

Appendix B – Erasmus+ Midterm Evaluation

Overview of standard evaluation questions, Denmark



CONTENTS

Appendix B – Erasmus+ Midterm Evaluation

1	Overview of standard evaluation questions	4
1.1	Effectiveness	4
1.2	Efficiency	6
1.3	Relevance	7
1.4	Coherence	7

1 Overview of standard evaluation questions

The used data sources are noted in a parenthesis at the end of each question.

1.1 Effectiveness

Q1: To what extent have the various programme fields both within Erasmus+ 2021-2027 and Erasmus+ 2014-2020 delivered the expected outputs, results and impacts in your country? What negative and positive factors seem to be influencing outputs, results and impacts? Do you consider that certain actions are more effective than others? Are there differences across fields? What are the determining factors for making these actions of the programme more effective? (survey, interviews)

Q2: What are the results and long-term impact of Erasmus+ 2014-2020 in your country? We are interested in the impact of all actions/elements of Erasmus+ 2014-2020, and with special attention to those actions/elements that are continued in Erasmus+ 2021-2027. We are also interested in the impact of actions/elements that have been discontinued to the extent that it might help design the future programme. What is your assessment of the quality of applications received in your country, and what measures could be taken to improve the quality of applications and awarded projects in your country taking into account the doubling of budget for the 2021-2027 programme cycle? (self-evaluation)

Q3: Please identify, describe and quantify (if possible) the spill-over effects between various actions (clusters of actions) of Erasmus+ 2021-2027 in your country, as described in the intervention logic. (self-evaluation)

Q4: To what extent has Erasmus+ 2021-2027 had a transformative effect in your country on systems, values and norms, in particular with respect to the four horizontal priorities of the programme: inclusion and diversity – digital transformation – green transition (environment and fight against climate change) – participation in democratic life and civic engagement? Could you identify the horizontal priorities the programme had the highest impact on through its actions? (survey, interviews)

Q5: What are the differences in impact of Erasmus+ 2021-2027 actions in your country on hard-to-reach groups, people with fewer opportunities or specific disadvantaged groups of the population

who traditionally do not engage in transnational or international activities as compared to other groups that benefit from the programme? We are interested in the evaluation of the first effects of the Framework of Inclusion Measures and of the Inclusion and Diversity Strategy on promoting accessibility to funding for a wider range of organisations, and to better reach out to more participants with fewer opportunities. **(survey, interviews)**

Q6: To what extent do the actions/activities/projects supported by Erasmus+ 2021-2027 contribute to mainstreaming climate and environment actions and to achieving the climate and environment objectives, including those intended to reduce the environmental impact of the programme, in your country? **(survey, interviews)**

Q7: To what extent have the forms of cooperation and the types of actions under Erasmus+ 2021-2027 and Erasmus+ 2014-2020 influenced policy developments in the fields of education and training, youth and sport in your country? Which actions of the programmes are the most effective considering the needs of your country? Are there marked differences between the different fields? **(self-evaluation)**

Q8: What specific approaches (such as co-financing, promotion or others) have you taken in order to try to enhance the effects of Erasmus+ 2021-2027 and Erasmus+ 2014-2020 in your country? To what extent have these approaches been effective? Can any particular points for improvement be identified? **(self-evaluation)**

Q9: To what extent are the results of Erasmus+ 2021-2027 and Erasmus+ 2014-2020 adequately being disseminated and exploited in your country? Where can you see the possibilities for improvements? **(self-evaluation)**

Q10: To what extent are the effects likely to last in your country after the intervention ends, both cumulatively and the level of each implemented grant? **(self-evaluation)**

Q11: What if the Erasmus+ programme had not existed? Would the relevant sectors (higher education, school education, adult education, vocational education and training, youth and sport) in your country be supported in the same way and to a comparable extent? **(interviews)**

Q12: How did the Covid-19 pandemic impact the implementation of the two generations of the programme in your country, and what was the effect of the measures taken to react to the consequences of the pandemic? **(survey, interviews)**

Q13: What was the effect in your country of the measures taken in the frame of the programme implementation to provide a reaction to the consequences of the Russian invasion of Ukraine? **(not included in the midterm evaluation)**

1.2 Efficiency

Q14: What is the cost-effectiveness of various actions (clusters of actions) of Erasmus+ 2021-2027 and Erasmus+ 2014-2020 in your country? **(self-evaluation, survey)**

Q15: To what extent, compared to the previous programme, is the size of budget appropriate and proportionate to what Erasmus+ 2021-2027 is set out to achieve? To what extent is the distribution of funds across the programme fields and key actions appropriate in relation to their level of effectiveness and utility? **(survey, self-evaluation)**

Q16: How efficient is the cooperation between the different actors involved in the implementation and supervision of the programme (Commission services – Erasmus+ Committee – Executive Agency – National Authorities – National Agencies – Independent Audit Bodies – International Organisations⁶) from the point of view of your country, and to what extent does the Commission fulfil its guiding role in the process? How has this changed between the two programming periods? What are the reasons for potential changes? What are the areas for possible improvement in the implementation of Erasmus 2021-2027 or a successor programme? **(self-evaluation)**

Q17: To what extent are the measures applied by your National Agency/ies for monitoring and supporting applicants, beneficiaries (including small and newcomer organisations) and participants effective and proportionate? What are the areas for improvement/simplification, considering the need for a smooth and effective implementation of the programme? **(self-evaluation)**

Q18: To what extent have simplification measures put in place, such as the system of simplified grants and accreditation system, resulted in a reduction of the administrative burden for National Agencies, programme beneficiaries and participants? Are there differences across actions or fields? What elements of the programme could be changed to further reduce the administrative burden and simplify the programme's management and implementation, without unduly compromising its sound management, results and impact? **(survey, interviews, self-evaluation)**

Q19: To what extent do the indicators identified for the programme in the Regulation correspond to the monitoring purposes at national level? How could the overall management and monitoring system be improved? **(self-evaluation)**

Q20: To what extent are the new management support tools⁸ consistent with the Erasmus+ programme needs and architecture? Which additional features would you recommend for future developments? **(survey, interviews, self-evaluation)**

Q21: To what extent have the antifraud measures allowed for the prevention and timely detection of fraud in your country? **(self-evaluation)**

1.3 Relevance

Q22: To what extent do the Erasmus+ 2021-2027 objectives as set up in Article 3.1 and 3.2 of the Erasmus+ regulation, in link with the EU policy agendas in the fields of education and training, youth and sport, continue to address the needs or challenges they are meant to help with? Are these needs or challenges (still) relevant in the context of your country? Have the needs or challenges evolved in such a way that the objectives of Erasmus+ 2021-2027 or its successor programme need to be adjusted? **(self-evaluation)**

Q23: To what extent are the needs of different stakeholders and sectors in your country addressed by the Erasmus+ 2021-2027 objectives? How successful is the programme in attracting and reaching target audiences and groups within different fields of the programme's scope? How well is the Erasmus+ programme known to the education and training, youth and sport communities in your country? In case some target groups are not sufficiently reached, what factors are limiting their access and what actions could be taken to remedy this? What are the reasons of limited participation of certain target groups? Are there target groups who chose not to participate or are there always external factors preventing them? **(survey, interviews)**

Q24: To what extent is the design of Erasmus+ 2021-2027 oriented and adapted towards the hard-to-reach groups, people with fewer opportunities or specific disadvantaged groups of the population who traditionally do not engage in transnational or international activities as compared to other groups that benefit from the programme? In case some target groups are not sufficiently reached in your country, what factors are limiting their access and what actions could be taken to remedy this? **(Interviews)**

Q25: To what extent are the needs and challenges linked to Europe's green and digital transitions reflected in the actions/activities of Erasmus+ 2021-2027? **(interviews)**

Q26: What is the relevance of Erasmus+ 2021-2027 compared to the relevance of Erasmus+ 2014-2020 from the point of view of your country? Has it been improved in the new programme generation? **(interviews, self-evaluation)**

1.4 Coherence

Q27: To what extent are the objectives of different programme fields within Erasmus+ 2021-2027 consistent and mutually supportive? What evidence exists of cooperation between the different programme fields, including those managed by different National Agencies, and actions? How well do different actions work together? To what extent there exist inconsistencies, overlaps, or other disadvantageous issues between the programme fields and how are they dealt with? **(self-evaluation)**

Q28: To what extent is Erasmus+ 2021-2027 coherent with other national or regional programmes, other forms of EU cooperation (bilateral programmes) as well as international programmes with

similar objectives available in your country? Can you identify any inconsistencies, overlaps or other disadvantageous issues with other programmes? **(self-evaluation)**

Q29: To what extent has Erasmus+ 2021-2027 proved to be complementary to other national and international programmes available in your country in the fields of education and training, youth and sport? To what extent is Erasmus+ 2021-2027 building effective synergies or interactions with other programmes at national or regional level and other EU or international programmes with complementary objectives available in your country? What evidence exist of synergies and complementarities between Erasmus+ and other EU, national or regional programmes? Can you identify any inconsistencies, overlaps or other disadvantageous issues with other programmes? Can you compare with the synergies and complementarities developed in the previous Erasmus+ programme 2014-2020? **(self-evaluation)**

Q30: What is the coherence of Erasmus+ 2021-2027 compared to the coherence of Erasmus+ 2014-2020 from the point of view of your country? Has it been improved in the new programme generation? **(self-evaluation)**

European added value

Q31: What is the additional value and benefit resulting from EU activities, compared to what could be achieved by similar actions initiated only at regional or national levels in your country? What does Erasmus+ 2021-2027 offer in addition to other education and training support schemes available at regional or national levels in your country? What possibilities do you see to adjust Erasmus+ or its successor programme in order to increase its European added value? **(self-evaluation)**

Q32: To what extent does the Erasmus+ programme contribute to developing knowledge in European integration matters, to raising awareness about the EU common values and to fostering a European sense of belonging in your country? **(self-evaluation)**

Q33: To what extent does Erasmus+ 2021-2027 promote cooperation between Member States and third countries associated to the programme? And between these countries and third countries not associated to the programme? **(self-evaluation)**

Q34: What is the benefit and added value of Erasmus+ 2021-2027 and Erasmus+ 2014-2020 for individuals or organisations participating to the programme compared to non-participants in your country? **(self-evaluation)**

Q35: To what extent are the results of Erasmus+ 2021-2027 and Erasmus+ 2014-2020 sustainable beyond the projects duration in your country? **(self-evaluation)**

Q36: What would be the most likely consequences in your country if the Erasmus+ programme were possibly to be discontinued? **(self-evaluation)**

Appendix B – Erasmus+ Midterm Evaluation

© 2024 The Danish Evaluation Institute

Quotation allowed only with source reference

Publikationen er kun udgivet i elektronisk form på: www.eva.dk

Photo: iStock

ISBN (www) 978-87-7182-747-7

The Danish Evaluation Institute, EVA, explores and develops the quality of day care centres, schools and educational programmes. We provide usable knowledge at all levels - from day care centres and schools to local governments and ministries.



**The Danish
Evaluation Institute**

+45 35 55 01 01
eva@eva.dk
www.eva.dk