Evaluation Criteria Identification

This form is for Quality Control and Monitor member (QCMM) to identify criteria for task evaluation.

**QCMM Name: Supapan Chaiprapat**

**WP No.: WP4**

**Task No.: 4.4**

1. **Objective(s) and Deliverable(s)**

*The main objective(s) of this task:*

1. To select a financial auditor or a team of financial auditors qualified to conduct the financial audit in accordance with the project objectives, structure, policies, processes, and external regulations, through a financial auditor selection process approved by QCMB.

2. To ensure that reports as outputs of the auditing process comply with the EU regulations and the project requirements.

*The deliverable(s) of this task:*

1. A team of auditors who possess qualifications specified in the criteria of the auditor selection process\*.

2. Reports as part of “Audit Certificate on the Final Financial Evaluation Report” include

a) Teaching/learning materials

b) Implementation of the activities, outputs and outcomes, the planned workload

c) Assessment of the sustainability of the project results (curriculum, syllabuses, teaching materials, etc.)

d) Intermediate and final verification and validation of the project teaching/learning materials and results in accordance with the QCMP

The financial evaluation report will be annexed to the Final Report submitted to the EU at M36.

1. **Process Monitoring & Assessment**

*In your opinion, what should we look at in order to say that the task is done properly and met the objective?*

1. Qualifications of the auditors

Possible criteria of auditor selection

 a) Education: a Bachelor degree (or equivalent), major in finance or business administration is preferred, from an accredited university as a minimum

 b) Auditing professional experience: the auditor shall have a minimum of 3 financial audits within a period of time not exceeding 3 years, prior to the date of qualification assessment. As a lead auditor, a minimum of 5 quality management system audits, within a period of time not exceeding 3 years prior to the date of qualification, 2 audits of which shall be the audits of projects funded by EU.

 c) Regulatory knowledge: knowledge about financial policies of an ERASMUS+ CBHE Project is preferred.

 d) Accreditation/ Certification/ License: accredited or certified by a program recognized worldwide, e.g, ACCA (Association of Chartered Certified Accountants) and ACA (Associate Chartered Accountant).

 e) Auditing firm: well recognized in financial auditing.

 f) Communication and interpersonal skills: Good communication and interpersonal skills are required.

 g) The auditor must not be employed in any matter that would create a conflict of interest.

2. Reports must comply with EU regulations and project requirements.

*Can we measure them and how do we measure them? If you can’t measure it, please remove and find another one.*

1. **Deliverable Assessment**

*In your opinion, what should be the specifications of the deliverable(s)?*

For the deliverable(1), we can assess its quality with respect to the qualifications aforementioned.

For the deliverable(2), we can assess its quality in different aspects as follows.

1. Format: the deliverable can be assessed with respect to the rules of Document Control in this project.
2. Content: the deliverable must be comprehensive enough to ensure an adequate coverage of the topics mentioned above
3. Time: the reports must be submitted by the timeline mentioned above

*Please identify similar deliverable(s) elsewhere.*

The deliverables of Task 4.3 (\*compare with the deliverables within this project or somewhere else?)

*Please rate those deliverables according to your specifications.*

Not sure what it means.

*What are the criteria or scales that you have used to rate those deliverables?*

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Education**
 |
| **Score** | **Education Level** |
| 0 | Degree acquired NOT in finance or business administration |
| 3 | Bachelor degree (or equivalent) in finance or business administration from an accredited institution in the country of origin |
| 5 | Master degree (or equivalent) in finance or business administration from an accredited institution in the country of origin |
| 1. **Auditing Experiences**
 |
| **Score** | **Auditing Experience** |
| 0 | Less than 3 financial audits |
| 3 | More than 3 financial audits |
| 5 | More than 3 financial audits with at least one audited project being funded by EU |
|  | \*extra 1 point with every one additional audit (a maximum of 5 points) |
| 1. **Regulatory Knowledge**
 |
| **Score** | **Knowledge Level** |
| 0 | NOT knowledgeable of finance policies of an ERASMUS+ CBHE Project |
| 3 | Knowledgeable of financial policies of an ERASMUS+ CBHE Project |
| 1. **Accreditation/Certification/License**
 |
| **Score** | **Accreditation Level** |
| 0 | Not accredited anywhere |
| 3 | Local or national accreditation/certification/license |
| 5 | International accreditation/certification/license |
| 1. **Recognition of Auditing Firm**
 |
| **Score** | **Recognition Level** |
| 0 | Not well recognized in the field |
| 3 | Well recognized locally or nationally |
| 5 | Well recognized internationally  |
| 1. **Communication and Interpersonal Skills**
 |
| **Score** | **Communication and Interpersonal Skill Level** |
| 0 | Unable to communicate |
| 3 | Communication via planned use of interpreters |
| 4 | Communication in good written and spoken English |
| 5 | Communication in excellent written and spoken English |

*According to your criteria, please set the target specifications for our deliverables to claim that the objective is met?*

For the deliverable (1), the total score is 30 and to meet the objective the score should not be less than 15.

\* The auditor selection process (The same process as elaborated in Task 4.3)

The process can be broken down into the following steps.

1. Establishing the auditor selection panel: The auditor selection process will be carried out by the auditor selection panel who in this project can be QCMB. The panel is responsible for the following tasks.
2. Setting up the criteria to select the auditors: The above criteria are tentatively imposed and needs revision.
3. Ranking the criteria: The criteria can be divided into factual criteria (educational background, experience, regulatory knowledge, for example) and soft-skill criteria (recognition and communication and interpersonal skill). The panel will have to assess which criteria are “of utmost importance”, “importance”, “nice to have”, and “not applicable”, and impose numeric scores accordingly.
4. Listing auditors who have qualifications that meet the criteria in 2)
5. Rating the auditors with respect to the rubric in 3)
6. Inviting the auditors with the highest score: if they are not available, the auditors with the next highest score will be considered.