# APPLICATION FORM

# Towards excellence in entrepreneurship and enterprise skills

The deadline for submission of this form is **3 July 2015**. It should be sent by email to **EEPGoodPractice@etf.europa.eu**

|  |
| --- |
| **ALL APPLICATIONS MUST BE COMPLETED USING MICROSOFT WORD. THE FORM CAN BE DOWNLOADED SEPARATELY FROM THE ETF WEBSITE.****ALL APPLICANTS MUST ALSO COMPLETE THE SECTION A) ON ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND B) THE CHECKLIST AT THE END OF THE APPLICATION FORM.** |

|  |
| --- |
| TITLE |
| *Please provide the full title of the training programme:*Click here to enter text. |
| Contact person | Person nominated for peer review exercise |
| Name: Click here to enter text.Organisation: Click here to enter text.Address: Click here to enter text. Click here to enter text. Click here to enter text.Email: Click here to enter text.Telephone: Click here to enter text.Website: Click here to enter text.Twitter: Click here to enter text. | Name: Click here to enter text.Email: Click here to enter text.Telephone: Click here to enter text.Skype: Click here to enter text. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. OBJECTIVES |
| *Please describe the objectives of the programme (maximum 2):**Please limit text to 100 words per objective.*1. Click here to enter text.2. Click here to enter text. |

|  |
| --- |
| 2. RESULTS OF THE TRAINING |
| *Please provide information on the main results of your training programme to date – bullets only:** Click here to enter text.
* Click here to enter text.
* Click here to enter text.
 |

|  |
| --- |
| 3. DESCRIPTION OF THE TRAINING PROGRAMMES |
| *Provide a short description of the training programme covering the five dimensions:*1. *How are the training needs assessed?*
2. *How is the training designed?*
3. *What are the training delivery arrangements?*
4. *How is the training monitored and evaluated?*
5. *What marketing tools are used?*

*Please limit text to 500 words.*Click here to enter text. |

|  |
| --- |
| 4. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON THE TRAINING PROGRAMME |
| TARGET GROUPS |
| *Who are the primary target groups of the training (e.g. pupils/students, unemployed, immigrants, women, start-ups, young entrepreneurs, micro-enterprises, growth enterprises)?* *Please, provide at least three companies or target groups that have engaged in the training (name of the company, contact person and e-mail).* Click here to enter text. |
| WORKING WITH POLICY MAKERS |
| **Policy context***Provide a brief statement of the policy context (e.g. education, employment, economy) to the training programme. For example, a youth entrepreneurship training programme reflects a national priority for measures to counteract the 27% youth unemployment rate.*Click here to enter text. |
| **Policy impact***Training has potential to create scale and impact beyond the training programme, through informing and shaping policies. For example, results from a women’s entrepreneurship support programme demonstrated that mortality rates for early-phase businesses were significantly reduced when access to on-line mentoring was extended from 6 months to 2 years. The results from the training programme were noted in a SME policy review and public-financed mentoring support was extended.**Make one recommendation as to how the experience from your training programme has or could improve policy*.Click here to enter text. |
| **Policy partners***Training providers selected for posting on the international good practice platform will also be invited to a practitioner-policy forum in early 2016. After consulting with your public policymakers (e.g. education, employment, economy, enterprise ministries), please provide details of two policy officials representing two distinct policy areas (e.g. education and employment) who will accompany the training provider to the forum.* |
| Name: Click here to enter text.Title: Click here to enter text.Organisation: Click here to enter text.Address: Click here to enter text.Email: Click here to enter text.Telephone: Click here to enter text. | Name: Click here to enter text.Title: Click here to enter text.Organisation: Click here to enter text.Address: Click here to enter text.Email: Click here to enter text.Telephone: Click here to enter text. |

|  |
| --- |
| SUSTAINABILITY |
| How long has the training been running and what are the approximate running costs?Click here to enter text.What makes the training programme sustainable?Click here to enter text. |
| NETWORKING |
| Briefly outline the networks in which the training provider is active and the value that each network brings to the training programme and vice versa.Click here to enter text. |
| DIGITAL SKILLS |
| Explain how the programme addresses digital skills.Click here to enter text. |

# ELIGILITY CRITERIA

Please complete this form to confirm eligibility to the Good Practice selection.

|  |
| --- |
| THEME |
| What is the theme of your training? Please tick more than one box, as appropriateYouth Entrepreneurship [ ] Women’s Entrepreneurship [ ] Internationalisation of SMEs [ ]  |
| COUNTRY |
| In which country or countries do you deliver the training?Click here to enter text. |
| TRAINING NEEDS ANALYSIS |
| Do you carry out a training needs analysis? **Choose an item.** |
| DIGITAL SKILLS |
| Does your training programme include digital skills training? **Choose an item.** |
| MONITORING AND EVALUATION |
| Do you have a programme monitoring procedure? **Choose an item.**Has your programme been independently evaluated? **Choose an item.** |

# CHECKLIST

In preparation of the peer review session, please “tick” the boxes next to each criterion which accurately reflect your training programme.

As part of the overall assessment process, you will be requested to provide explanation and concrete evidence on the criteria during the peer review session.

|  |
| --- |
| **DIMENSION 1: TRAINING NEEDS ANALYSIS (TNA)**The objective of this component of the ETF good practice peer review is to determine how well the training needs analysis has been defined as input to the design and execution of a training programme, including the potential for use in wider policy developments. |
| 1 | Evidence of proxy-TNA process: data and analysis borrowed from other training environments with risk that training design is less relevant to local market | [ ]  |
| 2 | TNA tools borrowed and not adapted to local training environment | [ ]  |
| 3 | Evidence of TNA is confined to ad hoc or one-off data/intelligence gathering related to the training provision under review with no defined plans to update TNA knowledge | [ ]  |
| 4 | Evidence that TNA is driven by actors external to the training environment (e.g. donors) | [ ]  |
| 5 | Clearly how the training provider liaises with private sector in identifying training needs | [ ]  |
| 6 | At least one TNA tool (e.g. survey, focus group) exploited for purposes of training design and delivery | [ ]  |
| 7 | At least one example that TNA tools and analysis for project under review are sensitive to specific target groups (e.g. women, youth, special needs, migrants, growth-phase enterprises) | [ ]  |
| 8 | TNA reflects scale of training provision in terms of numbers involved in training and geographical spread | [ ]  |
| 9 | TNA is core feature of training provider’s business or organisation plan | [ ]  |
| 10 | At least one example shared which convinces peer reviewers of innovation in the TNA process. Innovation involves any aspect which brings real added value to the TNA process | [ ]  |
| 11 | At least one example of an agreement established between training provider and general industry or sector-specific organisation for training development purposes | [ ]  |
| 12 | TNA includes analysis of sector trends (trade, turnover, employment, skills) using primary and secondary data. | [ ]  |
| 13 | Evidence that TNA intelligence from the project has been provided by training provider for wider policy debate e.g. sector-specific, government policies (education, training, employment, enterprise, economic development) | [ ]  |
| 14 | At least one example shared which convinces peer reviewers of innovative use of technology for TNA process (e.g. e-surveys) | [ ]  |

|  |
| --- |
| **DIMENSION 2: TRAINING DESIGN**The objective of this component of the ETF good practice peer review is to assess how the contents of training programme, as well as the methods and assessment arrangements have contributed to the learning outcomes. |
| 15 | Curriculum materials directly borrowed from outside training provider environment | [ ]  |
| 16 | Learning outcomes borrowed from outside training environment | [ ]  |
| 17 | Pedagogic approach overwhelmingly relies on one-way communication between trainer and trainees | [ ]  |
| 18 | No evidence of assessment arrangements for trainees during the training programme | [ ]  |
| 19 | Curriculum borrowed and adapted to training needs | [ ]  |
| 20 | Learning outcomes borrowed and customised to training provision under review | [ ]  |
| 21 | Assessment arrangements confined to end-of- cycle assessment | [ ]  |
| 22 | Curriculum design includes clearly defined learning outcomes set against training needs identified | [ ]  |
| 23 | Participatory pedagogic approaches involve active learning (e.g. group work, focus groups, apprenticeship placements) | [ ]  |
| 24 | Evidence of ad hoc assessment arrangements of trainees during training | [ ]  |
| 25 | Evidence of innovative approaches to curriculum design (e.g. students engaged in the design process, curriculum peer reviewed by representatives from business world) and how the curriculum is delivered in an innovative way (e.g. role play, quizzes, simulation, case studies, enterprise labs, engagement of external speakers) | [ ]  |
| 26 | Assessment arrangements for trainees involve a) entry assessment and c) exit assessment | [ ]  |
| 27 | Evidence of review of learning outcomes and inclusion of trainees in review process | [ ]  |
| 28 | Evidence of curriculum revision as a function of analysis of similar training provided by other training organisations providing similar training | [ ]  |
| 29 | Evidence that curriculum has been customised to meet training requirements of new customers or new demands of existing customers | [ ]  |
| 30 | Evidence of learning technologies feature in the training design (e.g. e-learning) | [ ]  |
| 31 | Assessment arrangements for trainees involve a) entry assessment, b) continuous review and c) exit assessment | [ ]  |
| **DIMENSION 3: TRAINING ENVIRONMENT**The objective of this component of the ETF good practice peer review is to assess the appropriateness of the training infrastructure and support mechanisms, including expertise of training staff, as essential elements for delivery of training programme under review |
| 32 | In the 3 years prior to the peer review, at least one trainer in the training organisation has delivered training in the subject area under review for at least 60 man-days | [ ]  |
| 33 | Adequate training space and equipment to deliver training course (description and visuals to be provided in good practice portfolio) | [ ]  |
| 34 | Existence of an action plan specifically devoted to training project (objectives, outcomes, budget, resources) | [ ]  |
| 35 | In the 3 years prior to the peer review, at least one trainer in the training organisation has delivered training in the subject area under review for at least 100 man-days | [ ]  |
| 36 | In the 2 years prior to the peer review, at least one trainer in the organisation has undertaken professional development in the subject area under review (e.g. attended conferences, study visits) prior to the peer review | [ ]  |
| 37 | In the 3 years prior to the peer review, at least one trainer in the organisation has delivered training in the subject area under review for at least 180 days | [ ]  |
| 38 | In the 2 years prior to the peer review, at least one trainer in the organisation has followed a dedicated course in the training area under review | [ ]  |
| 39 | Well-developed training space and equipment for training provided (description and visuals to be provided in good practice portfolio) | [ ]  |
| 40 | Training project is embedded within training provider’s strategy/action plan of the training provider | [ ]  |
| 41 | In the 3 years prior to the peer review, at least one trainer in the organisation has delivered training in the subject area under review for at least 240 days | [ ]  |
| 42 | In the 3 years prior to the peer review, at least one trainer in the organisation is a certified trainer (public or private certification body) | [ ]  |
| 43 | In the 3 years prior to the peer review, at least one trainer in the organisation has delivered training in the subject area under review for more than 240 days | [ ]  |
| 44 | At least one trainer in the organisation is a recognised authority for training in the sector (e.g. publications, awards) | [ ]  |
| 45 | Multi-functional support services available on site or partnership arrangement with other service providers (examples of agreements required) to compliment training environment (e.g. agreement with vocational school for access to IT laboratory) | [ ]  |
| 46 | Area of training provision forms part of a corporate strategy and action plan. | [ ]  |
| **DIMENSION 4: MONITORING, EVALUATION AND IMPROVEMENTS**The objective of this component of the ETF good practice peer review is to determine how effective the M&E arrangements have been for the training programme under review with implications for improving the training environment |
| 47 | Evidence of one-off, ad hoc approach to monitoring and evaluation for training project (examples should be provided) | [ ]  |
| 48 | Training provider is aware of improvement requirements to the training programme (any of the 5 good practice criteria) but has not introduced change for whatever reason (e.g. lack of resources) | [ ]  |
| 49 | Evidence of a systematic approach to monitoring and evaluation of the training project (M&E plan, copies of M&E notes, reports etc.) involving trainees and trainers | [ ]  |
| 50 | Evidence of adjustments or improvements to training (any of the 5 good practice criteria) following either a) end-of-cycle evaluation or, b) feedback from trainees or trainers if training is still on-going | [ ]  |
| 51 | An end-of-cycle evaluation report on training programme is available and recommended improvements to training programme have been introduced | [ ]  |
| 52 | The training provider has a dedicated M&E function assigned to an individual or team. | [ ]  |
| 53 | Evidence that good practice from the training has been disseminated with practitioners and policy makers in the country  | [ ]  |
| 54 | A tracker system is available to follow-up trainees to determine post-training impact for the trainee and/or the business purchasing the training (e.g. surveys) with evidence of adjustment or improvements to training project. | [ ]  |
| 55 | Evidence that the training programme has made an impact on the beneficiaries and its business | [ ]  |
| 56 | Evidence that good practice from the training programme is disseminated internationally. | [ ]  |
| 57 | Recommendations from the end of the cycle, independent evaluation have been discussed with policy makers. | [ ]  |
| 58 | Evidence that recommendations from independent evaluation have been incorporated into wider training strategy of the training provider. | [ ]  |
| 59 | Training provider has a web-based tool to gather anonymous feedback from trainees on a) training programme, b) trainers | [ ]  |
| 60 | Evidence demonstrating that experience from the training programme has had an impact on policy | [ ]  |
| **DIMENSION 5: MARKETING**The objective of this component of the ETF best practice peer review is to determine how effective the training provider is in promoting the training programme under review. |
| 61 | Evidence of ad hoc marketing of the training programme | [ ]  |
| 62 | Evidence of at least 2 methods being used to market the training programme | [ ]  |
| 63 | The training project has its own dedicated marketing plan and budget | [ ]  |
| 64 | Evidence of use of information technology to market the training programme at local, regional or national level | [ ]  |
| 65 | Evidence of impact of marketing plan at national level (e.g. new sponsors, customer base extended nationally) | [ ]  |
| 66 | Evidence of use of information technology to market the training programme at international level | [ ]  |
| 67 | Evidence of impact of marketing plan at international level (e.g. new sponsors, international customers) | [ ]  |