

Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency

Erasmus+: Higher Education - Knowledge Alliances, Bologna Support, Jean Monnet

Brussels, 27/07/2016 EACEA/A2/UHB/EG

Prof. Gianmaria Palmieri, UNIVERSITA DEGLI STUDI DEL MOLISE Via De Sanctis Ioc. Vazzieri IT - 86100-CAMPOBASSO Italia

rettore@unimol.it

cc: relazint@unimol.it

## Subject: Erasmus+ Programme – Jean Monnet "Modules, Chairs and Centres of Excellence"- Rejection Call for proposals 2016 – EAC/A04/2015

## Reference:575092-EPP-1-2016-1-IT-EPPJMO-CHAIRProject Title:"The future of European Integration: EU Economic and Financial<br/>Governance in a Global Economy"

Dear Applicant,

You have submitted an application to the Erasmus+ Programme – "Jean Monnet Modules, Chairs and Centres of Excellence", 2016 call for proposals for the action specified above. The call for proposals closed on 25/02/2016. The Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA) received 737 applications for this action.

I am writing to inform you about the selection decision taken by the Head of Department of the Agency, acting in her capacity as authorising officer, based on the recommendations of an Evaluation Committee assisted by external experts.

I regret to inform you that your application has not been selected for EU co-funding.

It received 83/100 points however given the available budget only applications with a score of 86/100 points and above could be selected for funding.

For your information, out of the 737 applications 147 have been selected for funding for this action. (A further 44 applications have been selected with additional funds allocated to countries outside the European Union identified as priority targets for the EU external action.)

The list of all selected projects will be published on the website of the Executive Agency when all applicants have been notified about the selection results (<u>http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus-plus/selection-results\_en</u>).

Attached to this letter you will find an evaluation report based on the opinion of the external experts. Please take into account that most of the evaluation reports were written by non-native speakers. The Executive Agency will not elaborate further on these assessments.

I thank you for the interest you have shown in the programme and the time and effort you have invested in preparing your application. This decision is in no way a negative reflection on the value and importance of your project.

For information on future Calls for proposals under the Erasmus+ Programme – Jean Monnet Activities, please refer to the web page <u>http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus-plus/actions/jean-monnet\_en</u>.

Yours sincerely,

Jally - The

Ute HALLER-BLOCK, Head of Unit

Contact: If you wish more information, please do not hesitate to contact us at <u>EACEA-AJM@ec.europa.eu</u>

cc: Dott. Loredana Di Rubbo

Annex 1: Evaluation Report

## Information on legal remedies

If you believe that you have been adversely affected by an error or irregularity committed as part of the selection procedure, you may request a review of the Agency's decision, clearly stating the reasons for disagreement, preferably within one month of receiving this letter, by writing to the following address:

EACEA

Director

<u>Brian.HOLMES@ec.europa.eu</u>

Office BOU2 03/13

Avenue du Bourget, 1

B - 1049 Brussels

You will find information on other means of redress under the following link: https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/about-eacea/legal-remedies-0\_en

Please note that any request you make and any reply from the Agency will not have the purpose or the effect of suspending the time-limit for launching other means of redress.

Should you experience problems accessing the link, please contact the Agency<u>at EACEA-REDRESS@ec.europa.eu</u>



Erasmus+ Programme Evaluation Report

Proposal number:	575092-EPP-1-2016-1-IT-EPPJMO-CHAIR
Proposal title:	The future of European Integration: EU Economic and Financial Governance in a Global Economy
Coordinator: Applicant organisation:	Loredana Di Rubbo UNIVERSITA DEGLI STUDI DEL MOLISE
Applicant organisation:	UNIVERSITA DEGLI STUDI DEL MOLISE

Award Criteria	Score	Max		
RELEVANCE OF THE PROJECT	22	25		
The proposal focuses on a specific angle which is at the top of the agenda for policy-makers and lawyers alike. Its activities target not only students but also officials and the wider public. There is a strong regional dimension in the light of a cooperation arrangement between the host institution and local authorities. An interesting feature of the project is that the applicant has already obtained the agreement of the region to open the teaching activities to the region's civil servants. This dimension suggests that the proposal would provide added value. The proposal aims to enhance EU law teaching which, at the moment, is somewhat basic in its scope at the applicant institution. The methodology is not fully explained, and this especially relates to the teaching activity. According to the proposal, all the activities will be multidisciplinary. 54 out of the 90 teaching hours will be new in the university curricula. Very distinguished professors will be invited to the events to be organized. All in all, the proposal meets the specific objectives of the action and is relevant to the programme as a whole.				
QUALITY OF THE PROJECT DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION	20	25		
The work programme is extremely well explained and detailed. The work plan is feasible, and is composed of 2 courses (one of them existing but extended by 9 hours), 4 deliverables, and 2 events. The design of the two teaching activities suggests that the proposal would bring added value: the core compulsory module is expanded and is accompanied by a new compulsory module focused on economic governance. Teaching courses will benefit students of the 8 faculties of the University of Molise, civil servants, professors, teachers, society at large. This is a good practice, although it is difficult to see how students of, for example, Medicine, Engineering or Surgery would be able to follow a master course about EU economic and financial governance side-by-side with students of the main target group, namely, master students of Political Science who have already followed the compulsory undergraduate course on EU Law. Syllabi have been included. The products are a unidirectional website, publicity materials and 2 books with open access whose tables of contents have not been provided. According to the proposal, privacy problems prevent the attachment of the table of contents of one of the books, but this undermines the possibility to assess whether it is sufficiently focused on Europe and whether the contents are consistent. One of the volumes will be a collective book but the names of invited authors have not been disclosed. Publishing houses are unknown for both. Despite the claim raised that the proposal will promote excellence in research, no research activity has been forecasted. This contradicts what it is said in the eForm, namely, that with the EU co-financing, and with the help of the Campobasso province, research on EU subjects will be promoted in 37 schools. This is, potentially, an original and very useful component of the proposal. It is not, however, clear from the proposal. The proposal incudes a series of lectures and the organization of a conference in the final year of the award. Both are well thought o				

Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency Avenue du Bourget 1 – 1049 Brussels - Belgium

the former is more extensive than that of the final conference.				
QUALITY OF THE PROJECT TEAM	21	25		
The proposal contains the CV, teaching experiences and selected publications of the prospective Chair				
holder. It contains the names of 4 administrative staff but their profiles are not disclosed. The applicant				
is a senior professor of Economics with an interesting background of international fellowships and				
studies abroad. The section of the proposal that should deal with the aims of the organization (key				
activities, affiliations, size) does not explain this question but, instead, the applicant's profile. The long				
CV is attached but its format is strange and this makes it difficult to read the scholar's qualifications,				
although his profile is centred in European studies. International publications in different languages				
are included. The applicant has taught and written in the areas covered by the proposal. His background				
suggests that he is qualified to carry out the activities set out in the proposal.				
IMPACT AND DISSEMINATION	20	25		
Impacts are explained. The proposal would produce impact on a range of audiences. The impact on				
research is the only one that is not clearly perceivable from the work plan. The dissemination plan is				
correct but not ambitious. It is mainly based in the deliverables and events and also in the word-of-				
mouth from people attending the JM activities, which is not a very proactive mechanism.				
Considerations has been given to monitoring the quality of the activities carried out under the aegis of				
the Chair. Quality control measures are standard.				
		1		
Total	83	100		