



Unione delle Università del Mediterraneo
Mediterranean Universities Union
Union des Universités de la Méditerranée
إتحاد الجامعات المتوسطية



APPRAIS

governAnce, quality, accountability:
a Piloting Reform PRocess
in kurdistan region of Iraq

D6.1 Quality and Evaluation Plan

September 2021



Authors

Nabil A. Fakhre, Salahaddin University- Erbil
Mohammed Azeed Saeed, Salahaddin University- Erbil
Barzan Hadi Hama Karim, University of Halabja
Aram Mohammed-Amin Qadi, University of Halabja

Contributors

Silvia Marchionne, UNIMED
Martina Zipoli, UNIMED

Editors

All Partners
Quality Committee members
External Evaluator

Partnership

- UNIMED, Mediterranean Universities Union, Italy (Coordinator)
- Università di Pisa, Italy
- University of Oslo, Norway
- University of Murcia, Spain
- University of Evora, Portugal
- Salahaddin University- Erbil, Iraq
- University of Sulaymania, Iraq
- University of Duhok, Iraq
- University of Halabja, Iraq
- Duhok Polytechnic University, Iraq
- Garmian University, Iraq
- University of Zakho, Iraq
- Charmo University, Iraq
- Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research KRG, Iraq

Website

www.appraisproject.eu





Document title:	D6.1 Quality and Evaluation Plan
Project title:	APPRAIS « <i>governAnce, quality, accountability: a Piloting Reform pRocess in kurdistAn region of Iraq</i> »
Project n .:	APPRAIS Project n.: 618781-EPP-1-2020-1-IT-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP
Work package:	WP6 Project Quality and Evaluation
Privacy Status:	Public, Partners

Revision	Dated	Author	Commentaries
V1	29/07/2021	Nabil A. Fakhre Barzan Hadi Hama Karim	Need to insert a road map for the deliverables and to add the GDPR policy (by Pisa, Oslo and Evora Universities)
V2	20/09/2021	Nabil Fakhre, Barzan Hadi Hama Karim, Muhammad Saeed	No comments



Summary

Introduction	5
2. Quality plan	7
2.1 APPRAIS quality goals and quality principles	7
2.2 Work Package Structure and Leaders	9
2.3 Main structure of project governance	10
2.4 Quality Committee (QC)	12
2.5 Workload among WP6 leaders, UNIMED, Quality Committee and all Partners	14
3. Monitoring the Project Work Plan	15
3.1 Internal Communication and Information Management	16
3.2 Deliverables: Submission Procedures and Quality Assurance	17
3.3 Project indicators	27
4. Project evaluation	27
4.1 Purpose and principles	27
4.2 Focus of the evaluation subjects and sources	28
4.3 Project evaluation methods and sources	29
4.4 External Evaluator	29
Annexes	31
Annex I: Mid-Term Evaluation Questionnaire for Partners	31
Annex II: Final evaluation questionnaire for Partners	34
Annex III: Evaluation of Coordination Meetings and the Kick-off meeting	37
Annex IV: Training evaluation form	38
Annex V: Study Visits / Field visits evaluation form	40
Annex VI: Terms of Reference for External Evaluation to the APPRAIS project	41
Annex VII: Template for Quality report (mid-term and final)	45



Introduction

Governance, quality, accountability: A Piloting Reform Process in Kurdistan region of Iraq (henceforth known as APPRAIS) is a project funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union. From 2021 to 2024 the project, led by UNIMED – Mediterranean Universities Union- will gather a consortium of eight Iraqi Kurdistan state universities, the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research KRG in Iraq and four European universities.

The main objective of the project is to enhance governance and strategic planning of Higher Education institutions in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq by improving quality assurance tools and through the implementation of the Bologna process. The project seeks to setting up a pilot reform on governance, quality assurance, training of university leaders, and educational tools such as credit mobility schemes. The project is in line with structural project objectives as it aims to enable a reform process that the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research KRI in Iraq would initialize to transform HEIs in accordance with the Bologna process. The project clearly links its main rationale to the Ministry strategy for higher education, as well as to other related official documents and strategies for modernization and internationalization of governance in HEIs. The project's innovative elements are tied to the generation of new governance structures for Kurdish higher education institutions in order to enhance the region's ability to catch up with European higher education systems.

In order to support the success of APPRAIS in the achievement of its ambitious objectives, it is key to establish proper quality and evaluation procedures enabling the effective monitoring of the project progress and accompanying the project throughout its development. The present Quality and



Evaluation Plan is elaborated to document quality and evaluation procedures and to guide the consortium in the effective and efficient performance of the project foreseen activities. Quality assurance and Evaluation are the joint responsibility of all APPRAIS partners until complete discharge of all obligations under the EU project.

The main goals of this Project Quality and Evaluation Plan are to provide guidelines on:

- 1) The architecture of the project governance
- 2) The role of partners in guaranteeing the smooth development of the project
- 3) The documentation of the project progress
- 4) The anticipation and identification of critical situations endangering project development and the prompt launch (where necessary) of remedial actions
- 5) The monitoring of project progress in terms of quality of the content of deliverables and of the nature of the networking/valorisation/dissemination actions launched with a formative and summative evaluation approach
- 6) The tools made available to support quality and evaluation activities in APPRAIS.

The Plan is articulated in two main parts: Section 2 concerns the APPRAIS quality plan and Section 3 outlines the project evaluation plan. Integration between evaluation and quality assurance activities and project management at the project level will help to facilitate the management of contingencies that may occur as the project develops. Monitoring and evaluation will feed into Project Management providing it with instruments for project self-review and improvement.

Within this plan the following tools are included as annexes:

- 1) Annex I: Mid-Term evaluation questionnaire for Partners (intermediate results)
- 2) Annex II: Final evaluation questionnaire for Partners (final results)
- 3) Annex III: Evaluation of Coordination Meetings
- 4) Annex IV: Training evaluation form
- 5) Annex V: Study visit/ Field visits evaluation form
- 6) Annex VI: Terms of Reference for the selection of the External Evaluator
- 7) Annex VII: Template for Quality report (mid-term and final)



2. Quality plan

2.1 APPRAIS quality goals and quality principles

The goals of the activities of quality control for the APPRAIS project are the following:

- Evaluation of project results through the establishment of a Quality Committee, composed of one member per partner as the main contact person, plus a second person who will closely follow-up the WP6 activity with the main referent. The Quality Committee will be the strategic body responsible for assessing the relevance and appropriateness of the planned results, and will approve deliverables with reference to the qualitative and quantitative indicators of progress, including corrective measures if necessary, and recommendations for improvement.
- Drafting of the Quality Plan approved by the Quality Committee which includes the questionnaires to be sent and the monitoring tools for the project.
- Obtaining comments and feedback on the quality of training activities and services provided to participants.
- Direct observations and supervision by the Partners responsible for the evaluation and monitoring activities, with the participation of the staff of the Quality Committee in the project.
- Interim and final internal and external evaluation. The external evaluator will be contracted to conduct the external evaluation on the implementation of the project. This expert will assess the progress and success of the activities against the project indicators and propose actions to improve the overall effectiveness of the results.

The project quality principles are:

- **Flexibility**



The capability to adjust the project and/or make changes should be notified and explained in written form. The changes or the adjustments are approved by all partners before becoming effective. The project is amendable to adapt to emerging needs identified during the project life-cycle.

- **Participation**

The participation of all the partners in all project meetings and/ or events and their full involvements guarantee the success of the project. All decisions taken together with the operational specifications of the activities are recorded in written form.

- **Documentation**

Proper project working documentation of all the activities in written form is undoubtedly facilitating project review and management.

- **Efficacy and Effectiveness**

All the activities of the APPRAIS project are developed with purpose to produce results that support achieving the objectives of the project in terms of planned outputs in the timeframe foreseen and within the remit of working plan. The corrective measures are agreed and approved by all partners. The level of the resources employed for carrying out the activities is coherent with the resources level anticipated in the approved project. All corrective measures are approved by all partners.

- **Innovation**

The value commitment of the partners and stakeholders supports innovation.

- **Coherence**

The processes/phases produce the expected results in terms of planned outputs.

- **Transparency**

The nature and level of resourcing available and all processes are transparent to all members of the partnership.

- **Relevance**

Relevance of the processes and results/outcomes is validated periodically. If necessary, corrective measures are put in place.

These principles will be considered in every quality assurance activity of the project.



2.2 Work Package Structure and Leaders

The Work packages are sets of activities that participate in achieving the same goal in the project or in achieving a result. The following table presents the project's work package leaders:

Table 2: Project work Package leaders			
WP N.	Type of work	Title of work package	WP leader & co-leader
WP1	Preparation	Update Needs assessment	P8 University of Duhok (co-leader P1 UNIMED)
WP2	Development	Definition of a roadmap for a better university governance and implementation of bologna process at KRI HEIs	P5, University of Evora (co-leader P13 Charmo University)
WP3	Development	Strategic Planning, Management and Quality Assurance: Capacity Building action	P2 University of Pisa, Co-leader P7, Sulaymania University
WP4	Development	Bologna process implementation at KRI Universities: Recognition of credits and learning mobility	P4 (Murcia University) – co-leader Zakho University, P12
WP5	Development	Restitution and harmonization phase towards a Shared Strategic Plan for University Reform	P14 (Ministry of HE) – co-leader P11, Garmian University
WP6	Quality plan	Project Quality and Evaluation	P6 Salahaddin University and the co-leader P9, Halabja University
WP7	Dissemination and Exploitation	Dissemination and Exploitation	P10, DPU (co-lead P1 UNIMED)



WP8	Management	Management	P1, UNIMED (Italy)
-----	------------	------------	--------------------

2.3 Main structure of project governance

In order to resolve issues and manage problems that arise during the project life cycle, and to consider recommendations on planning project deliverables, a project management is to be structured which entails all the key elements of effective and high-quality coordination of the project activities to reform governance, enhance quality assurance and develop strategic planning of Higher Education institutions in an effective and robust way in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq. The management activities will include the coordination of the “technical” tasks of the project, the overall legal, contractual, ethical, financial and administrative management of the consortium, the coordination of knowledge management and other innovation-related activities. The structure of APPRAIS Project Management is organized into four main bodies, corresponding to different decision-making levels:

- a) Project Manager (PM)
- b) Assembly of Partners (AoP)
- c) Steering Committee (SC)
- d) Quality and Evaluation Team (WP6 leader and co-leader)

The Project Manager (PM)

The PM, who is appointed by UNIMED, ensures quality project execution by providing the needed skills to manage international initiatives linked to cutting-edge education and technologies. The PM will be the main interface between the consortium and the EACEA. Her main mission is the day-to-day management and overall supervision of activities and she is:

- o Ultimately responsible of the overall legal, contractual, ethical, financial, administrative management, revision and reporting;



- Responsible to ensure that project progress is constantly monitored, assessed and maintained at high quality standards, through intermediate checks and peer review of all deliverables;
- Acts as the main interface between the consortium and the Executive Agency;
- Interacts on a regular basis with WP and tasks leaders to make sure that technical work is carried out according to the provisions set in the description of work and within the scheduled deadlines.

The Assembly of Partners (AoP):

The AoP is composed of one representative for each project partner. Chaired by the Coordinator. AoP is a forum where the positions of individual partners are represented. AoP is consulted and regularly informed about decisions pertaining to issues of relevance to all partners such as: amendments of the Grant Agreement, changes in budget allocation among project partners and any other corrective measure.

The Steering Committee (SC):

The SC, which is composed of representatives of the WP leaders, is in charge of strategic input to the project. This does not entail direct action or modifications to the work-plan (which are under responsibility of the PM) but it is responsible for dissemination, communication and relations with stakeholders, and project sustainability.

The Quality & Evaluation Team (Q&E Team):

The University of Salahaddin-Erbil (leader of the WP6) and the University of Halabja (co-leader of the WP6) will be in charge of the success of the Quality Assurance and Control of the APPRAIS project and the involvement of all the partners.

The Quality and Evaluation Team is then composed by the staff members of the leader of the WP6 (University of Salahaddin-Erbil) and the staff members of the co-leader, University of Halabja, and the UNIMED team as coordinator of the entire project. The Q&E Team is then responsible for:

1. The definition of indicators and monitoring procedures within this plan
2. The design and submission of evaluation tools
3. The draft of the internal evaluation reports (mid-term and final)
4. The relation with the external evaluator

Decision making process



Decisions will normally be taken by consensus. In the unlikely case that voting becomes necessary, the majority of votes of the AoP decides. The vote of the PM, being ex-officio member, is only counted in case of an equal number of pro and contra votes. Decisions will be collected in the AoP minutes and distributed to all partners with minimum delay and no later than 5 working days after the AoP meeting.

2.4 Quality Committee (QC)

The APPRAIS Quality Committee (QC) will be the strategic body in charge of internal control and monitoring and will approve the quality of the planned results with reference to the qualitative and quantitative indicators of progress (Logical Framework Matrix) and the ones set up the Q&E team. The QC will assess the results of the project during the execution of the activities and at the end of the works.

The QC will act according to a peer review system internal to the project so that the intermediate results and the expected results will have to be validated by project partners different from those who carried out the task.

Operation strategy

It will meet virtually twice a year and the work will develop mainly by e-mail. The QC will organize one or more additional meetings and define adaptation measures if the results of the project are not achieved within the expected period or with the expected quality. In the event of non-compliance with the expected quality standards, this will result in a management alert, which may eventually lead to corrective actions.

Main responsibilities of the APPRAIS Quality Committee

The Quality Committee is in charge of the quality assurance of the project, including process and progress assessment. It is thus responsible for:

1. The quality assessment of the project results
2. The peer-review of the project deliverables
3. The validation of the quality reports



Composition of the Quality Committee

The Quality Committee is composed of two representatives of each of the project partners. As a reference, the main person could be the director of quality assurance and the second person could be anyone who has expertise in project management, leadership, international relations and others. The composition of the Quality Committee has been discussed during the project kick-off meeting organised online in February 2021 and the dedicated WP session in March 2021, and is composed as it is shown in the table below:

Table 1: Quality Committee		
Partner	Main reference	Second person
UNIMED (Coordinator)	Silvia Marchionne	Federica De Giorgi
University of Pisa	Roberta Moruzzo	Simone D'Alessandro
University of Oslo	Guri Vestad	Bjarn Olav Utvik
University of Murcia	María Jesús Periago	Constanza Saavedra
University of Evora	Carlos Godinho	Luís Pardal
Salahaddin University-Erbil	Nabil Fakhre	Mohammed Azeez
University of Sulaymania	Ava Omar Fatah	Aysser Ab. Abdulrahman
University of Duhok	Sarhat M Adam	Ismail Amin Ali
University of Halabja	Barzan Hama Karim	Aram Mohammed Amin Qadir
Duhok Polytechnic University	Karzan Awni Abduljabar	Muhammad Duhoki
University of Garmian	Ahmed Rashid Tarkhany	Drivan Jalal Al-Bajalan
University of Zakho	Dler Jameel	Islam Babela
Charmo University	Lanja Haidar	Ako Khalid Mohammed
Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research-KRG	Mohammed Ahmed Hussein	Hawkar Rashid Arab



2.5 Workload among WP6 leaders, UNIMED, Quality Committee and all Partners

WP Number	TASKS	RESPONSIBLE	IN COLLABORATION WITH (Feedback, review)	PARTICIPANTS
WP6	Mid-term evaluation report (external)	External Evaluator	Quality Committee	All the partners
	Final evaluation report (external)	External Evaluator	Quality Committee	All the partners
	Mid-term quality report (internal)	Salahaddin University- Erbil	Halabja University; UNIMED	Quality Committee
	Final quality report (internal)	Salahaddin University- Erbil	Halabja University + UNIMED	Quality Committee
WP8	Questionnaire for the evaluation of the project KoM	Salahaddin University- Erbil	Salahaddin University- Erbil + UNIMED	All the partners
	Report on the evaluation of the KoM	Salahaddin University- Erbil	Halabja University + UNIMED	All the partners
	Questionnaire for evaluation of all the mid-term project management meetings	Halabja University	Salahaddin University + UNIMED	All the partners
	Report on evaluation of all the mid-term project management meetings	Halabja University	Salahaddin University- Erbil + UNIMED	All the partners



Furthermore, all the **evaluation questionnaires submission related to training activities in Kurdistan (WP3), of the field visits in Europe (WP4) and the consultation workshop in Kurdistan (WP5) and the related evaluation reports** are performed by Salaheddin University with the collaboration of Halabja University and UNIMED.

3. Monitoring the Project Work Plan

The scope of monitoring the project processes is to ensure:

- a) that work in each task is consistent with the general workflow of the project;
- b) that resources are used properly as planned and committed, and
- c) that a reasonable time-plan is adopted. In order to ensure the above-mentioned issues.

The following procedure is introduced:

1. Before the starting date of a work package, the work package leader forwards a work-plan to be discussed with the project manager.
2. The project manager checks the quality of the workplan for verifiability and feasibility, together with the project quality leader. A consolidated version of this work package plan will be made available to all project partners.
3. The work package leader and the project manager monitor the on-going work against the work package plan and establish together issues and deviations from plan. Issues which concern only the work package are handled directly within the work package team. Long term actions and issues where the interdependence with other work packages is concerned or where the success of the project is affected, are dealt within the AoP. Short term corrective actions are taken by the work package leader in accordance with the project manager.

WP leaders are responsible to monitor the progress of their own WP. The project Coordinator is responsible to monitor the overall progress of the project. In case of deviations from the original plans within a specific WP, corrective actions should be taken through a shared approach and should primarily be adopted within the respective work package itself. The main concern of corrective



actions on a project management basis is the quality and timeliness of project deliverables. Deviations from plan of formal project output will be documented by the project manager. If only one WP is concerned, the work package leader will supply an updated work plan for the work package. If the work of other work packages or the success of the whole project is endangered because of late or poor performance, the project manager will inform immediately the AoP, that will elaborate an up-dated project plan.

3.1 Internal Communication and Information Management

Operational communication among partners will take place through the project mailing list (apprais@googlegroups.com) and via audio-conference and video-conference, but these means will need to be complemented by regular face-to-face meetings.

In regard to legal and ethical issues, all the material produced will be available to all partners and they will be acknowledged and attributed alongside consortium ownership/authorship. Intellectual property generated by any particular partner will be fully acknowledged, while the project will support the principle of sharing knowledge and building on it to produce new understandings. Moreover, transfer of sensitive personal data will comply with the EU GDPR-regulations.

Circulation of documents will depend upon their nature:

- Official deliverables: WP Leaders will be responsible for the production and delivery of deliverables to the project Coordinator and the whole Consortium. The PM will be responsible for the delivery of the approved documents to the Agency.
- Progress and final reports, cost statements will follow the rules provided in the Grant Agreement and the instructions provided on the “E+CBHE Guidelines for the Use of the Grant” (https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus-plus/events/erasmus-capacity-building-in-higher-education-granholders-meeting_en).
- Working documents will be circulated by partners through the project mailing list or to a selected set of partners collaborating on the specific document (depending on the nature of the document). The project Coordinator will always be copied.



- As for project administrative documents, the project financial officer from the Coordinating institution will assure the circulation of cost statements and all relevant documents. The project PM will always be copied.
- English is the official language of the project
- All relevant documents will be uploaded and versioned in the project shared folder.
- Public deliverables will be made available on the project website.

Communications between Partners may also occur informally, through bilateral calls or chats. However, official communications must be delivered through the means above mentioned.

3.2 Deliverables: Submission Procedures and Quality Assurance

Each Deliverable is assigned to one leading responsible partner. This partner will have the responsibility that the deliverable is approved in terms of content, presentation and linguistic quality and is submitted to the European Commission through the Coordinator on time.

More specifically the responsible partner assures that the content of a deliverable is consistent with the output of the team working on the deliverable and that the overall goals of the project are met. Any issues endangering the success of the work package or the project have to be reported immediately to the project Coordinator. Each deliverable will be reviewed by the Quality Committee through a peer-reviewing process to assess the quality of the result.

The submission procedure for deliverables ensures that the formal output of the project has met the agreed internal quality standards. Deliverables have to be submitted in standard form using the template made available in the shared folder.

A complete list of APPRAIS deliverables with planned delivery dates is presented in the table below.

Table 3: list of the project deliverables			
WP	WP leader & co-leader	Deliverables	Due date



WP1	P8 University of Duhok co-leader P1 UNIMED	D1.1 Report stock taking of governance framework including glossary	31/05/2020
		D2.2 Report on the field visits in KRI provinces (Erbil, Sulaymaniyah & Duhok)	31/07/2020
		D3.3 Final report of the update needs analysis (included desk research, self-evaluation and field visits reports)	30/09/2020
WP2	P5 University of Evora co-leader P13 Charmo University	D2.1 Designing of roadmap: aims, mission, workplan	30/11/2021
		D2.2 Consultative workshop report	31/03/2022
WP3	P2 University of Pisa co-leader P7 Sulaymania University	D3.1 Report on the training week in Oslo	31/05/2022
		D3.2 Report on the three local training workshops in KRI and on restitution workshop performed	31/08/2022
		D3.3 Report on study visit in Pisa and Evora performed	30/11/2022



WP4	P4 Murcia University co-leader P12 Zakho University	D4.1 Report on the study visits performed in Italy and Spain	31/12/2022
		D4.2 Online training platform & handbook	28/02/2023
WP5	P14 Ministry of HE co-leader P1, Garmian University	D5.1 Report on the restitution event	31/05/2023
		D5.2 Report on ToT activities performed at institutional and national level	31/08/2023
		D5.3 Strategic Plan approved by the Ministry and adopted by the HEIs	31/12/2023
WP6	P6 Salahaddin University- Erbil co-leader P9 Halabja University	D6.1 Quality and Evaluation Plan	31/03/2021
		D6.2 Mid-Term evaluation report	30/06/2022
		D6.3 Final evaluation report	14/01/2024
WP7	P10 Duhok Polytechnic University co-lead P1 UNIMED	D7.1 Dissemination and exploitation plan	15/02/2021



		D7.2 Project website	31/03/2021
		D7.3 Dissemination and branding materials	31/03/2021 31/08/2023
		D7.4 Final project conference	14/01/2024
WP8	P1, UNIMED (Italy)	D8.1 Project Management Handbook	28/02/2021
		D8.2 Reports on plenary meetings (KOM, mid-term meeting and final meeting)	Multiple dates 14/01/2024
		D8.3 Virtual Meetings	14/01/2024

Quality assurance of deliverables will be guaranteed by the following steps:

1. Deliverables must be sent to the project coordinator (UNIMED) at the latest two weeks prior to the due date by the WP leader.
2. At the same time, the partner responsible for the deliverable makes the deliverable available to all project partners either by email or through the project platform for internal review and collects remarks and suggestions. The feedback period for project partners depends on the time schedule, but will usually last at least 5 working days. Feedback is sent directly to the responsible partner with the mailing list in cc, to allow social commenting on the documents.
3. The deliverable is considered validated. In some specific cases, in particular where the result has a high relevance for the continuation of the project, the deliverable is discussed during plenary meetings to allow a process of feedback sharing and discussion.



4. The deliverable is then sent to the Quality Committee for the quality assessment.

Here follows a **Roadmap for the quality control of the deliverables**. This roadmap summarises what has to be achieved by the project regarding procedures related to management and quality control. It is a fundamental working tool that every partner is invited to refer to, when a deliverable is to be prepared, or progress is to be reported.



WP	Deliverables	Goal	Milestone	Gaps and barriers	Actions	Due date	Evaluation indicators	Evaluation Tools
WP1	D1.1 Report stock taking of governance framework including glossary	First draft of the report which will include governance Frameworks based on the comprehensive desk research, and a Governance Glossary.	Generate a reference on governance models, and standardize the concepts and terminologies of governance, quality assurance and Bologna process among consortium institutions.	Many sources Differences in the HE sectors between countries Differences in the understanding of concepts Language barriers	Desk research Identification of BP Selection of Terms Compiling definitions Collaborative work.	31/05/2020	N.1 Report delivered N.1 Governance Glossary drafted	Monitoring on behalf of the Quality Committee on deadlines and contents. Peer review.
	D2.2 Report on the field visits in KRI provinces (Erbil, Sulaymaniyah & Duhok)	Investigation and assessment of the major governance Dimensions on site.	Identify gaps and priorities at the Kurdish HEIs to be addressed.	Limitations in travelling due to the Covid-19 pandemic Language barriers Availability of key figures	Field Visits Discussion with institutional strategic figures Reporting	31/07/2020	N.3 Field visits conducted in the Kurdistan region of Iraq	Monitoring on behalf of the Quality Committee on deadlines and contents. Questionnaire delivered to Partners.
	D3.3 Final report of the update needs analysis (included desk research, self-evaluation and field visits reports)	Defining a comprehensive report of the HE sectors, governance, quality assurance and Bologna process implementation in Kurdistan.	Building a knowledge base and an updated needs assessment on the Kurdish HE system.	Difficulties in the knowledge and understanding of the dimensions under evaluation Language barriers Availability of key figures	Self-assessment on behalf of the 8 Kurdish universities	30/09/2020	<8 self-assessment conducted by the Kurdish Universities <40 respondents covering strategic roles at the HEI	Monitoring on behalf of the Quality Committee on deadlines and contents. Peer review.



WP2	D2.1 Designing of roadmap: aims, mission, workplan	Definition of a roadmap for each Kurdish university of the Consortium presenting their goals and path for modernization.	Present the aims, mission and detailed workplan that each HEIs in Kurdistan would like to implement to improve their governance system and adopt the Bologna process.	Staff capacity and competences Generating a link with the institutional strategic plan	Internal consultations Definition of aim and mission Definition of an institutional workplan Drafting of the roadmap	30/11/2021	N. 8 of Institutional Roadmaps	Monitoring on behalf of the Quality Committee on deadlines and contents. Peer review.
	D2.2 Consultative workshop report	The consultation workshop will allow, through sharing of experiences among different university governance systems (Italy, Spain, Portugal and Norway) and among KRI HEIs, that each one can learn from each other.	The roadmaps will be presented to the whole consortium, discussed and validated by all the partners.	Availability of key figures and Partners	Organization of the workshop	31/03/2022	N.1 Consultative workshop at national level	Monitoring on behalf of the Quality Committee.
WP3	D3.1 Report on the training week in Oslo	The training week in Oslo is meant at training university staff and leaders on strategic planning, university management, quality assurance and credits recognition.	Training key university staff members to support the definition of the institutional strategic plan	Availability of participants Difficulties in travelling Difficulties for the transmission of knowledge	Planning of training activities Selection and engagement of participants Selection and engagement of trainers Delivery of the training Reporting	31/05/2022	< 32 of staff trained in Oslo, Norway	Monitoring on behalf of the Quality Committee on deadlines and contents. Questionnaire delivered to Partners.



	D3.2 Report on the three local training workshops in KRI and on restitution workshop performed	The local workshops are meant to transfer the knowledge at all levels at beneficiary universities. A harmonization event will be finally held with all participants.	Contribute to definition of the vision and development strategy for each Kurdish HEIs, and implementation of institutional action plan. The final event will capitalise on the experiences, lessons learnt and good practices shared in each local training.	Availability of participants Difficulties for the transmission of knowledge Difficulties in travelling and taking part to the restitution workshop	Planning of training workshops Selection and engagement of participants Selection and engagement of trainers Delivery of the training Organization of the Restitution workshop Reporting	31/08/2022	< 80 of staff training during the three local training workshops in Kurdistan	Monitoring on behalf of the Quality Committee on deadlines and contents. Questionnaire delivered to Partners.
	D3.3 Report on study visit in Pisa and Evora performed	Field visits and exchange of good practices and practical examples on QA. On-the-job training on quality mechanisms, standards, practices.	Providing staff members with competences and practices for the implementation of quality standard according to the strategy provided by the Kurdish Ministry.	Availability of participants Difficulties in travelling Difficulties in the transmission of knowledge	Organization of the study visits Reporting	30/11/2022	< 24 staff members taking part in the field visits in Pisa and Evora	Monitoring on behalf of the Quality Committee on deadlines and contents. Questionnaire delivered to Partners.
WP4	D4.1 Report on the study visits performed in Italy and Spain	Field visits and exchange of good practices and practical examples on internationalization, learning mobility, Bologna process implementation.	See on the ground how the Bologna process is implemented and how could be adopted by Kurdish HEIs staff and university leaders.	Availability of participants Difficulties in travelling Difficulties in the transmission of knowledge	Organization of the study visits Reporting	31/12/2022	< 24 staff members taking part in the field visits in Rome and Murcia	Monitoring on behalf of the Quality Committee on deadlines and contents. Questionnaire delivered to Partners.



	D4.2 Online training platform & handbook	Set-up and promotion of an online training platform. Development of a "Good Governance Guidelines Handbook".	Capitalise all the training activities performed, guarantee the sustainability of the training, create a space where all training materials are available to beneficiaries and others. The handbook will summarize the main recommendations and techniques for strategic planning, improve governance and implement the Bologna process.	Limited digital competences of learners Difficulties in engaging participants in online learning Difficulties in the identification of transferable practices suitable in the Kurdish context	Setting up of the platform for online learning Engagement of learners Drafting of the handbook	28/02/2023	Visits on the online training platform by HEIs in Kurdistan inside and outside the consortium	Monitoring on behalf of the Quality Committee. Peer review. Monitoring the visits on the platform.
WP5	D5.1 Report on the restitution event	Cross-presentation workshop to present the training results.	Share the respective experiences and learnings and transmit and build a logic of complementarity between all the beneficiaries.	Availability of participants	Organization of the event Reporting	31/05/2023	N.1 Report delivered	Monitoring on behalf of the Quality Committee.
	D5.2 Report on ToT activities performed at institutional and national level	Training of trainers activities performed at each Kurdish university.	Generating a cascade effect of the capacity building action, involving	Availability of participants Difficulties for the transmission of knowledge	Planning of training activities Selection and engagement of participants	31/08/2023	N. 160 staff members trained during the ToT activities at	Monitoring on behalf of the Quality Committee.



			university staff and in a later stage also HEIs not partners of the project.		Selection and engagement of trainers Delivery of the training Reporting		institutional and national level	Questionnaire delivered to participants.
	D5.3 Strategic Plan approved by the Ministry and adopted by the HEIs	Definition of a strategic plan for each HEI based on the roadmap defined at the beginning of the project.	Strategy on quality assurance, recognition of credits, and university governance and management.	Difficulties in generating consensus over the new strategic plan Delays in the validation process	Definition of the strategic plan Validation process on behalf of the university leadership and the Ministry.	31/12/2023	N. 8 Strategic Institutional Plans available and ready for consultation	Monitoring on behalf of the Quality Committee. Peer review.



3.3 Project indicators

The following table introduces project indicators regarding the different activities, inspired from the schemes and frameworks described in the approved project application.

Table 4: list of project indicators
N.8 institutional self-assessments performed by the Kurdish HEIs at the beginning of the project
N.8 institutional survey performed by the Kurdish HEIs at the end of the project
N.3 Field visits conducted in the Kurdistan region of Iraq
N. 8 of Institutional Roadmaps
N.1 Consultative workshop at national level
N. 4 Records and reports of the trainings
< 32 of staff trained in Oslo, Norway
< 80 of staff training during the three local training workshops in Kurdistan
< 24 staff members taking part in the field visits in Pisa and Evora
< 24 staff members taking part in the field visits in Rome and Murcia
Visits on the online training platform by HEIs in Kurdistan inside and outside the consortium
N. 160 staff members trained during the ToT activities at institutional and national level
N. 8 Strategic Institutional Plans available and ready for consultation
< 6 Monitoring reports delivered (internal and external)
< 100 participants at the final project conference

4. Project evaluation

4.1 Purpose and principles

The main purposes of the project evaluation within the APPRAIS project are threefold as follows:

- **Formative purposes** are to serve how the project is being developed, managed and the participation of the partners in terms of respecting the deadlines, quality criteria as well as potential corrective measures.

- **Summative purposes** serve as a means to find out whether the expected results and achieved results match each other as well as provide a foundation to understand how well the resources used (efficiency) in order to impact target groups effectively.
- **Learning purposes** are to identify the crucial and critical success factors that make the project activities successful as well as the overall assessment of the “lessons” that can be drawn throughout the project development.

The main evaluation principles of the project are the following:

- **Integrating formative and summative approaches to evaluation.** The formative approach means to provide in-progress feedback on how the project is being developed as well as to enable refinements and/or changes whenever a problem is identified by means of evaluation. The summative approach is used to determine if the stated objectives have been met and their impacts have been produced.
- **A multi-disciplinary approach** is to be adopted in order to consider different dimensions of evaluation such as pedagogical, institutional, technological, and socio-cultural.
- **Flexibility and applicability.** The evaluation principles to be flexible and applicable in order to collect necessary data in an easy and transparent manner.

4.2 Focus of the evaluation subjects and sources

In order to compose a coherent evaluation plan for the purposes of the APPRAIS project, the scope of the evaluation activities will be limited to:

- **Project Management performance.** The focus of the evaluation plan is to emphasize on linkages between the evaluations itself and the activities that are traditionally associated with project management through the lifecycle of the project development process.
- **Communication patterns.** The overall communication patterns set up in the Quality Plan are to be constantly monitored to ensure efficiency and effectiveness.
- **Quality of the outcomes obtained.** The quality of outcomes will undergo a process of internal and external evaluation based on the provided scheme, through evaluation discussions at project meetings and by replying to evaluation questionnaires. The actors involved in the monitoring of quality will be project manager, the members of the both Assembling

Committee and Steering Committee as well Quality Committee members in collaboration with the External Quality Expert.

4.3 Project evaluation methods and sources

The evaluation activities are the following:

1. Mid-term evaluation questionnaire, collected on six-monthly basis, to promote self-reflection of the members of the working group on adopted methods, procedures, achievements, and processes within the partnership and with the project manager group. The results will feed the Interim Evaluation Report. (See Annex I)
2. Evaluation of Coordination Meetings questionnaires from the participants of during the project events (meetings) in relation to processes toward the outputs, in order to collect feedback and comments on the project and the perception of the outcomes (See Annex III)
3. Training evaluation form for the training participants to get the feedback to ensure the usefulness and effectiveness of the training sessions (See Annex IV)
4. Field visit evaluation form for the training participants to get the feedback to ensure the usefulness and effectiveness of field visits sessions (See Annex V)
5. Final evaluation questionnaire, administered to partners towards the end of the project in order to assess if the project objectives had been achieved and project progressing has been effective. The results will feed the Final Evaluation Report. (See Annex II).

Additionally, monitoring activities will be performed by the External Evaluator which may be willing to integrate results providing Partners with additional evaluation tools.

4.4 External Evaluator

In order to get an external view and feedback on the activities and quality of work in the project, an External Evaluator is identified and subcontracted by the project coordinator, who will perform the external monitoring and evaluation of the project.

The External Evaluator will provide a mid-term and a final evaluation reports (month 21 and 36).

The external monitoring and evaluation include the evaluation of:

- partnership performance (quality of the management and WP leaderships, effectiveness of communication, meeting deadlines, etc.);
- progress toward the contractual outcomes and respect of the workplan;
- effectiveness and impact of dissemination activities.

The External Quality Expert will be responsible for

- the compliance with the quality principles;
- the monitoring of quality indicators for each item;
- the design of monitoring procedures;
- the design and submission of evaluation tools to evaluate the project plenary meetings and the overall management;
- the collection of data and analysis;
- the co-operation with the internal Quality and Evaluation Team and integration of results;
- the elaboration of external evaluation reports.

The work of the external evaluator is meant to monitor project progressing and make recommendations. Based on a participatory approach, the results of the external evaluation will be shared and discussed within the partnership during the project meetings. On the basis of recommendations from the External Evaluator and feedback from partners, corrective actions will be taken whenever necessary. The external evaluation will be focusing on the quality of the project activities and results, and will support the project activities starting from the actual impact of the outcomes resulting from each activity streamline. The external evaluator will collaborate closely with the PM, supporting the internal evaluation mechanisms providing an independent perspective for quality assurance.

The Terms of Reference for the selection of the External Evaluator have been developed by the project Coordinator UNIMED, and made available online on the UNIMED website and on project partners website where possible. The TOR are available in Annex V.

Annexes

Annex I: Mid-Term Evaluation Questionnaire for Partners

Management, including decision-making, consultation and problem-solving

1. Overall rating of the project coordination

Mark only one option

- very good
- good
- on average
- bad
- very bad

2. Please describe the problems encountered as well as the positive aspects that are related to the project coordination

.....

.....

Any recommendation to improve the project management

.....

.....

Scheduling, task assignment, work process, and deadline monitoring

3. Overall, how would you rate the quality of the project scheduling, task assignment, work process, and deadline monitoring?

Mark only one option

- very good
- good
- on average
- bad
- very bad

4. Please describe the problems as well as the positive aspects that are related to project scheduling, task assignment, work process, and deadline monitoring

.....

.....



Any suggestions about project progressing?

.....
.....

Quality of outcomes and results

Aspect	OVERALL RATING	Problems ENCOUNTERED	Satisfactory aspects	ADDITIONAL comments
Quality of project results	<input type="checkbox"/> very good <input type="checkbox"/> good <input type="checkbox"/> on average <input type="checkbox"/> bad <input type="checkbox"/> very bad			
Coherence with the project objectives	<input type="checkbox"/> very good <input type="checkbox"/> good <input type="checkbox"/> on average <input type="checkbox"/> bad <input type="checkbox"/> very bad			
Trasferability potential of project results	<input type="checkbox"/> very good <input type="checkbox"/> good <input type="checkbox"/> on average <input type="checkbox"/> bad <input type="checkbox"/> very bad			

Internal communication among partners

5. In general, how do you rate the internal communication among the project partners?

Mark only one option

- very good
- good
- on average
- bad
- very bad

6. Please describe the main weakness and the positive aspects of the project internal communication (from the coordinator and between partners)

.....
.....



Recommended action to improve the project internal communications (from the coordinator and between partners)

.....
.....

Dissemination of the project

7. How do you evaluate the APPRAIS website?

Mark only one option

- very good
- good
- neither good nor bad
- bad
- very bad

8. Any suggestions to improve the APPRAIS website?

.....
.....

9. How do you evaluate the APPRAIS dissemination efforts put in place?

Mark only one option

- very good
- good
- neither good nor bad
- bad
- very bad

10. Any suggestions to improve the APPRAIS dissemination?

.....
.....



Annex II: Final evaluation questionnaire for Partners

Please provide for each aspect of the evaluation a quantitative assessment as well as a qualitative explanation justifying your quantitative assessment.

1. OVERALL Project EVALUATION

Aspect	OVERALL RATING	Problems ENCOUNTERED	Positive/satisfactory aspects	ADDITIONAL comments
In which way did the project achieve its planned objectives? very good	<input type="checkbox"/> very good <input type="checkbox"/> good <input type="checkbox"/> on average <input type="checkbox"/> bad <input type="checkbox"/> very bad			
How do you rate the consortium collaboration in reaching the project objectives?	<input type="checkbox"/> very good <input type="checkbox"/> good <input type="checkbox"/> on average <input type="checkbox"/> bad <input type="checkbox"/> very bad			
How do you rate the impact of the project among target groups?	<input type="checkbox"/> very good <input type="checkbox"/> good <input type="checkbox"/> on average <input type="checkbox"/> bad <input type="checkbox"/> very bad			

2. Project Management PERFORMANCE

When assessing the APPRAIS Project Management Performance up-to-date please consider aspects such as:

- ◆ Scheduling, task assignment, work process & deadline monitoring;
- ◆ Coordination i.e. decision-making, consultation and problem-solving;
- ◆ Handling of financial and administrative issues;
- ◆ Handling of management and meetings;
- ◆ Overall adjustment and alignment to the original work plan;

Aspect	OVERALL RATING	Problems ENCOUNTERED	Positive/satisfactory aspects	ADDITIONAL comments
Project Management Performance	<input type="checkbox"/> very good <input type="checkbox"/> good <input type="checkbox"/> on average <input type="checkbox"/> bad <input type="checkbox"/> very bad			

3. Communication When assessing the Internal Communication procedures of APPRAIS please think about aspects such as:

- ◆ Circulation of strategic information;
- ◆ Feedback from the Project Coordinator and Work Package leaders to questions & problems;
- ◆ Technical performance of internal communication flow e.g. through e-mail, website, internal collaboration platform

Aspect	OVERALL RATING	Problems ENCOUNTERED	Positive/satisfactory aspects	ADDITIONAL comments
Internal communication	<input type="checkbox"/> very good <input type="checkbox"/> good <input type="checkbox"/> on average <input type="checkbox"/> bad <input type="checkbox"/> very bad			

4. Quality of outcomes/Results

When assessing the quality of APPRAIS Outcomes and Results please think about aspects such as:

- ◆ Overall match between initially set objectives and outcomes/results;
- ◆ Overall integration and transferability of the project outcomes/results;
- ◆ Relevance of the outcomes/results to decision makers, to the research community, to end-users

Aspect	OVERALL RATING	Problems ENCOUNTERED	Positive/satisfactory aspects	ADDITIONAL comments
Quality of project results	<input type="checkbox"/> very good <input type="checkbox"/> good <input type="checkbox"/> on average <input type="checkbox"/> bad <input type="checkbox"/> very bad			
Coherence with the project objectives	<input type="checkbox"/> very good <input type="checkbox"/> good <input type="checkbox"/> on average <input type="checkbox"/> bad <input type="checkbox"/> very bad			
Transferability potential of project results	<input type="checkbox"/> very good <input type="checkbox"/> good <input type="checkbox"/> on average <input type="checkbox"/> bad <input type="checkbox"/> very bad			

Do you have any further comments?

.....

.....

Thank you very much



Annex III: Evaluation of Coordination Meetings and the Kick-off meeting

Coordination meeting Title:

Location:

Date:

Practical Organisation					
Please answer the following questions by marking your response using the scale provided, where 1 = very poor and 5 = very good.	Very Bad	Bad	On Average	Good	Very Good
How was the general organisation of the meeting?	1	2	3	4	5
How well designed was the Agenda for the meeting?	1	2	3	4	5
How well was the time managed during the meeting (working time, breaks, intervention, time for questions, etc)?	1	2	3	4	5
How did the room and the facilities fit the purpose?	1	2	3	4	5
How were the accommodations?	1	2	3	4	5
How was the lunch meals?	1	2	3	4	5
How was the local transportation?	1	2	3	4	5
Was the online channel chosen suitable and usable for the purpose (e.g. Zoom, GoToMeeting, MS Teams, etc.)?	1	2	3	4	5
Were all topics of importance discussed?	1	2	3	4	5
Satisfaction					
Please indicate how much you agree with the following statements by circling your response using the scale provided, where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree.	Very Bad	Bad	On Average	Good	Very Good
We shared decision-making at this meeting.	1	2	3	4	5
All meeting participants were actively involved.	1	2	3	4	5
We used our meeting time effectively.	1	2	3	4	5
I am satisfied with this meeting.	1	2	3	4	5
I enjoyed this meeting.	1	2	3	4	5
Do you have any suggestions or additional comments about this meeting?					

Annex IV: Training evaluation form

Relevance					
Please assess the following statements on a scale 1-5, where 1 = not at all, and 5 = very much					
The training content was appropriate to my field of work	1	2	3	4	5
The training content was updated as regards my ongoing work	1	2	3	4	5
The training is coherent with the future development of my institution	1	2	3	4	5
Learning resources and teaching methods were appropriate	1	2	3	4	5
Trainers were competent and provided crucial information	1	2	3	4	5
My expectation on the training were met	1	2	3	4	5
Organizational aspects					
Please assess the following statements on a scale 1-5, where 1 = not at all, and 5 = very much					
Sufficient information was provided before the training sessions	1	2	3	4	5
The training was easy to follow (synchronous and asynchronous learning)	1	2	3	4	5
The interaction between trainers and trainees was effective	1	2	3	4	5
The training content was easily accessible	1	2	3	4	5
The training organization was effective	1	2	3	4	5
Usefulness					
Please assess the following statements on a scale 1-5, where 1 = not at all, and 5 = very much					
The course further developed my skills and knowledge	1	2	3	4	5
The course content is relevant for my future professional life	1	2	3	4	5
I will use the acquired knowledge in my working routine	1	2	3	4	5
I will use the acquired knowledge in the planning of my future work	1	2	3	4	5

In general, considering content, teaching methods and resources, the training has provided me with skills useful for the future of my institution	1	2	3	4	5
Free comments					

Thank you very much



Annex V: Study Visits / Field visits evaluation form

Relevance					
Please assess the following statements on a scale 1-5, where 1 = not at all, and 5 = very much					
The study / field visit content was appropriate to my field of work	1	2	3	4	5
The study / field visit content was updated as regards my ongoing work	1	2	3	4	5
The study / field visit content was coherent with the future developments at my institution	1	2	3	4	5
Learning processes and discussed topics were appropriate	1	2	3	4	5
During the study / field visit key and crucial information were shared	1	2	3	4	5
My expectation on the study / field visit were met	1	2	3	4	5
Organizational aspects					
Please assess the following statements on a scale 1-5, where 1 = not at all, and 5 = very much					
Sufficient information was provided before the study / field visits	1	2	3	4	5
The study / field visit was well designed (Agenda, timing)	1	2	3	4	5
The Agenda for the study / field visit was well designed					
The interaction between the staff at the hosting institution and the staff at the sending institutions was effective	1	2	3	4	5
The study / field visit organization was effective	1	2	3	4	5
Usefulness					
Please assess the following statements on a scale 1-5, where 1 = not at all, and 5 = very much					
I will use the acquired knowledge in my working routine	1	2	3	4	5
I will use the acquired knowledge in the planning of my future work	1	2	3	4	5
Free comments					

Thank you very much

Annex VI: Terms of Reference for External Evaluation to the APPRAIS project

url: <https://www.uni-med.net/selezione-fornitori/>

link: https://www.uni-med.net/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/APPRAIS_ToR_External-Evaluation.pdf

TERMS OF REFERENCE

for External Evaluation to the APPRAIS project

APPRAIS – “governAnce, quality, accountability: a Piloting Reform PProcess in kurdistan region of Iraq”

Grant Agreement Number 618781-EPP-1-2020-1-IT-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP

1. Background of the project

The overarching goal of APPRAIS is to support, through the cooperation of European institutions, the rebuilding and modernisation of the governance system of higher education institutions (HEIs) in Kurdistan region of Iraq with a specific focus on strategic planning, quality assurance and Bologna process implementation. Due to the recent crisis and political economic situation, the current higher education system requires a strong intervention to face the weakness of the existing governance system by benefiting from the European expertise.

To institutionalize good governance practices in Iraqi HEIs, which also means enforcing institutional values such as autonomy, accountability, quality assurance, and internationalization, as well as implementing well-structured management systems, will contribute to the development of HEIs in Kurdistan region of Iraq helping them to meet the international standards.

Therefore, the overall aim of the project is to support HEIs in Kurdistan region of Iraq in order to make them capable of establishing a modern governance framework through the adoption and implementation of Bologna process.

More specifically, it seeks to:

- Enhancing good governance, by strengthening the definition and development of HEIs roadmap;
- Improving HEIs capacities on quality assurance mechanisms, strategic planning, management and accountability practices;
- Supporting the implementation of Bologna Process within HEIs in Kurdistan region of Iraq by improving knowledge on recognition of credits and learning mobility;
- Adopting the university reform on good governance and Bologna process at each HEIs, through the definition and validation of institutional action plans

The main project results are:

- State of the art on governance and quality assurance in the universities of Kurdistan region of Iraq
- University roadmap for better university governance and implementation of Bologna process in the HEIs of Kurdistan region of Iraq

- 56 university leaders (presidents, vice-presidents, heads of IROs and QA responsables) upskilled on strategic planning, quality assurance and credits recognition
- 80 administrative staff upskilled on university administrative management, quality assurance and internationalisation strategies
- Further 160 university staff (20 people from each HEI) benefit from the institutional ToTs during the harmonisation phase
- 8 shared strategic institutional plans validated by the KRI Ministry and adopted by the HEIs in Kurdistan.

The project is funded in the framework of the Erasmus+ CBHE Programme of the European Union under the Grant agreement number 618781-EPP-1-2020-1-IT-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP

The project is carried out by:

1. UNIMED – Mediterranean Universities Union, Italy (coordinator)
2. Università di Pisa, Italy
3. Oslo University, Norway
4. University of Murcia, Spain
5. University of Evora, Portugal
6. Salahaddin University- Erbil, Iraq
7. University of Sulaymania, Iraq
8. University of Duhok, Iraq
9. Halabja University, Iraq
10. Duhok Polytechnic University, Iraq
11. University of Garmian, Iraq
12. University of Zakho, Iraq
13. Charmo University, Iraq
14. Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research, KRG, Iraq

Project duration: From 15 January 2021 to 14 January 2024

2. Objectives and Key Principles of the Evaluation

The aim of the external monitoring and evaluation is to ensure that monitoring of the project is performed adequately and accurately. It identifies procedures, criteria and resources for monitoring the project. It also deals with the evaluation of the progress of the project, risk and issue management and with the evaluation of the results in comparison with the needs of the target group(s) and sector(s).

The external monitoring and evaluation includes the evaluation of:

- partnership performance (quality of the management and WP leaderships, effectiveness of communication, meeting deadlines, etc.);
- progress toward the contractual outcomes and respect of the work plan.
- quality and relevance of the project outcomes in reaching the set objectives.

Furthermore, the partners will identify key areas of concern for additional evaluation.

- In the framework of APPRAIS the External Quality Expert(s) will contribute to:

- the monitoring of effectiveness and impact of management activities; partnership performance; progress toward the contractual outcomes and respect of the contractual work plan;
- the definition of monitoring procedures;
- the design of tools to evaluate the project plenary meetings and the overall management;
- the analysis of data collected;
- the evaluation of the quality and appropriateness of the project results;

The External Quality Expert(s) will take part in in at least 2 in-presence meetings;

- take part in all the online meetings, upon availability;
- co-operate with the Quality Manager and the Management Committee and integrate the results derived from the internal evaluations with the results of the external evaluations;
- elaborate evaluation reports;

The results of the evaluation will be shared and discussed within the partnership. On the basis of recommendations from Evaluators and feedback from partners, corrective actions will be taken if necessary.

3. Contents of the Evaluation and document to be produced

Deliverable	Delivery Date
<p>Quality and Evaluation Plan - External part</p> <p>At the outset of her/his activities, the External Quality Expert will provide a contribution (external part) of the project Quality Plan.. The document, prepared by the Leaders of the WP6 Quality and Evaluation at the beginning of the project, defines the methods for the project quality and evaluation. The External Quality Expert(s) will contribute to the document with an indication of the evaluation procedures, the roles that the various Partners have in the quality control of the project and the criteria and the quality indicators that have to be used for the inspection. The document should contain a series of evaluation schemes and checklists in order to standardize as much as possible the monitoring process.</p>	31/07/2021
<p>Quality mid-term report and final report</p> <p>These documents are periodically produced by the Quality Committees supported by the external evaluator according to the schedule for the quality control. These documents report the results of the quality control on the different activities of the project and include eventual recommendations to be taken into consideration to solve wrong situations.</p>	14/10/2022 14/01/2024

4. Contract Period

The contract shall be carried out during the eligibility period of the project (15th January 2021 – 14 January 2024). In case of an extension to the eligibility period of the project, the contract period is intended to be extended accordingly.

Starting date of the assignment: 1st July 2021

Finishing date of the assignment: End of the project

5. Form of Contract

Goods or services ordered by the APPRAIS as a result of the bid shall be in accordance with the APPRAIS conditions of contract. The Terms and Conditions are those of the contractor which is UNIMED - Mediterranean Universities Union.

6. Budget

The total value of the contract (including any taxes and contributions) shall not exceed 12.000 EUR. VAT exemption is applicable. For Italian providers, the VAT exemption is applicable according to the Article 72 of the Italian Law D.P.R. 633/72. Providers based in other countries must refer to the national legislation and indicate the applicable law.

Any travel costs incurred while carrying out assignment(s) are covered directly by the provider.

7. Application procedure

Offers should include:

- CVs of relevant staff members(s) who will directly perform the Evaluation activities;
- reference projects;
- a concept note with a rough indication of the anticipated methodology of max 2 pages.
- statement of availability;
- detailed financial offer for the implementation of the tasks.

Deadline for receipt of offers: **10/06/2021**

Applications should be sent in English to: uni-med@pec.it

8. Selection Criteria

The contract will be awarded to the bid offering best value for money (best price-quality ratio).

The criteria for the selection of applications are:

- 30% price;
- 30% professional experience and reference projects;
- 40% compliance with the Terms of Reference

9. The Debriefing

Both successful and unsuccessful contractors who wish to have the opportunity of debriefing should contact Mr. Marcello Scalisi after award of the contract.

10. Contact

Marcello Scalisi, Director

UNIMED - Mediterranean Universities Union

Corso Vittorio Emanuele II, 244 | 00186 - Rome - Italy

uni-med@pec.it | Tel. +39 06 68581430

Annex VII: Template for Quality report (mid-term and final)

(to be reported on the project deliverable template)

QUALITY REPORT

Project months 1-21

VERSION 1.0



DOCUMENT SUMMARY

The Document Summary is the introduction to the document and explains what the reader will find in it. This section is usually short (max one page) and does not contain details on the described content.



QUALITY WITHIN APPRAIS PROJECT

THE OBJECTIVES OF PROJECT

In this paragraph the outline of the project is given: this should be a short description of the project aims and core deliverables (max 1 page length) and should not include unnecessary details which can be found elsewhere in the project documents, or that are not needed to understand the rest of the plan. Even if you include e.g. the workplan, this should be taken at a minimum description, in order to avoid the re-writing of the application form.

QUALITY WITHIN THE PROJECT

In this paragraph, the description of the evaluation and quality activities as stated in the quality plan should be provided. This is to provide the framework in which the WP activities have been carried out.



QUALITY OF INTERNAL PROCESSES

As introduction, a short description of the internal quality assurance meaning in the frame of the project (objectives, criteria, indicators) should be provided.

Following, describe the data, the analysis, and the use of analysis' results collected (one sub-header for each exercise).

[title of the event/process in which the data have been collected, e.g. Kick off Meeting]

Provide here:

- *the description of the event/activity with dates, locations, participants*
- *the description of the respondents and tools (how many respondents, tool used, channel used for collection -offline/online etc.)*
- *the description of the data collected as such (for example rating for each item, if a questionnaire has been used)*
- *the analysis of data (with conclusions)*
- *the way in which the results have been made available to other partners (e.g. uploaded onto the repository; discussed during the following project meeting, etc.)*

[title of the event/process in which the data have been collected, e.g. Second Coordination Meeting]

As above

QUALITY OF EXTERNAL PROCESSES

As introduction, a short description of the external quality assurance meaning in the frame of the project (objectives, criteria, indicators) should be provided. "External" refers to all activities that included participation of audiences external to the project team, as in example training activities, events, workshops, etc.

Following, describe the data, the analysis, and the use of analysis' results collected (one sub-header for each exercise).

[title of the event/process in which the data have been collected, e.g. Training Course]

Provide here:

- *the description of the event/activity with dates, locations, participants*
- *the description of the respondents and tools (how many respondents, tool used, channel used for collection -offline/online etc.)*
- *the description of the data collected as such (for example rating for each item, if a questionnaire has been used)*
- *the analysis of data (with conclusions)*
- *the way in which the results have been made available to other partners (e.g. uploaded onto the repository; discussed during the following project meeting, etc.)*

[title of the event/process in which the data have been collected, e.g. Dissemination Event]

As above



QUALITY CONTROL OF OUTPUTS/DELIVERABLES

Provide a list of the outputs/deliverables that have been subject to review.

Following, describe the process and the result of each output/deliverable.

[title of the output]

Provide here a short description on how the output/deliverable has been produced (by whom, has been there any co-writing, or contribution from other project partners, has it included field research as interviews and/or key respondents contributing to the output, etc.) and how the review/control has been made (e.g. co-writing again, then ongoing peer review, final review – made by whom, validation of the consortium during the meetings, or in other forms/through other channels, etc.)



CONCLUSIONS

It is suggested to introduce this final chapter with a short sentence referring to the state of art of the project in general (e.g. The project at M18 is in a good stage of implementation, and processes and delivered products are so far satisfactory/excellent/good, etc.)

Following, it is suggested to divide the overall discussion about data and conclusions in two main sections, the first referring to the project level, both in its internal and external processes (and outputs) quality assurance and quality control; the second referring to the stage of the project in relation with the achievement of its specific objective, with reference to the general objective to which the project contributes.

Project progresses and lessons learnt

Here conclusions on a general analysis of all project activities should be provided (is the project at risk? Is any critical issue arisen during the first half of the project? Have been the results of the evaluation used to improve performances and processes of collaboration?)

After a first general analysis, it is suggested to clarify in a summary:

- Strengths
- Weaknesses (or areas of improvement)

Then suggestions on potential activities or different approaches for implementing the project should be listed (such as i.e. establish a structured peer review process, use templates to track specific activities, etc.).

Project's contribution to Programme objectives

A short paragraph highlighting the contribution of the project so far to the general objective of the programme can be provided. It will be of course contextualised in the country where the project is implemented.

Not knowing what has been declared in the logical framework matrix, the project at M18 has probably already contributed (through activities that you will describe) to the following programme objectives:

- enhance the management, governance and innovation capacities, as well as the internationalisation of HEIs;
- increase the capacities of national authorities to modernise their higher education systems, by supporting to the definition, implementation and monitoring of reform policies