QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN

Document Info	
Project reference	618768-EPP-1-2020-1-EL-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP
Deliverable / Task	T6.1
Dissemination level	Internal
Date	26.02.2021
Document version	1.0
Status	Final
Authors	Carlos Vaz de Carvalho
Reviewer	Hariklia Tsalapatas
Contributors	All partners
Approved by	Steering Committee

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The objective of a Quality Assurance process is to support the management entities in the production of concrete and high–quality results in line with the project objectives and work plan. In this context, the main purpose of the Quality Assurance Plan is to organize this process by establishing a coherent set of guidelines by which all aspects of the project are measured and assessed. The use of these guidelines will ensure better collaboration among the consortium members and will also ensure that the entire consortium is responsible for and engaged in the project activities. As such, the plan defines:

• The roles and responsibilities of the consortium members;

• The guidelines for adequate implementation and assessment of the tasks;

• The content, format, review and approval process of the project results;

• The different quality criteria, indicators and tools to be applied throughout the project duration;

• The roles and responsibilities of the external evaluator;

• In general, the overall quality requirements that must be respected throughout the project lifecycle, that the deliverables, actions and results must conform to.

PROJECT SUMMARY

ICT is a rapidly growing innovation sector due to the demand of digital services and, in turn, it drives economic growth and job creation. Universities have the responsibility to modernize their educational practices for developing highly skilled ICT professionals capable of putting ideas into action. Building the innovation capacity of ICT students is crucial because: it benefits individuals by building knowledge and skills for pursuing successful careers in a highly evolving sector; it builds a highly skilled workforce; it contributes to community wellbeing through services that address industry and societal issues.

Design thinking is an innovation building framework that introduces solutions that better address needs through a process of empathy that allows designers to better understand the experiences and feeling of users. Design thinking enables the definition of more accurate problem statements and encourages brainstorming for building and validating solutions that work, even when none appears to exist at first glance.

OBJECTIVES

ICT-INOV aims to enrich ICT higher education in Asia, and specifically Malaysia, Vietnam, Nepal, and Pakistan, for promoting innovation. Implementation in South Asia is important due to the region's high growth. While educational objectives in these Partner Countries may differ, they all converge to the need of enriching higher education as a vehicle of innovation and growth. ICT-INOV aims to introduce a technology-enhanced, design thinking learning intervention for contributing to the development of an ICT workforce highly capable of innovation.

The project will produce:

- A design thinking, experiential learning framework for innovation

- Physical labs and digital services for promoting collaboration in design thinking

- Educational activities that integrate design thinking

- Instructor training and community building towards the adoption of design thinking in ICT education

TARGET GROUPS

The project mainly targets educators, students and Higher Education Institutions. Educators and Students will benefit from the added value of ICT-INOV methodologies and digital tools for building skills for employment. HEIs will also benefit from a holistic strategical approach towards promoting innovation in ICT education in a specific unit at partner universities.

CONSORTIUM

ICT-INOV consortium gathers 12 Higher Education Institutions from Greece, Portugal, Estonia, Italy, Malaysia, Pakistan, Nepal, Viet Nam:

- PANEPISTIMIO THESSALIAS
- INSTITUTO POLITECNICO DO PORTO
- TALLINN UNIVERSITY
- EUROPEAN TRAINING AND RESEARCH ASSOCIATION
- UNIVERSITY OF MALAYA
- UNIVERSITI TENAGA NASIONAL SDN. BHD
- ISRA ISLAMIC FOUNDATION (GUARENTEE)LIMITED
- NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF COMPUTER AND EMERGING SCIENCES NUCES
- TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY
- KATHMANDU UNIVERSITY
- TRUNG TAM XUAT SAC JOHN VON NEUMANN
- HANOI UNIVERSITY

This way it is possible to identify needs and requirements related to teachers and students and to the HEIs. This also means that the end-users are already in the consortium and can contribute to the activities and results throughout the project.

WORK PLAN

The duration of the project is 36 months (01/09/2017 – 31/08/2020) and is comprised of 7 Work Packages (3 technical WPs, 3 Management and Quality Assurance WPs and 1 WP for Dissemination and Exploitation).

WP1: Preparation (work package leader: Tallinn University)

- Goal: To analyse current practices in ICT education as well as learning needs per Partner Country and organization. This work is expected to last 3 months, as much of the analysis has already taken place during the proposal preparation period.
- Method, activities, and deliverables:
  - Analysis of state of the art and learning needs at each partner site using internal databases, documents, and analyses (milestone 1.1 - M1.1 - State of the art and needs analysis completion, month 3).

WP2: Methodological learning framework (work package leader: EU-Track)

- Goal: To develop an experiential learning framework for building innovation skills through design thinking and gamification.
- Method, activities, and deliverables:
  - Survey of expectations (M2.1 Completion of surverys, month 12)
  - Development of institutional strategies (M2.2 Completion of institutional strategies, month 18)
  - Development of methodological learning framework based on experience (M2.3 Completion of methodological learning framework, month 18)

WP3: Implementation (work package leader: University of Thessaly)

- Goal: To develop the physical and digital infrastructure for supporting design thinking in ICT education.
- Method, activities, and deliverables:

- o Building physical labs (M3.1 Completion of 1 lab per Asian partner, month 18)
- o Developing a digital repository of design thinking activities (M3.2 Completion of digital services, month 18)
- o Populating the digital repository with activities (M3.3 50 activities published, month 24)
- o On-going training of instructors (M3.4 360 instructors trained, month 36)
- o Piloting of the labs and services with students (M3.5 1.200 students engaged, month 36)

WP4: Capacity and community building activities (work package leader University of Malaya)

- Goal: To build a community of good practices on deploying design thinking for innovation
- Method, activities, and deliverables:
  - o Developing an on-line community (M4.1 Completion of community, at least 350 participants, month 24)
  - o Organizing one event per country (M4.2 Completion of events, 50 participants per country, month 36)
  - o Organizing a final conference (M4.3 Completion of conference, 50 participants, month 36)

WP5: Dissemination and exploitation (work package leader: Universiti Tenaga Nacional)

- Goal: To disseminate widely and promote the adoption of project results
- Method, activities, and deliverables:
  - o Developing a project portal (M5.1 Initial version ready, month 4)
  - o Project newsletter (M5.2 4 issues completed, month 36)
  - o Scientific articles (M5.3 2 publications completed, month 36)

o Internet publications (M5.4 at least 20 publications, month 36)

o Traditional media publications (M5.5 at least 10 publications, month 36)

o Social media page for the project (M5.6 initial version completed, month 4)

WP6: Quality Plan (work package leader: Porto Polytechnic)

- Goal: To establish the degree to which the project is implemented according to the goals set in this proposal

- Method, activities, and deliverables:

  o Internal evaluation to take place every 6 months in project meetings through dedicated sessions (M6.1 internal quality assurance evaluation report, months 18 and 36)

  o Interim evaluation by external expert (M6.2 Interim external evaluation report completed, month 18)

  o Final evaluation by external expert (M6.3 Final external evaluation report completed, month 36)

WP7: Management (work package leader: University of Thessaly)

- Goal: To ensure the smooth and timely implementation of the work plan

- Method, activities, and deliverables:

  o Establishment of partnership agreements (M7.1 Completion of agreements, month 6)

  o Periodic financial reporting, every 6 months

  o Compilation of interim and final reports to EACEA (M7.2 Completion of interim report, month 18. M7.3 Completion of final report, end of implementation period)

QUALITY ASSURANCE METHODOLOGY

The quality assurance methodology ensures a proper implementation of the activities and results of the project. It also ensures that all partners are fully involved in the different monitoring and evaluation mechanisms along the various project phases and report, on a periodic basis, about the activities they are leading and participating in.

In general, the methodology focuses on the objectives, outcomes, milestones, effectiveness of the approach and used tools, resource usage, control procedures, partner's roles and responsibilities, etc. Detailed quantitative and qualitative indicators are established:

(a) indicators of realization, based on the actual realization of deliverables and number of target users reached vs. expected for the different activities (piloting, dissemination, exploitation). These indicators are measured through the monitoring activities in correspondence with project milestones and delivery dates. Success corresponds to the delivery of all the expected outcomes with at least the number of users indicated in the quality assurance plan;

(b) indicators of result, that will be mainly based on a qualitative assessment of project tangible and intangible outcomes as evaluated internally, by the end-users and by external experts. The indicators concern the quality, relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the outcomes, as far as perceived by the end-users and peer-reviewers. Success corresponds to positive feedbacks from the users (an average rate of 4 out of 5 on a Likert scale);

(c) impact indicators, measuring the capacity of the project to make any external positive change towards the main project goal. The indicators concern mainly the impact and sustainability of project results.

STRUCTURE, ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITES

The Quality Assurance structure is directly connected to the management structure and reflects the consortium's determination to maintain focused goals and balanced activities among its members. The structure and responsibilities for the different participants in the QA process are:

The **Project Coordinator (PC)** is the responsible for the overall operation of the project and its smooth running, timeliness and accomplishment. He oversees financial and administrative management including the preparation of reports. The PC is the final responsible to ensure that all partners' contributions meet the expectations. The coordinator's main responsibilities are the following:

• To manage the project's decision-making process.

• To ensure the implementation of the agreed action plan to the agreed standards and deadlines.

• To work with the WP leaders in the coordination of the corresponding activities.

• To assure the quality of the project's deliverables and of the required processes.

• To ensure the effective flow of information between partners.

• To report on project progress to the EACEA.

• To serve as the representative of the Consortium to the EACEA.

• To act as the Financial Officer within the Consortium and manage the preparation of financial statements for the EACEA.

The **Steering Committee (SC)** supervises the implementation of the whole project. It is chaired by the PC and it is composed by one member of each partner. The SC is the arbitration body which implements the provisions of the Grant Agreement and decides on the following matters:

• Define the strategic orientation of the project.

• Take all decisions required for the successful progress of the project.

- Take consequential decisions on dissemination and exploitation activities.

- Implement the scientific decisions and orientations, taken by the coordinator, by redefining the work plan and schedule and/or re-defining partner roles, contributions and budgets.

- Approve progress reports on the state of advancement of each work package; monitor any significant difference between planned and actual advancement of participants' work, particularly with respect of project results and deliverables.

- In case of default by a partner, to review participants' roles and budget as well as any new entity to replace the defaulting contractor.

During the bi-annual consortium meetings the SC members review interim results and set interim (6-month) implementation goals. Evaluation results will be made public at the end of the project implementation period in a corresponding report.

The **Quality Manager (QM),** is responsible for the achievement of the quality objectives of the project. The duty of the QM is to monitor and evaluate the progress of the project and to ensure that all its activities are carried out properly according to European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance and ensuring proper execution of the project to achieve its objective. The QM designs a monitoring and evaluation process and is responsible for selecting criteria, indicators, and data collection tools.

The **External Evaluator (EE),** monitors and evaluates the progress of the project with an external perspective. Before each meeting of the SC, he produces a report on the status of progress of the project. He is also responsible for producing the deliverables 6.3 and 6.4.

The **Work Package Leader (WPL)** - Each WPL will be responsible for the detailed co-ordination and reporting of the specific Output. If needed, meetings of the partners involved in the Output will be organized and chaired by the WPL. For each deliverable, within the WP, the WPL will assign direct responsibility either to himself or to an associate individual. The WPL is the person that will be contacted by the PC as part of the monitoring of progress towards completion of the deliverables.

ORGANIZATION, FOCUS AND TOOLS

The project quality is assured through the monitoring and evaluation of the quality of two main aspects: the project processes and the project deliverables.

Quality of the project processes (indicators of realization and impact indicators)

The quality of the key project processes will be monitored and assessed through periodic internal self-evaluation of the consortium by the project partners. The evaluation will be done by each partner through a questionnaire (Annex 1) with an assessment of the performance of the consortium and of the current state of the project activities. This internal evaluation will be performed twice during the lifecycle of the project, in months 18 and 36. The QM will collect all the answers from the partners and integrate them into a report which will reflect the views of the consortium on its progress. The project evaluation is considered positive if the percentage of agreement is more than 70% of weighted answers with score ≥ 3. Lower scores will require corrective actions by the SC, led by the Project Coordinator. At the same time the external evaluator will conduct a qualitative evaluation of the project progress using his/her own tools combined with a reanalysis of the results of the internal evaluation.

Each project meeting (including online meetings) will include a specific session dedicated to Quality Assurance to analyse the Internal and External Evaluation evidences and other monitoring data. Furthermore, after each meeting, a section of the meeting evaluation questionnaire will be dedicated to the assessment of the current state of the partnership and the project progress.

The Detailed Work Plan is a detailed list of activities for the next period with definition of deadlines and responsible partner(s) produced by the coordinator after each meeting.

The Risk Management Plan establishes the project strategy to anticipate and manage Risks.

The Quality Assurance Plan is a referential for monitoring and evaluation, including mechanisms and quality indicators.

The Dissemination Plan provides a detailed list of planned dissemination activities and expected impact. The accompanying Dissemination Activities table provides a list of activities already organized and the achieved impact.

Quality of project deliverables (indicators of result)

The deliverables of the project are classified into tangible ones, such as printed and/or electronic publications, software, manuals, reports, guidelines, plans, minutes, handbooks, promotional material, etc.

Intangible deliverables can be in the form of meetings (partnership, stakeholders' or other), organized events (such as multiplier events, trainings, conferences, etc.), established social media presence, electronic platforms for training, communication, dissemination, file-sharing, competitions, challenges, etc.

A common quality expectation for all deliverables is their relevance to the project objectives, their timely delivery according to the time-schedule agreed in the project work plan and their general adequacy to the quality criteria.

Tangible deliverables undergo a peer review process of evaluation by the QM, who can assign that task to a different partner. In any case, the reviewer(s) is/are person(s) not directly associated with the work carried out for the relevant task of the tangible deliverable in question. The review process is the following:

- When a deliverable is finished, the author sends the "draft version" of the relevant document to the WPL for an initial evaluation.
- The WPL examines the deliverable for its compliance with the Document Template and the general objectives of the project.
- After the document is approved by the WPL, it is sent to the reviewer(s) who check(s) it for its completeness, clarity and comprehensiveness, using the Deliverable Evaluation document. The reviewer(s) must verify whether the

deliverable satisfies the requirements, description, or objective, identify problems and/or deviations from requirements and suggest improvements to author. Peer review evaluations should include the following information:

- General comments:
    o Thoroughness of contents
    o Correspondence to project objectives
- Specific comments:
    o Relevance
    o Format (layout, spelling, etc.)
- Suggested actions:
    o Changes that should be implemented
    o Missing information
    o Further improvements

The reviewer(s) then send(s) back the evaluation to the WPL and the author who is then responsible for amending the document according to the review results, if needed. The time for this amendment is set according to the time schedule already agreed upon by the partners.

- Once the document is amended (if needed) its revised version is sent by the WPL to all members of the consortium. The document that is finally approved takes the status of "final version/version 1" and is included by the PC in the formal work plan and/or progress report of the project.

Event evaluation will be done by all participants. At the end of each event (SC meeting or other) organized by and/or for the partnership, a relevant questionnaire will be completed by the participants. Standard questionnaires will be used, one for partner meetings (Meeting Evaluation Questionnaire – Annex II) and one for events (Event Evaluation Questionnaire – Annex III). The event is considered approved if the percentage of satisfaction is more than 70% of weighted answers with score ≥ 3.

The questionnaires will normally be delivered using an online digital survey tool that allows respondents to remain anonymous in order to collect quantitative and

qualitative data. The event evaluations will be done on the spot using hardcopies of the standard document.

The meeting/event is considered positive if the percentage of agreement is more than 70% of weighted answers with score ≥ 3. Scores less than this will require a analysis by the partnership, led by the Project Coordinator.

Other project deliverables, such as the website, or the internal communication platform, will be evaluated according to the criteria with a focus on the overall quality of the deliverable and the usability and the added value to the final users.

The external evaluator will also conduct a qualitative assessment process of all the deliverables produced.

RESULTS

The quality assurance process will produce the following results:

- Internal evaluation to take place every 6 months in project meetings through dedicated sessions with two internal evaluation synthesis rounds (collecting all the internal evaluation evidences) on months 18 and 36 and the production of the corresponding reports **M6.1 Internal Quality Assurance Evaluation reports, months 18 and 36**
- Interim evaluation by external expert and release of **M6.2 Interim external evaluation report completed, month 18**
- Final evaluation by external expert with release of **M6.3 Final external evaluation report completed, month 36**

CRITERIA AND INDICATORS

	Criteria	Indicators	Quantified objectives (min.)
WP1	Depth of the research performed (strategies, policies, projects, etc.)	1.1 Number of sources used in desk research 1.2 Number of external cases (strategies, policies, projects, etc.) used in the research 1.3 Number of institutional cases identified and used in the research	1.1: 100 1.2: 30 1.3: 12
WP2	Depth of the research performed	2.1 Number of sources used in desk research 2.2 Number of external cases (strategies, policies, projects, etc.) used in the research	2.1: 50 2.2: 10
	Assessment of students' needs	2.3 Number of students involved 2.4 Number of HEI involved	2.3: 360 2.4: 15
	Depth and scope of the educational framework	2.5 Number of identified needs supported by the framework 2.6 Proposed design thinking and gamification features	2.5: 15 2.6: 6
	Depth and scope of the institutional strategy	2.7 Number of consortium HEI implementing the institutional strategy 2.8 Number of external HEI reached to develop an institutional strategy based on ICT INOV educational framework	2.7: 12 2.8: 10
WP3	Physical laboratories	3.1. Number of laboratories installed 3.2. Number of users of the laboratories	3.1: 8 3.2: 1200
	Digital learning service	3.3. Number of students involved 3.4. Number of educators involved	3.3: 750 3.4: 160
	Digital content repository	3.5 Number of educational resources/activities integrated 3.6 Number of users of the repository	3.5: 50 3.6: 500
	National events	3.7 Number of events	3.7: 6

		3.8 Number of participants	3.8: 150
WP4	Webinar organization	4.1 Number of events 4.2 Number of participants	4.1: 6 4.2: 150
	National events	4.3 Number of events 4.4 Number of participants	4.3: 6 4.4: 150
	Final conference	4.5 Number of participants 4.6 Average perceived satisfaction of the participants	4.5: 100 4.6: 75%
	Training events	4.7 Number of participants 4.8 Average perceived satisfaction of the participants	4.7: 30 4.8: 75%
WP5	Dissemination tools produced and released	5.1 Number of unique visitors to the project website 5.2 Number of likes/followers in social media 5.3 Number of publicity materials printed (flyers, etc.) and distributed 5.4 Number of organizations/stakeholders receiving the e-newsletters	5.1: 5 000 5.2: 2.000 5.3: 2500 (1st edition) + 2500 (2nd edition) 5.4 500
	Exposure in external events, publications or in the media	5.5 Number of Posters and Technical/Scientific Papers published 5.6 Number of Articles published in technical/scientific journals 5.7 Number of articles in the media/press referring to the project	5.5: 6 5.6: 3 5.7: 6
	Extent of the project dissemination efforts	5.8 Number of dissemination activities carried out 5.9 Number of individuals reached	5.8: 150 5.9: 50.000
	Range of external organizations reached	5.10 Number of external organizations contacted 5.11 Number of external organizations engaged (or that expressed interest) in project activities	5.10: 150 5.11: 25
WP6	Quality of the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan	6.1 Ratio of instruments proposed/applied for indicators of	6.1: 90%

		realization 6.2 Ratio of instruments proposed/applied for indicators of result	6.2: 90%
	Evidences of the Monitoring and Evaluation process	6.3 Number of quality indicators below threshold 6.4 Number of end-users involved in evaluation activities	6.3: 4 (max) 6.4: 200
WP7	Compliance in the implementation of the planned tasks and in the releasing of project deliverables	7.1 % of tasks completed on time 7.2 % of deliverables released on time	7.1: 70% 7.2: 80%
	Value of the communication and workflow process among partners	7.3 Number of partners not attending meetings (maximum) 7.4 Number of e-mail messages between partners	7.3: 2 (max) 7.4: 150
	Degree of effective use of resources	7.5 % of financial execution in the first year 7.6 % of operational actual costs overrun (staff, travel and subsistence, subcontracts, other) compared to project budgeted values	7.5: 40% 7.6: 10%

ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

Reports

The QM is responsible for producing an Interim and a Final Quality Report, based on the results of the scheduled evaluations. These Quality Reports, together with the ones provided by the External Evaluator, will be the basis for any corrective or adaptive measures, should there be a need.

Document Control

All documents will be stored in the internal communication platform for visibility and use for all partners when needed.

All documents essential to the progress of the project must be named using the project title, version number, status (draft or final) and the relevant code of the deliverable.

Example: ICT-INOV WP7. Quality Assurance Plan v1 final.docx

Example: ICT-INOV WP5. Newsletter R1 v0.5 draft.docx

In communication, the documents can simply be referred to with their title and their sequential reference number (if any), for example "Quality Plan" or "Newsletter R1".

All documents will be saved in MS Word, MS Excel or MS PowerPoint compatible file types. A template (including font, built-in header, footer, page numbers, etc.) to be used for the creation of Word documents will be available to all partners, posted as a separate document in the Quality Management folder. Templates of the documents to be used for the peer evaluation of deliverables, meeting evaluations, event evaluations shall also be placed in the Quality Management folder.

Final versions of documents should be marked as final and uploaded in read-only format.

Documents or other material addressed to the external public (informative material, brochures, leaflets, posters, presentations, DVDs, etc) must bear appropriate logos and disclaimers, according to EACEA projects visual identity requirements. All produced documents will be assigned a distribution/access level: Partnership (Confidential), Public, or restricted to certain recipients.

Communication

Communication between the members of the consortium, between the PC and the EACEA is very crucial for the successful implementation of project. Day by day communication will be conducted through the internal communication platform forums, by e-mail, telephone conversations and skype meetings. For the avoidance of any confusion, special attention is paid to the clear drafting of the subject of the e-mail.

In general, all information relevant to the project is sent to the PC, who then forwards it to the partners involved in the specific action(s). Direct partner/partner communications flows will be set up in those cases where an increase in efficiency can be achieved.

External communication with EACEA is the responsibility of the PC. This communication takes place mainly by e-mail, telephone conversations and face-to-face discussions when it is needed.

ANNEXES

ANNEX I: INTERNAL EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

The Internal Evaluation Questionnaire will have a set of 16 Likert-scale questions. Each question will be assigned a grade, on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest (fully agree) and 1 the lowest (fully disagree). Respondents will also be asked for open comments and suggestions. They will help for the synthesis of the results and for the project management.

How do you evaluate….

1. The professional competence and commitment displayed by the Project Coordinator.
2. The effectiveness of the project management process.
3. The effectiveness and clarity of the communication between the partners and the PC.
4. The commitment and proportionate involvement of all partners.
5. The quality of the relationship among the partners.
6. The sharing of resources/expertise amongst partners.
7. The extent to which the consortium commits time and resources as required by the work plan.
8. The arrangements for the implementation of the work packages and the administration of budget.
9. The adherence to the work plan by all partners.
10. The link between project workplan and cost-effective use of resources.
11. The quality of the project monitoring and evaluation processes.
12. The quality of materials/guides/reports/products already produced.
13. The quality of the project information/results dissemination arrangements.
14. The quality of the project in terms of its short, medium and long term impact at local/regional/national/European level.

15. The support from within your partner organization, in terms of managerial support, specialized support or peer support.

16. The sufficiency, range and suitability of project resources, including, where appropriate, technology resources.

ANNEX II: MEETING EVALUATION

The Meeting Evaluation Questionnaire[1] will have a set of 20 Likert-scale questions. Each question will be assigned a grade, on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest (fully agree) and 1 the lowest (fully disagree). Respondents will also be asked for open comments and suggestions. They will help for the synthesis of the results and for the project management.

A. Meeting

1. The participants received all information about the meeting on time.
2. Access to the venue of the meeting was easy.
3. The conference room and its facilities facilitated the work during the meeting.
4. Catering and meals were satisfactory.
5. The agenda of the meeting was balanced, focusing on all key aspects of the project.
6. The timetable was respected.
7. The presentations by the partners were clear and understandable.
8. In general, the meeting was well planned and managed.

B. Partnership

1. Participants had the chance and the possibility to meet and interact with the other project partners.
2. The communication amongst the partners was effective and clear.
3. The meeting helped with the development of trust and positive attitudes among partners.
4. I feel the project is built on a strong partnership with an efficient administrative and financial coordination.

---

[1] Questions can be adjusted in case of a virtual online meeting.

B. Project

After the meeting…

1. I have a clear view of the project aims and objectives.

2. I understand clearly the administrative structure of the project.

3. The information given as to the administrative /financial management facilitated my understanding of those issues.

4. The information given helped me to better understand the tasks and activities of the project.

5. I understand clearly the role of my institution/organization in this project and what is expected from me for the project.

6. I understand clearly the framework and deadlines to be respected by all partners.

7. The timescales proposed are realistic and feasible.

8. The meeting contributed positively to the progress of the project and the scheduling of the next steps.

D. Personal Remarks

Project partners are asked to provide their opinions and concerns on the following project aspects. (Open questions)

- The meeting enabled me to clear up questions I previously had on:

- The following aspects are still a major concern to me:

- The major obstacle/barrier in this project for the near future will be:

- What will be the most important outcomes of the project for your organization?

- Other suggestions and aspects to be improved

ANNEX III: EVENT EVALUATION

The Event Evaluation Questionnaire will have a set of 20 Likert-scale questions. Each question will be assigned a grade, on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest (fully agree) and 1 the lowest (fully disagree). Respondents will also be asked for open comments and suggestions. They will help for the synthesis of the results and for the project management.

- What is your opinion of the general organization and facilities of the event?
- To which extent did the event live up to your expectations?
- What is your opinion of the presenters/facilitators?
- What is your opinion of the material that was distributed before or during the event?
- How do you evaluate the agenda of the event?
- How do you evaluate the technical resources used?
- How effective do you think was the methodologies used?
- How useful was the event?
- How valuable was the event for your professional growth?
- How satisfied are you from the level of participation to the event proceedings?
- Do you feel that the targets of the event have been fulfilled?