

SAMPLE PROPOSAL AUDIT REPORT

CIRCULAR-EU LAB — Jean Monnet Module

Table 1. *Audit identification*

Field	Details
Document type	Demonstration sample of a PAP client report
Proposal	CIRCULAR-EU LAB: EU Circular Economy Policy for Future Municipal Engineers
Call	ERASMUS-JMO-2026-HEI-TCH-RSCH-MODULE
Applicant	Asterion University of Technology — fictional HEI in the synthetic scenario
Audited source	CIRCULAR_EU_LAB_Synthetic_Part_B_v1.0.docx — separately created full synthetic document
Time status	Retrospective demonstration under the 2026 call rules; the call closed on 3 February 2026
Status	All names, persons, figures and weaknesses were created solely for demonstration

PAP DECISION: the concept fits the Jean Monnet Module action; a different type of call is therefore not required. In this retrospective simulation under the rules of the closed 2026 call, the proposal scores 67/100: below the 70/100 overall threshold, while the Impact criterion scores 14/25 against the required minimum of 15/25. The concept should be retained for a possible future submission, revised in a targeted manner and reassessed against the official conditions of a new call once they are published.

1. What PAP examined

The audit simulates an independent evaluator's reading of the proposal. It examines alignment with the purpose of the action, project logic, evidence of need, implementation credibility, team competence, evaluation of results, impact, dissemination and sustainability.

The synthetic proposal presents a three-year teaching module for engineering and municipal-systems students. The module is intended to explain how EU circular-economy policy affects urban infrastructure design, waste management, ecodesign and procurement. It provides 45 teaching hours per year, practical laboratories with municipalities and open events. Every conclusion below is traceable to numbered sections and tables in the separate synthetic source.

2. Overall assessment

2.1 PAP scoring method

The official rules define four criteria worth 25 points each but do not prescribe an arithmetic formula within each criterion. To make the assessment reproducible, PAP applies an internal analytical decomposition: each criterion is divided into five components, and each component is rated from 0 to 5. Scale: 0 — absent; 1 — critically insufficient; 2 — partial; 3 — adequate; 4 — strong; 5 — excellent and fully substantiated. This is a PAP analytical tool, not an official EACEA formula. The complete calculation is provided in Appendix A.

2.2 Summary by official award criteria

Table 2. *Assessment against the award criteria*

Criterion	What the criterion should demonstrate	PAP conclusion on the proposal	Score
Relevance of the project	Whether EU matters form the substantive core; whether the proposal connects them with policies, values, societal dialogue and priority groups.	The core fits Jean Monnet: EU circular-economy policy is integrated into engineering education. However, common EU values are barely integrated into outcomes and cases. Source: §1.3.	20/25
Quality of project design and implementation	Whether objectives, methods, work plan, resources, monitoring and evaluation form a complete and feasible system.	The teaching structure is realistic, but some objectives are unmeasurable and evaluation relies mainly on participant satisfaction. Source: §1.2, §2.1–2.4, Tables S2 and S5–S6.	16/25
Quality of the team and cooperation arrangements	Whether the team has complementary competence in EU matters and the project topic, and whether responsibilities are clearly allocated.	The team covers EU policy and municipal engineering. Capacity for public engagement is not demonstrated; the workload of invited experts is undefined. Source: §3, Table S7.	17/25
Impact	Whether changes for the institution, students and external groups are substantiated; whether dissemination, use of results and continuation after the grant are realistic.	Substantial reach is claimed, but there is no audience calculation, confirmed university decision or resource provision for continuing the module. Source: §4.1–4.3, Table S8.	14/25
Total	Funding requires at least 70/100 overall and at least 15/25 for each criterion.	The proposal fails the overall threshold and the minimum threshold for Impact.	67/100

The PAP score is an expert estimate, not an official EACEA decision. The expected range for the supplied synthetic version is 63–71/100. The uncertainty reflects the fact that the strength of some evidence would depend on the complete Part A, team CVs and institutional confirmations.

3. Strengths to preserve

Table 3. *Substantiated strengths*

Code	Strength	Evidence in the proposal	How to use it during revision
S-01	Correct substantive core	§1.3, §2.1, Table S4: the Circular Economy Action Plan, Waste Framework Directive and ESPR are directly incorporated into the teaching.	Create an explicit 'EU policy — session — learning outcome — task' map.
S-02	Priority audience	§1.4: the module targets engineering students who do not normally study EU matters.	Add a baseline measure of their knowledge and a specific recruitment plan.
S-03	Academia–practice link	§1.4 and §3: laboratories with municipal services and open discussions are planned.	Secure external roles through letters and a schedule.
S-04	Formal duration	Tables S1 and S4: 45 contact hours are planned annually over 36 months.	Retain the volume and verify that all hours are accounted for in the teaching plan.

4. Critical and major findings

1. Expected impact is not substantiated

Finding: §1.4, Table S3, §4.1–4.2 and Table S8: the proposal promises to reach 600 students and 1,500 external participants but provides no recruitment calculation or conversion path from contact to participation.

Why it matters: The Impact criterion is the criterion that fails the mandatory threshold. Large figures without an acquisition mechanism read as declarations rather than credible targets.

PAP recommendation: Build a separate calculation for each audience: starting pool, channel, frequency, expected reach, evidence of participation and accountable owner.

2. No institutional decision supports continuation

Finding: §4.3: the module is intended to become an elective course, but there is no curriculum-board decision, course owner, workload plan or funding source.

Why it matters: An evaluator cannot regard sustainability as substantiated solely by the authors' intention.

PAP recommendation: Add a university commitment letter, the procedure for placing the course in the catalogue, the responsible unit and a minimum post-grant budget.

3. Evaluation measures satisfaction rather than learning achievement

Finding: §2.3, Table S5: the main indicators are attendance, a satisfaction survey and downloads. No assessment of knowledge or application of EU policy is defined.

Why it matters: High satisfaction does not demonstrate that students acquired the intended competences.

PAP recommendation: Add baseline and final tests, a scored practical case, an assessment rubric and a target gain with analysis rules.

4. Learning outcomes are partly unmeasurable

Finding: §1.2, Table S2 and §2.1: verbs such as ‘understand’ and ‘be aware of’ do not specify an observable action or level of attainment.

Why it matters: Teaching, tasks and assessment cannot be aligned when the outcome cannot be verified.

PAP recommendation: Reformulate the outcomes as actions: compare, interpret, apply, justify, assess compliance and propose a solution.

5. EU values are insufficiently integrated

Finding: §1.3: environmental policies are described, but their connection with equality, non-discrimination, citizen participation and a just transition is almost absent.

Why it matters: The official criteria separately assess respect for and promotion of common EU values.

PAP recommendation: Include a teaching case on the equitable distribution of circular-transition costs and benefits, accessibility of services and participation of vulnerable groups.

6. Roles of external contributors remain declarative

Finding: §3, Table S7: municipalities, companies and an NGO are named as external contributors, but their tasks, schedule, contribution and confirmation of availability are not defined.

Why it matters: A Jean Monnet Module has a single applicant, but external participation must still be operationally credible.

PAP recommendation: Without changing the single-applicant structure, add participation letters and a ‘contributor — activity — input — result’ matrix.

5. Formal and logical checks

Table 4. *Compliance checks*

Check	Required state	Actual state	Decision
EU Studies subject matter	EU policy or an EU topic is the central object of teaching.	§1.3 and §2.1: the module focuses on EU circular-economy policy.	Compliant
Teaching hours	At least 40 contact hours per year over three years.	Tables S1 and S4: 45 hours per year; 135 hours in total.	Compliant
Single applicant	The application is submitted by one higher education institution.	Table S1 and §3: Asterion University of Technology; external organisations are not presented as co-beneficiaries.	Compliant

Check	Required state	Actual state	Decision
Objectives — outcomes — assessment	Each objective has a measurable outcome and a verification method.	§1.2, §2.3, Tables S2 and S5: some outcomes are unmeasurable; a satisfaction survey dominates.	Revision required
Dissemination	A message, channel, scale and indicator are defined for each audience.	§4.2: channels are listed, but scale and conversion to participation are not substantiated.	Revision required
Sustainability	A decision, responsible owners and post-grant resources are in place.	§4.3: an intention exists, but there is no institutional confirmation or resource plan.	Not met
Ethics and data	Legal basis, minimisation, access, retention and voluntariness of additional evaluation are defined.	§5: only a general reference to standard GDPR procedures is provided.	Revision required
Hours and lump sum	The requested amount matches the country and total number of hours in the official table.	§6 and Table S1: 135 hours, Poland, EUR 18,000 — arithmetically consistent for the 2026 scenario.	Compliant

6. Project-logic check

Table 5. *Traceability from need to impact*

Link	What is claimed	What must be substantiated	Gap
Need	Engineers have insufficient understanding of EU policies.	Curriculum data, an employer survey or baseline testing.	Only a general reference to the lack of EU Studies in STEM is provided.
Objective	Increase knowledge and capacity to apply EU policies.	Baseline value, target gain, timeframe and group.	No numeric knowledge target is defined.
Activity	45 hours of teaching and municipal laboratories.	A link from each session to EU policy and a learning outcome.	The alignment map is incomplete.
Output	Materials, cases and open events.	Quality, acceptance and use criteria for each output.	Creation is counted, but quality or use is not.
Outcome	Students apply EU requirements in design decisions.	A verifiable pre/post task and an assessment rubric.	Only a final presentation without a rubric is planned.
Impact	The module changes the curriculum and municipal practice.	A university decision, repeated teaching and municipal use of the cases.	The continuation mechanism is not substantiated.

7. Revision plan for a possible future call

The 2026 call is closed. The actions below are not a submission plan for a closed call; they prepare the concept for reassessment after the conditions of the next relevant call are published.

Table 6. *Priority action plan*

Priority	Action	Expected result	Criterion for reassessment
P0	Obtain institutional confirmation of continuation and resources.	Commitment letter, decision to include the course and responsible unit.	Impact: institutional change and sustainability
P0	Replace declarative reach indicators with a substantiated calculation.	Table of audiences, channels, frequency, conversion to participation and participation evidence.	Impact: dissemination and external groups
P1	Rebuild the learning-outcome evaluation system.	Baseline/final test, practical case, rubric and target gain.	Quality: monitoring and evaluation
P1	Reformulate learning outcomes and align them with teaching sessions.	'EU policy — outcome — session — task — assessment' matrix.	Quality: methodology and coherence
P1	Integrate common EU values into content and cases.	A dedicated learning block and assessed task on the just transition.	Relevance: common EU values
P1	Develop a data-management and evaluation-ethics plan.	Legal basis, minimisation, access, retention, voluntariness and separation of data.	Quality: feasibility and sound management
P2	Confirm contributions from external participants.	Participation letters and a responsibility matrix.	Team; quality of cooperation

REASSESSMENT: scores are not recalculated by mechanically adding points for completed recommendations. After revision, PAP must reassess the complete text against every component because one change may strengthen several criteria at once or create new inconsistencies.

8. What the client should receive after the audit

In a real engagement, this report would be accompanied by materials that allow the client not only to read the findings but also to manage the revision:

- a register of all findings with severity, evidence, proposal location and recommended action;
- an award-criteria compliance matrix;
- a claim-evidence matrix for key needs and expected results;
- a consistency map linking objectives, activities, results, indicators and impact;
- a priority revision plan identifying what must be corrected before language editing;

- a list of questions requiring clarification or supporting documents from the authors.

9. PROFESSIONAL APPENDICES

The appendices make the assessment reproducible for an experienced grant professional. The main report remains self-contained for a client without specialist grant-evaluation training.

Appendix A. Full scoring decomposition

Table 7. *PAP internal analytical scale*

Cod e	Component	Score 0–5	Source	Rationale
R1	EU Studies as the substantive core	5	§1.3; §2.1; S4	EU policies directly shape the module content.
R2	Alignment with Jean Monnet objectives	4	§1.2–1.4	Education and dialogue are present; knowledge generation for policy is weaker.
R3	Dialogue between academia and society	4	§1.4; §3	Municipal laboratories are planned, but the contribution is unconfirmed.
R4	Common EU values	3	§1.3	Inclusion is mentioned; values are not integrated into outcomes and assessment.
R5	Priority target groups	4	§1.4; S3	The STEM audience is relevant; participant numbers are not justified.
Q1	Evidence of need	2	§1.1	The need is stated, but baseline evidence is not provided.
Q2	Methodology and novelty	3	§2.1–2.2	The methods are appropriate; comparison with existing courses is absent.
Q3	Coherence of the work plan	4	§2.4; S6	The sequence is clear; stages require acceptance criteria.
Q4	Monitoring and evaluation	2	§2.3; S5	Participation and satisfaction are measured, not competences.
Q5	Feasibility and resources	5	§2.1; §3; §6	Hours, profiles and the scenario lump sum are coherent.
T1	Competence in EU Studies	4	§3; S7	An academic lead in EU policy is present; evidence detail is limited.
T2	Competence in the project topic	4	§3; S7	Engineering and educational competence are complementary.
T3	Complementarity	4	§3; S7	Core roles are covered; public-engagement competence is missing.

Cod e	Component	Score 0–5	Source	Rationale
T4	Allocation of responsibilities	3	§3; S7	Functions are named, but workload and replacement capacity are absent.
T5	External cooperation	2	§3; S7	Contributors are named without letters, a schedule or defined inputs.
I1	Impact on the institution	2	§4.1; §4.3	Course integration is claimed without an institutional decision.
I2	Impact on students	3	§4.1; S8	Beneficiaries and change are defined, but knowledge is not measured adequately.
I3	Impact on external groups	3	§1.4; §4.1	The groups are relevant; use of results is not demonstrated.
I4	Dissemination and communication	3	§4.2	Channels exist; messages, scale, conversion and owners are incomplete.
I5	Sustainability	3	§4.3	An intention exists; decision, resources and maintenance owner are absent.

Score check: R1–R5 = 20/25; Q1–Q5 = 16/25; T1–T5 = 17/25; I1–I5 = 14/25; total = 67/100. The PAP decomposition explains professional judgement but does not turn it into an official EACEA formula.

Appendix B. Full findings register

Table 8. Findings register

Cod e	Severity	Criterion	Exact location	Finding	Required action
F-01	Critical	Impact	§4.3	Sustainability is not substantiated by a decision and resources.	Obtain an institutional decision, owner and resource plan.
F-02	Critical	Impact	§1.4; S3; §4.1; S8	Reach of 600/1,500 has no calculation.	Build an audience model and participation-evidence plan.
F-03	Major	Quality	§2.3; S5	Evaluation does not measure learning achievement.	Add baseline and final measures, a practical task, rubric and analysis.
F-04	Major	Quality	§1.2; S2; §2.1	Outcomes stated as 'understand/be aware of' are unmeasurable.	Reformulate them as observable actions.
F-05	Major	Relevance	§1.3	Common EU values are not integrated into teaching.	Add a just-transition case and assessment.

Cod e	Severity	Criterion	Exact location	Finding	Required action
F-06	Major	Team	§3; S7	External contribution is not confirmed.	Add letters and a contribution matrix.
F-07	Major	Quality	§1.1	The need has no substantiated baseline.	Add curriculum analysis, a survey or a baseline test.
F-08	Major	Quality	§2.2	Novelty is claimed without comparison with existing courses.	Conduct a comparative review and distinguish local from methodological novelty.
F-09	Major	Quality	§2.4	Risks have no ratings, owners or triggers.	Create a complete risk register.
F-10	Major	Impact	§4.2	Communication and dissemination are not distinguished.	Define audience, message, channel, KPI and owner.
F-11	Major	Quality	§5	Data management is reduced to a generic GDPR reference.	Add legal basis, minimisation, access and retention periods.
F-12	Moderate	Quality	§2.4; S6	Outputs have no quality or acceptance criteria.	Define acceptance criteria for the syllabus, practical cases and materials.

Appendix C. Claim–evidence matrix

Table 9. *Key claims and evidence gaps*

Proposal claim	Location	Existing evidence	Evidence required	Status
Engineers lack knowledge of EU policies.	§1.1	General statement about curriculum analysis.	Analysis results, programme sample, baseline test or stakeholder data.	Gap
The module will reach 600 students.	§1.4; S3	Channels are named.	Recruitment flow, group capacity, repeated intakes and unique participants.	Gap
Students' knowledge will improve.	§4.1; S8	Final presentation and satisfaction survey.	Valid baseline and final measures plus a scored practical task.	Gap
The university will integrate the module.	§4.3	Intention in the proposal narrative.	Board decision, workload, accountable owner and budget.	Gap
Municipalities will use the cases.	§4.1; S8	Plan to obtain confirmations.	Signed commitments and a criterion for documented use.	Partial

Proposal claim	Location	Existing evidence	Evidence required	Status
The lump sum matches the hours.	§6; S1	Poland; 135 hours; EUR 18,000.	Official 2026 table.	Confirmed for the scenario

Appendix D. Cross-section consistency matrix

Table 10. *Consistency of proposal logic*

Link	Source A	Source B	Check result	Resolution
Need → objective	§1.1	§1.2; S2	Logically connected, but baseline and target values are absent.	Add measurable baseline and target values.
Objective → curriculum	§1.2; S2	§2.1; S4	The content aligns, but the outcome map is incomplete.	Create a curriculum-alignment matrix.
Curriculum → assessment	§2.1; S4	§2.3; S5	Assessment does not demonstrate the ability to apply EU policy.	Add a test, practical task and assessment rubric.
Target group → reach	§1.4; S3	§4.1; S8	The same groups are used, but the figures have no counting method.	Calculate unique participants and channels.
Impact → sustainability	§4.1	§4.3	Curriculum integration is claimed without a decision.	Obtain a formal institutional commitment.
Data collection → governance	§2.3; S5	§5	Data are collected, but protection rules are not defined.	Add a data-management protocol.

Appendix E. Questions for the applicant

Table 11. *Clarifications required before reassessment*

No.	Question	Why the answer is required	Related finding
1	Which programmes and courses were included in the curriculum analysis, and where are the results available?	Confirm the baseline for the need.	F-07
2	How will 600 unique students complete a 45-hour module over three years?	Check capacity and feasibility.	F-02
3	What minimum knowledge gain will count as success?	Set a target value and decision rule.	F-03
4	Who will approve the module as an elective, and by what date?	Confirm institutional impact.	F-01

No	Question	Why the answer is required	Related finding
5	Which resources and teaching workload will remain after the grant?	Check sustainability.	F-01
6	Which specific tasks will each external contributor perform?	Check cooperation feasibility.	F-06
7	Which existing courses make the methodology genuinely novel?	Substantiate the novelty claim.	F-08
8	Which data are mandatory for teaching, and which are collected only for evaluation?	Separate academic from research/evaluation data.	F-11
9	Who owns each risk, and when are response measures triggered?	Operationalise risk management.	F-09
10	What evidence will confirm actual municipal use of a case?	Distinguish dissemination from actual use.	F-02/F-10

10. Professional notes

10.1 Status of statements

Table 12. *Distinction between facts and analytical conclusions*

Status	What belongs in this category
FACT	Official Jean Monnet Module requirements: one applicant; 36 months; at least 40 contact hours per year; four criteria worth 25 points each; thresholds of 70/100 and 15/25.
SYNTHETIC DATA	The file CIRCULAR_EU_LAB_Synthetic_Part_B_v1.0.docx, the name Asterion University of Technology, team, target groups, indicators, work plan and all weaknesses were created by PAP for demonstration.
ANALYTICAL CONCLUSION	Scores of 20/25, 16/25, 17/25 and 14/25; overall estimate 67/100; recommendation to remain within this action and revise the proposal.
UNCERTAINTY	The actual score of a real proposal would depend on the complete package, confirmations and the professional judgement of independent evaluators.

10.2 Audit limitations

This sample demonstrates the content and structure of a full report by auditing a separately created synthetic source. It contains no confidential client material. Because the institution is fictional, it does not assess a real applicant's eligibility, ECHE or submission. A real PAP audit uses the proposal, current call template, official criteria, supporting evidence and the authors' clarifications.

10.3 Official source

Erasmus+ Programme Guide — Jean Monnet actions in higher education: [Official Erasmus+ Programme Guide page](#)

Verified: 27 August 2026. The 2026 call closed on 3 February 2026. Requirements for any future submission must be checked again only after a new call is officially published.