ERASMUS+ VET

RED TEAM QUICK CHECK

15 Critical Questions Before Submitting Your Proposal

A rapid pre-submission check for Erasmus+ VET teams.
Use it to identify serious weaknesses before you hit Submit.



ERASMUS+ VET

RED TEAM QUICK CHECK

15 critical questions before submitting your proposal

A rapid pre-submission review for Erasmus+ VET teams.
Use it to identify serious weaknesses before pressing Submit.

GREEN	AMBER	RED	UNKNOWN
Acceptable	Needs attention	Serious weakness	Insufficient evidence

Serhii Kosov • Dmytro Yurkovskyi

Free digital edition

HOW TO USE THE RED TEAM QUICK CHECK

Use this tool when your proposal is nearly complete. It does not replace a full quality audit, the current Erasmus+ Programme Guide, the specific Call for Proposals, or the official submission requirements.

Rule: do not count green marks.

One serious contradiction may matter more than ten strong sections. If a RED status concerns the project's core logic, stop and correct it before submission.

STATUS SCALE

GREEN	Acceptable
AMBER	Needs attention
RED	Serious weakness
UNKNOWN	Insufficient evidence

HOW TO RECORD AN ANSWER

For each question, mark one status and indicate exactly where the answer appears in the proposal:

Proposal section: _____ Page: _____ Comment: _____

QUICK RULES

- If the answer exists only in the team's heads, it does not exist for an evaluator.
- Do not hide a structural weakness behind better wording.
- If information is missing, mark UNKNOWN; do not guess.
- The Quick Check is a rapid diagnostic tool. A full Red Team Audit examines each audit area in much greater depth.

15 CRITICAL QUESTIONS BEFORE SUBMISSION

Critical question	G / A / R / ?	Where in the proposal?	Comment
1. RELEVANCE — Relevance Is the problem the project aims to address clearly defined, specific, and genuinely important to the target group?	☐ G ☐ A ☐ R ☐ ?		
2. NEED — Need Does the proposal show what needs to change for the target group or organisations, rather than only listing the activities the team plans to carry out?	☐ G ☐ A ☐ R ☐ ?		
3. EVIDENCE — Evidence Are the key problem and identified needs supported by concrete, relevant, and sufficient evidence?	☐ G ☐ A ☐ R ☐ ?		
4. TRANSNATIONAL NECESSITY — Transnational necessity Does the proposal explain why addressing the problem solely at national level would be impossible or inappropriate, and why cooperation between partners from different countries is needed?	☐ G ☐ A ☐ R ☐ ?		
5. ACTION FIT — Fit with the Erasmus+ action Do the project logic, scale, and expected changes fit the selected Erasmus+ action, rather than being artificially adapted to an available call?	☐ G ☐ A ☐ R ☐ ?		
6. OBJECTIVES — Objectives Do the objectives follow directly from the identified needs and required changes, and is it clear what the project aims to achieve?	☐ G ☐ A ☐ R ☐ ?		
7. CAUSAL LOGIC — Causal logic Can you trace a convincing chain: need → required change → objective → activity → immediate output → result → expected change?	☐ G ☐ A ☐ R ☐ ?		
8. PARTNERS — Partnership Does every partner have a clearly justified role, necessary expertise, and contribution without which project delivery would be weaker?	☐ G ☐ A ☐ R ☐ ?		
9. WORK PACKAGES — Work packages Does every work package have a clear purpose, responsible partner, expected result, and logical link to other parts of the project?	☐ G ☐ A ☐ R ☐ ?		
10. RESOURCES — Resources Are the workload, timelines, partner responsibilities, and planned resources proportionate to the actual scale of the tasks?	☐ G ☐ A ☐ R ☐ ?		
11. RISKS — Risks Have the most significant delivery risks, their owners, and realistic prevention or response measures been identified?	☐ G ☐ A ☐ R ☐ ?		
12. INDICATORS — Indicators Do the indicators show not only whether activities took place but also whether the planned results and changes were achieved?	☐ G ☐ A ☐ R ☐ ?		
13. IMPACT — Impact Is there a realistic causal link between project results and wider changes for participants, organisations, or the VET system?	☐ G ☐ A ☐ R ☐ ?		
14. SUSTAINABILITY — Sustainability Is it clear which results or practices will continue to be used after funding ends, who will be responsible, and what resources will be needed?	☐ G ☐ A ☐ R ☐ ?		
15. CONSISTENCY — Consistency Do all sections describe the same project without contradictions in needs, objectives, target groups, partner roles, indicators, timelines, or planned results?	☐ G ☐ A ☐ R ☐ ?		

10 CRITICAL RED FLAGS THAT SHOULD STOP THE TEAM

1. PROJECT FOLLOWS THE CALL, NOT THE PROBLEM

The call or budget was chosen first, and the project problem was then framed to fit it.

2. CLAIMS WITHOUT EVIDENCE

Key claims about the problem, needs, or target group lack a sufficient evidence base.

3. BROKEN INTERVENTION LOGIC

Need, required change, objectives, activities, and expected results do not form a clear causal chain.

4. TRANSNATIONALITY IS DECORATIVE

The proposal includes an international partnership but does not explain why transnational cooperation is needed to address the problem.

5. DECORATIVE PARTNERS

One or more partners lack a distinct function, necessary expertise, or real responsibility for a result.

6. WORK PACKAGES ARE ACTIVITY LISTS

Work packages read like lists of activities, without clear results, responsible partners, milestones, or logical dependencies.

7. SUCCESS IS MEASURED BY ACTIVITY

Success is measured mainly by counts of training sessions, meetings, participants, or materials rather than achieved changes.

8. IMPACT IS AN AMBITION, NOT A CONSEQUENCE

Impact is described as a broad aspiration, but the proposal does not show how project results could lead to those changes.

9. SUSTAINABILITY = “THE WEBSITE WILL REMAIN ONLINE”

Sustainability is reduced to keeping a website, platform, materials, or partner network in place, without owners, resources, and a mechanism for continued use.

10. THE PROPOSAL TELLS DIFFERENT STORIES

Needs, objectives, target groups, partner roles, indicators, timelines, or expected results change between sections.

STOP RULE

If even one critical red flag concerns the project’s core logic, do not consider the proposal ready for submission.

30-SECOND EVIDENCE CHECK

- Can you point to the exact section of the proposal where this claim is supported?
- Does the evidence concern the same target group, context, and problem?
- Would an external evaluator understand the argument without an oral explanation from the team?
- If a claim matters but lacks support, mark it UNKNOWN or RED.

QUICK RED TEAM SUMMARY

Audit area	GREEN	AMBER	RED	Critical note / action
Relevance	☐	☐	☐	
Evidence	☐	☐	☐	
Logic	☐	☐	☐	
Partnership	☐	☐	☐	
Work packages	☐	☐	☐	
Risks	☐	☐	☐	
Indicators	☐	☐	☐	
Impact	☐	☐	☐	
Sustainability	☐	☐	☐	

YOUR CURRENT STATUS

☐ **READY TO REVIEW FURTHER — the quick check has found no obvious structural obstacle to a further final audit.**

☐ **MAJOR ISSUES FOUND — substantial weaknesses need to be corrected before the final audit.**

☐ **NOT READY — one or more problems in the project's core logic make submission premature.**

NEED A FULL AUDIT?

The full ERASMUS+ VET RED TEAM PROPOSAL CHECKLIST goes beyond this rapid diagnostic review and provides an in-depth structured audit:

Relevance → Evidence → Logic → Consortium → Work Packages → Risk & Quality → Indicators → Impact → Sustainability → Consistency → Final Gate

Use the full version when you need a documented pre-submission review, corrective actions, a severity rating for identified weaknesses, and a final decision on proposal readiness.

VET PROJECTS LAB • Evidence-Based VET Projects