with all registered applicants to ensure equal treatment.

21. Annexes

The following documents are attached to this call:

- **Annex 1. Terms of Reference**
- **Annex 2. Financial Offer Form**
- **Annex 3. Declaration of Honour**
- **Annex 4. Evaluation Grid**



Annex 1. Terms of Reference

RfP-ALMEX-EE-01 | External Evaluation Services | External Evaluator

Project title	Alumni Management Excellence: Building University Capacity for Sustainable Graduate Engagement
Project acronym	ALMEX
Programme	Erasmus+ Capacity Building in Higher Education
Grant Agreement No.	101236357
Task	2.3 External Evaluation
Work Package	WP2 Quality Assurance & Evaluation Mechanisms
Responsible beneficiary	Ukrainian Catholic University (UCU)
Type of assignment	Subcontracted service
Indicative maximum budget	EUR 8,000 (all costs inclusive)
Working language	English

1. Background

ALMEX is an Erasmus+ Capacity Building in Higher Education project aimed at strengthening alumni engagement systems, services, practices, and institutional capacity in partner higher education institutions.

External evaluation is foreseen as a dedicated project task and shall provide an independent, evidence-based assessment of project implementation, quality, performance, results, and sustainability. The assignment shall support project learning, timely improvement, accountability, and stronger long-term value.

2. Purpose of the assignment

The purpose of this assignment is to ensure independent and continuous external evaluation of the ALMEX project throughout its implementation period and to produce the final external evaluation report in line with the approved project work plan.

The External Evaluator shall assess the project against recognised evaluation principles and provide practical recommendations for improvement, quality enhancement, and sustainability.

3. Scope of work



The External Evaluator shall perform the following tasks.

3.1. Inception and operational setup

- Review the Grant Agreement, Annex I, approved application, relevant deliverables, governance documents, Quality Assurance documents, and the approved External Evaluation Framework.
- Prepare an Inception Note describing the operational approach for the implementation of continuous external evaluation.
- Define the practical evaluation flow, evidence sources, reporting schedule, and review timing in line with the approved framework.
- Where needed, provide expert methodological comments and limited refinement proposals to support the effective application of the approved External Evaluation Framework, without altering its ownership or approval structure.
- Apply the OECD DAC criteria, namely relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability.
- Ensure that the evaluation approach reflects the principles of independence, transparency, ethical conduct, and evidence-based judgement.

3.2. Continuous external evaluation

- Monitor project implementation at agreed milestones during the project period.
- Review selected deliverables, milestones, activities, outputs, and supporting evidence.
- Assess the quality and consistency of implementation across relevant work packages.
- Examine project performance in relation to objectives, target groups, expected results, dissemination, stakeholder engagement, and sustainability.
- Provide concise written feedback and practical recommendations at agreed intervals.

- Identify risks, weaknesses, delays, gaps, and possible corrective actions where relevant.

3.3. Final evaluation

- Prepare the Final External Evaluation Report.
- Assess the overall quality and performance of the project.
- Review long-term relevance, institutional value, expected continuation potential, and sustainability prospects.
- Formulate clear conclusions and recommendations for future use, scaling, and institutionalisation.

4. Key evaluation dimensions

The evaluation shall cover, as relevant:

- project relevance to identified needs and objectives;
- internal coherence and intervention logic;
- effectiveness of implementation and delivery of results;
- efficiency in the use of resources and project arrangements;
- quality of deliverables and outputs;
- stakeholder engagement and partnership performance;
- dissemination, outreach, and visibility measures;
- contribution to institutional development and capacity building;
- expected impact and sustainability.

5. Deliverables

The External Evaluator shall produce at least the following deliverables, all in English.

Deliverable 1. Inception Note for the Implementation of Continuous External Evaluation

This document shall include:

- understanding of the assignment;
- operational approach for conducting the evaluation;
- use of the approved External Evaluation Framework;
- evidence sources;

- work plan and timeline;
- reporting schedule;
- practical arrangements for periodic review.

Deliverable 2. Periodic External Evaluation Notes

The External Evaluator shall submit at least three short written review notes during project implementation, linked to agreed project milestones. Each note shall include:

- brief assessment of progress;
- identified strengths and weaknesses;
- risks or concerns, if any;
- actionable recommendations.

The exact submission points shall be agreed at contract signature stage and reflected in the approved work plan.

Deliverable 3. Final External Evaluation Report

A consolidated final report in English, with an indicative length of about 60 pages. The report shall include:

- executive summary;
- methodology;
- findings by evaluation criterion;
- overall conclusions;
- recommendations;
- annexes, where needed.

6. Timing

The assignment shall cover the project implementation period in line with Task 2.3 and shall be completed before project closure.

The indicative timeline, including the submission schedule for the Inception Note, Periodic External Evaluation Notes, and the Final External Evaluation Report, shall be agreed at contract signature stage.

The Final External Evaluation Report shall be submitted in line with the project schedule for Deliverable D2.2.



7. Reporting, coordination, and working language

The External Evaluator shall report to the responsible beneficiary, Ukrainian Catholic University, and shall coordinate, where needed, with the project coordinator and relevant project bodies for access to documents, evidence, and clarification of context.

The working language of communication, meetings, written coordination, and reporting under this assignment shall be English.

The External Evaluator shall remain fully independent in professional judgement, findings, and conclusions.

8. Required profile

The applicant must meet the following minimum requirements:

- advanced university degree in education, public policy, social sciences, management, evaluation, or another relevant field;
- proven experience in external evaluation of international projects, preferably EU-funded projects;
- strong knowledge of higher education reform, institutional development, quality assurance, or alumni engagement related processes;
- demonstrated ability to apply structured evaluation methods and recognised evaluation criteria;
- excellent analytical and report-writing skills in English;
- no conflict of interest in relation to the ALMEX consortium or project implementation.

The following will be considered an asset:

- experience with Erasmus+ CBHE projects;
- experience in evaluating higher education cooperation projects;
- experience in institutional development, stakeholder engagement, or sustainability assessment.

9. Independence and conflict of interest

The External Evaluator must be independent from the ALMEX consortium and must not have any actual, potential, or perceived conflict of interest in relation to this assignment.

The External Evaluator shall not perform project coordination, internal management, or decision-making functions within the project.

10. Confidentiality and ethics

All project documents and information received within the framework of this assignment shall be treated as confidential and used only for the purposes of the assignment.

The External Evaluator shall comply with high standards of professional ethics, impartiality, integrity, and professional discretion.

11. Financial offer

The applicant shall submit a financial offer in EUR within the maximum available budget of EUR 8,000.

To ensure comparability of offers, the financial proposal shall include a clear breakdown showing:

- estimated number of expert days;
- proposed daily rate;
- total price.

The total price shall include all costs related to the assignment, including taxes, fees, travel, communication, and any other incidental costs, if applicable.

12. Selection principles

Selection shall be based on:

- delivery capability and quality of the technical proposal;
- relevant experience and profile;
- financial offer and overall value for money.

The detailed application procedure, submission requirements, deadline, and evaluation process shall be defined in the corresponding Request for Proposals issued by the Contracting Authority.



Annex 2. Financial Offer Form

RfP-ALMEX-EE-01 | External Evaluation Services

Project	ALMEX – Alumni Management Excellence
Grant Agreement No.	101236357
Programme	Erasmus+ Capacity Building in Higher Education
Contracting Authority	Ukrainian Catholic University
Reference	RfP-ALMEX-EE-01

Applicant details

Full name / organisation name	
Address	
Contact person	
Email address	
Phone number	
VAT / Tax number (if applicable)	

Financial breakdown

Please complete all fields. The total price must include all costs related to the assignment, including taxes, fees, travel, communication, and any incidental costs.

No.	Task / Deliverable	Estimated Expert Days	Daily Rate (EUR)	Sub-total (EUR)	Notes
1	Inception and operational setup (review of documents, Inception Note)				
2	Continuous evaluation – Review Point 1 (approx. Month 12) (document review, Periodic Note 1)				
3	Continuous evaluation – Review Point 2 (approx. Month 18) (document review, Periodic Note 2)				
4	Continuous evaluation – Review Point 3 (approx. Month 30)				



No.	Task / Deliverable	Estimated Expert Days	Daily Rate (EUR)	Sub-total (EUR)	Notes
	(document review, Periodic Note 3)				
5	Final evaluation (Final External Evaluation Report)				
6	Coordination, communication, revisions (throughout the project period)				
TOTAL PRICE (EUR, VAT included):					

Notes and clarifications

Please provide any clarifications regarding your offer, assumptions, or cost breakdown (optional):

Declaration

By submitting this Financial Offer Form, I/we confirm that:

1. the price offered is valid for a period of at least 60 days from the submission deadline;
2. the offer covers the full scope of the assignment as described in the RfP and Terms of Reference;
3. I/we have read and understood the terms and conditions of this call.

Name and surname:

Signature:

Position / Title:

Official stamp (if applicable):

Date:



Annex 3. Declaration of Honour

Independence and Absence of Conflict of Interest | RfP-ALMEX-EE-01

Project	ALMEX – Alumni Management Excellence
Grant Agreement No.	101236357
Programme	Erasmus+ Capacity Building in Higher Education
Contracting Authority	Ukrainian Catholic University
Reference	RfP-ALMEX-EE-01

Applicant / Lead Evaluator details

Full name	
Organisation / affiliation (if applicable)	
Country of residence	
Contact email	

Declaration

I, the undersigned, hereby declare that:

1. I am fully independent from all organisations participating in the ALMEX consortium, including Ukrainian Catholic University (UCU) and all partner institutions, and I have no employment, contractual, financial, or personal relationship with any of them that could affect my professional judgement.
2. I have no direct or indirect financial interest in the ALMEX project or in the outcome of this selection procedure.
3. I have not participated in the design, preparation, implementation, or management of the ALMEX project in any capacity.
4. I am not aware of any actual, potential, or perceived conflict of interest that could compromise my independence or impartiality in carrying out this assignment.
5. If selected, I will not perform any project coordination, internal management, or decision-making functions within the ALMEX project.
6. I will treat all project documents and information provided to me in the course of this assignment as strictly confidential and will use them solely for the purposes of the external evaluation.
7. I will comply with high standards of professional ethics, integrity, impartiality, and professional discretion throughout the assignment.
8. I will notify the Contracting Authority without delay if, at any point during the assignment, a conflict of interest arises or becomes apparent.



I understand that any false declaration or concealment of a conflict of interest may result in the disqualification of my proposal or, if already contracted, in the termination of the contract and, where applicable, referral to competent authorities.

Full name:

Signature:

Organisation (if applicable):

Place and date:

Note: This declaration must be signed by the Lead Evaluator. Where the applicant is a legal entity, the declaration must also be signed by the authorised representative of that entity.



Annex 4. Evaluation Grid

RfP-ALMEX-EE-01 | External Evaluation Services | For internal use of the Evaluation Committee only

Project	ALMEX – Alumni Management Excellence
Grant Agreement No.	101236357
Reference	RfP-ALMEX-EE-01
Contracting Authority	Ukrainian Catholic University
For internal use by	Evaluation Committee — not to be shared with applicants

Assessor details

Applicant being assessed	
Name of committee member	
Date of assessment	

Scoring instructions

Each committee member shall complete a separate Evaluation Grid for each proposal assessed. Scores shall be awarded independently, without discussion with other committee members prior to completing this form.

Scoring scale:

Score range	Rating	What it means	Assessor action
90–100% of max	Excellent	Fully meets and substantially exceeds all requirements. Evidence is strong, specific, and directly relevant.	Award maximum or near-maximum score. No reservations.
70–89% of max	Good	Meets requirements with minor gaps or areas for improvement. Evidence is adequate and relevant.	Recommend. Note any gaps in comments.
50–69% of max	Adequate	Partially meets requirements. Some relevant evidence but gaps are notable.	Flag concerns. Award only if overall score exceeds minimum threshold.
< 50% of max	Weak / Insufficient	Does not adequately meet requirements. Evidence is absent, vague, or irrelevant.	Do not recommend. Record specific deficiencies.

Minimum thresholds: • Section A (Technical quality): minimum 35 out of 50 points required. • Total score: minimum 70 out of 100 points required. Proposals failing to meet either threshold shall not be considered for contract award, regardless of their score on other criteria.



Pricing assessment (Section C): Scores for C.1 shall reflect both the absolute value of the offer relative to the indicative maximum budget (EUR 8,000) and the proportionality of costs to the scope of the assignment. Unusually low offers that raise doubts about deliverability shall be scored down, not up. The Evaluation Committee may request clarification on pricing before finalising scores.

Evaluation grid

Sub-criterion	Anchor descriptors (score → what it looks like)	Score	Justification / comments										
A. Delivery Capability and Quality of Proposal		Max: 50	Score & Comments										
A.1 Clarity of understanding of the assignment Max: 15 points	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Score</th> <th>Anchor descriptor</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>13–15</td> <td>Demonstrates thorough and accurate understanding of the ALMEX context, the role of external evaluation, and the distinction between internal QA and external evaluation.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8–12</td> <td>Demonstrates solid understanding with minor gaps or general statements not fully tailored to the project.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4–7</td> <td>Understanding is partial; proposal is generic or misses key aspects of the assignment.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0–3</td> <td>Little or no evidence of understanding of the assignment or project context.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Score	Anchor descriptor	13–15	Demonstrates thorough and accurate understanding of the ALMEX context, the role of external evaluation, and the distinction between internal QA and external evaluation.	8–12	Demonstrates solid understanding with minor gaps or general statements not fully tailored to the project.	4–7	Understanding is partial; proposal is generic or misses key aspects of the assignment.	0–3	Little or no evidence of understanding of the assignment or project context.	_ / 15	
	Score	Anchor descriptor											
	13–15	Demonstrates thorough and accurate understanding of the ALMEX context, the role of external evaluation, and the distinction between internal QA and external evaluation.											
	8–12	Demonstrates solid understanding with minor gaps or general statements not fully tailored to the project.											
	4–7	Understanding is partial; proposal is generic or misses key aspects of the assignment.											
0–3	Little or no evidence of understanding of the assignment or project context.												
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Score</th> <th>Anchor descriptor</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>13–15</td> <td>Methodology explicitly references OECD DAC criteria, is well-adapted to a multi-partner Erasmus+ CBHE context, and proposes proportionate evidence-based methods. Innovation or added value noted.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8–12</td> <td>Methodology is appropriate and references relevant criteria, with minor gaps in adaptation to the specific context.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4–7</td> <td>Methodology is generic, borrowed from unrelated contexts, or insufficiently grounded in recognised evaluation frameworks.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0–3</td> <td>Methodology is absent, unclear, or not fit for purpose.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Score	Anchor descriptor	13–15	Methodology explicitly references OECD DAC criteria, is well-adapted to a multi-partner Erasmus+ CBHE context, and proposes proportionate evidence-based methods. Innovation or added value noted.	8–12	Methodology is appropriate and references relevant criteria, with minor gaps in adaptation to the specific context.	4–7	Methodology is generic, borrowed from unrelated contexts, or insufficiently grounded in recognised evaluation frameworks.	0–3	Methodology is absent, unclear, or not fit for purpose.	_ / 15		
Score	Anchor descriptor												
13–15	Methodology explicitly references OECD DAC criteria, is well-adapted to a multi-partner Erasmus+ CBHE context, and proposes proportionate evidence-based methods. Innovation or added value noted.												
8–12	Methodology is appropriate and references relevant criteria, with minor gaps in adaptation to the specific context.												
4–7	Methodology is generic, borrowed from unrelated contexts, or insufficiently grounded in recognised evaluation frameworks.												
0–3	Methodology is absent, unclear, or not fit for purpose.												
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Score</th> <th>Anchor descriptor</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>9–10</td> <td>Work plan is detailed, realistic, and clearly aligned with project milestones (M12, M18, M30, M36). Risks and contingencies are addressed.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6–8</td> <td>Work plan is generally feasible with minor gaps in detail or milestone alignment.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3–5</td> <td>Work plan is vague, overly optimistic, or poorly aligned with project timeline.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0–2</td> <td>Work plan is absent or unrealistic.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Score	Anchor descriptor	9–10	Work plan is detailed, realistic, and clearly aligned with project milestones (M12, M18, M30, M36). Risks and contingencies are addressed.	6–8	Work plan is generally feasible with minor gaps in detail or milestone alignment.	3–5	Work plan is vague, overly optimistic, or poorly aligned with project timeline.	0–2	Work plan is absent or unrealistic.	_ / 10		
Score	Anchor descriptor												
9–10	Work plan is detailed, realistic, and clearly aligned with project milestones (M12, M18, M30, M36). Risks and contingencies are addressed.												
6–8	Work plan is generally feasible with minor gaps in detail or milestone alignment.												
3–5	Work plan is vague, overly optimistic, or poorly aligned with project timeline.												
0–2	Work plan is absent or unrealistic.												
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Score</th> <th>Anchor descriptor</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>9–10</td> <td>Deliverables are clearly described, match RfP and ToR requirements precisely, and demonstrate understanding of their purpose and interconnection.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6–8</td> <td>Deliverables are adequately described with minor omissions or imprecisions.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3–5</td> <td>Description of deliverables is incomplete or partially inconsistent with RfP requirements.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0–2</td> <td>Deliverables are not addressed or fundamentally misunderstood.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Score	Anchor descriptor	9–10	Deliverables are clearly described, match RfP and ToR requirements precisely, and demonstrate understanding of their purpose and interconnection.	6–8	Deliverables are adequately described with minor omissions or imprecisions.	3–5	Description of deliverables is incomplete or partially inconsistent with RfP requirements.	0–2	Deliverables are not addressed or fundamentally misunderstood.	_ / 10		
Score	Anchor descriptor												
9–10	Deliverables are clearly described, match RfP and ToR requirements precisely, and demonstrate understanding of their purpose and interconnection.												
6–8	Deliverables are adequately described with minor omissions or imprecisions.												
3–5	Description of deliverables is incomplete or partially inconsistent with RfP requirements.												
0–2	Deliverables are not addressed or fundamentally misunderstood.												
Section A subtotal:		_ / 50											



Sub-criterion	Anchor descriptors (score → what it looks like)	Score	Justification / comments
B. Relevant Experience and Profile		Max: 30	Score & Comments
B.1 Experience in external evaluation of EU-funded or international projects Max: 12 points	Score	Anchor descriptor	— / 12
	11–12	At least two completed, directly comparable evaluation assignments of EU-funded or international projects demonstrated with specific evidence (client, period, outputs).	
	7–10	Relevant experience demonstrated but assignments are partially comparable or evidence is limited.	
	3–6	Some evaluation experience but not clearly international or EU-funded, or insufficient detail provided.	
	0–2	No relevant evaluation experience demonstrated.	
B.2 Experience with Erasmus+ CBHE or higher education cooperation projects Max: 8 points	Score	Anchor descriptor	— / 8
	7–8	Direct Erasmus+ CBHE experience demonstrated, or substantial experience in comparable higher education cooperation projects with clear institutional development focus.	
	4–6	Experience in higher education or related international cooperation, but not specifically CBHE or equivalent.	
	1–3	Indirect or peripheral experience in higher education contexts.	
	0	No relevant higher education experience.	
B.3 Thematic knowledge (higher education, alumni engagement, institutional development, QA) Max: 10 points	Score	Anchor descriptor	— / 10
	9–10	Clear, specific knowledge of alumni engagement, institutional development, quality assurance, or related processes demonstrated through experience or publications.	
	5–8	Adequate knowledge demonstrated but less specific or evidenced.	
	1–4	General familiarity claimed but not substantiated.	
	0	No relevant thematic knowledge demonstrated.	
Section B subtotal:		— / 30	
C. Financial Offer and Value for Money		Max: 20	Score & Comments
C.1 Reasonableness and proportionality of the financial offer Max: 18 points	Score	Anchor descriptor	— / 18
	16–18	Offer is well within the indicative budget of EUR 8,000, clearly justified by scope, and competitive relative to the deliverables required.	
	10–15	Offer is within budget and generally proportionate, with minor concerns about justification or scope coverage.	
	5–9	Offer raises concerns: either approaching the budget ceiling without clear justification, or suspiciously low suggesting under-scoping.	
	0–4	Offer exceeds the maximum budget or is so low as to raise serious doubts about deliverability.	
C.2 Clarity and transparency of the pricing structure Max: 12 points	Score	Anchor descriptor	— / 12
	10–12	Breakdown is detailed and transparent: expert days per task, daily rate, and sub-totals clearly stated. All cost categories addressed.	
	6–9	Breakdown is generally clear with minor gaps or rounding issues.	
	2–5	Breakdown is incomplete, inconsistent, or difficult to verify.	
	0–1	No meaningful breakdown provided.	



Sub-criterion	Anchor descriptors (score → what it looks like)	Score	Justification / comments
		Section C subtotal:	__ / 30
		TOTAL SCORE:	__ / 100

Threshold check

Threshold	Required	Achieved
Section A minimum (technical quality)	≥ 35 / 50	__ / 50 <input type="checkbox"/> Pass <input type="checkbox"/> Fail
Total score minimum	≥ 70 / 100	__ / 100 <input type="checkbox"/> Pass <input type="checkbox"/> Fail
Overall eligibility for contract award	<input type="checkbox"/> ELIGIBLE	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT ELIGIBLE

Overall assessment and recommendation

Summary of key strengths:
Key concerns or risks:
Recommendation: <input type="checkbox"/> RECOMMEND FOR CONTRACT AWARD <input type="checkbox"/> DO NOT RECOMMEND

Name of committee member:

Signature:

Date:

This grid is for the exclusive internal use of the Evaluation Committee. It shall not be shared with applicants at any stage of the procedure. Committee members must complete this form independently before any collective deliberation takes place.