



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

APPRAIS

**GovernAnce, quality, accountability: a Piloting Reform
pRocess in kurdistAn region of Iraq**

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



APPRAIS

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

Quality Plan

WP6

Developed by Roberto Righi

Table of Contents

SUMMARY.....	- 3 -
1. PROJECT OVERVIEW.....	- 4 -
1.1. BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES OF THE APPRAIS PROJECT	- 4 -
1.2. PROJECT TASKS AND DELIVERABLES.....	- 4 -
2. PROJECT QUALITY AND EVALUATION.....	- 5 -
2.1. THE QUALITY AND EVALUATION FRAMEWORK.....	- 5 -
2.2. THE FRAMEWORK METHODOLOGY.....	- 6 -
2.3. MAIN STEPS WITHIN THE EVALUATION PROCESS.....	- 7 -
2.4. THE QUALITY AND EVALUATION TEAM.....	- 8 -
2.5. QUALITY REVIEWS OF DELIVERABLES.....	- 8 -
2.6. DOCUMENT STRUCTURE, LAYOUT, STORAGE AND PRODUCTION DEADLINES.....	- 9 -
3. LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX	- 11 -
4. QUALITY AND EVALUATION TOOLBOX.....	- 14 -
ANNEX 1 – INTERNAL EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PARTNERS	- 14 -
ANNEX 2 – EVENTS FEEDBACK QUESTIONNAIRE	- 17 -
ANNEX 3 – DELIVERABLE QUALITY TABLE.....	- 18 -
ANNEX 4 – PROJECT WEBSITE QUALITY TABLE.....	- 19 -

SUMMARY

This document sets out the external quality control and evaluation procedures established in the frame of the APPRAIS project to ensure monitoring of the project processes and evaluation of intermediate and final outputs and outcomes. More specifically this document contributes to and matches the **D6.1 Quality and Evaluation Plan**, indicating the criteria and the quality indicators that have to be used, including a series of evaluation schemes and checklists to standardize as much as possible the monitoring process, and eventually propose actions to improve the overall effectiveness of the results.

The external evaluation will also have the aim to support the project management and the Evaluation Committee to reinforce the impact assessment of the project, through a specific set of tools, surveys and possibly interviews – that will be in line with the framework prepared by the project Quality Manager and the Management Committee.

More specifically, the external monitoring and evaluation will assess several project aspects, such as:

- 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 compliance with the quality principles;
- the monitoring of quality indicators for each item;
- the collection of data and analysis;
- the elaboration of external evaluation reports;
- the co-operation with the internal Quality and Evaluation Team and integration of results.

This latter aspect is a significant one, because the match between internal and external evaluation must be organised in order to avoid any kind of overlapping, to elude possible repetitions and to ensure that a coherent and consistent approach will be applied by both sides. The consistency does not mean “asking the same questions twice”, but rather using a common framework from different angles and perspectives. This will allow to collect different feedback and different points of view (from partners and stakeholders), that will be combined in order to check and monitor the project development and find possible corrective actions, if any. The “external” independent perspective will also aim to provide an outside feedback for the overall management, the partners’ contribution, the quality of the deliverable, thus enriching the internal ones as detected by the WP6 leaders, and possibly find out critical points that can be improved.

The results of the external evaluation will be shared and discussed with the partnership during the project and the WP6 meetings.

The document is composed by four main sections as follows:

Section 1 explains objectives of the project and makes an overview of the project’s objectives, work packages, deliverables, and deadlines;

Section 2 describes the approach to monitoring and evaluation as well as the adopted methodology for the quality control;

Section 3 introduces the Logical Framework Matrix;

Section 4 presents the tools that will be used to carry out the quality and evaluation activities.

1. PROJECT OVERVIEW

1.1. Background and objectives of the APPRAIS 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.

1.2. Project Tasks and Deliverables

Task	Leader	Deadline
WP1 UPDATE NEEDS ASSESSMENT		
1.1 Report stock taking of governance framework including glossary	P8 University of Duhok (co-leader P1 UNIMED)	31 May 2021
1.2 Report on the field visits in KRI provinces (Erbil Sulaymania & Duhok)		31 July 2021
1.3 Final report of the update needs analysis		30 September 2021
WP2 Definition of a roadmap for a better university governance and implementation of Bologna process at KRI HEIs		
2.1 Designing of roadmap: aims, mission, workplan	P5 University of Evora (co-leader P13 Charms University)	30 November 2021
2.2 Consultative workshop report		31 March 2022
WP3 Strategic Planning, Management and Quality Assurance: Capacity Building action		
3.1 Report on the training week in Oslo	P2 University of Pisa, Co-leader P7, Sulaymania University	31 May 2022
3.2 Report on the three local training workshops in KRI and on restitution workshop performed		31 August 2022



Task	Leader	Deadline
3.3 Report on study visits in Pisa and Evora performed		30 November 2022
WP4 Bologna process implementation at KRI Universities: Recognition of credits and learning mobility		
4.1 Report on the study visits performed in Italy and Spain	P4 (Murcia University) –_co-leader Zakho University, P12	31 December 2022
4.2 Online training platform & handbook		28 February 2023
WP5 Restitution and harmonization phase towards a Shared Strategic Plan for University Reform		
5.1 Report on the restitution event	P14 (Ministry of HE) co-leader P11, Garmian University	31 May 2023
5.2 Report on ToT activities performed at institutional and national level		31 August 2023
5.3 Strategic Plan approved by the Ministry and adopted by the HEIs		31 December 2023
WP6 Project Quality and Evaluation		
6.1 Quality and Evaluation Plan	P6 Salaheddine University and the co-leader P9, Halabja University	31 March 2021
6.2 Mid-Term evaluation report		30 June 2022
6.3 Final evaluation report		14 January 2024
WP7 Dissemination and Exploitation		
7.1 Dissemination and exploitation plan	P10, DPU (co-lead P1 UNIMED)	15 February 2021
7.2 Project website		31 March 2021
7.3 Dissemination and branding materials		31 August 2023
7.4 Final project conference		14 January 2024
WP8 Management		
8.1 Project Management Handbook	P1, UNIMED (Italy)	28 February 2021
8.2 Reports of plenary meetings		M1, M9, M14, M22, M29, M36
8.3 Virtual meetings		14 January 2024

2. PROJECT QUALITY AND EVALUATION

2.1. The Quality and Evaluation Framework

The framework comprises quality, monitoring and evaluation activities.

Broadly, these terms can be defined as follows:

- **Monitoring** refers to setting targets and milestones to measure progress and achievement. It is an on-going activity to ensure that the intervention is implemented in a manner which is consistent with the design.
- **Evaluation** refers to mechanisms to assess the effectiveness of the project and to reflect on the lessons learned.
- **Quality** refers to the procedures that the project team will follow to assure and control the quality of all processes and outputs produced, guaranteeing that certain quality standards in the tasks' performance are fulfilled.

Monitoring and evaluation should enable the analysis of a project's efficiency (management team's inputs, outputs, and budget), efficacy (the extent to which the project enhances the capacity of boundary partners), and effectiveness (contribution to wide-scale change).

The evaluation framework is aimed at monitoring and evaluating processes and results of the *outputs* and on the *short-term outcomes*.

Outputs are those results that we aim to achieve (deliverables, products, services). In social interventions in particular the practical social and professional inclusion opportunities that can be accessible to the persons we want to reach (direct and indirect target groups) can help measure the potential or effective impact of the outputs themselves. In this respect the target groups/persons are central to the outputs' evaluation.

Outcomes answer the question "What has happened as a result of the project (so far)?" Outcomes are usually divided in short (also immediate), medium- and long-term outcomes, with reference to their impact on the target groups situation. Outcomes are changes we would like to see in other people/settings, and are thus not entirely within our control. As said, the evaluation framework focuses particularly on short-term outcomes (project lifespan), and partially tackles medium-term outcomes (immediate impact after the piloting). Long-term outcomes that follow intermediate-term outcomes when changed behaviours result into changed conditions, are subjects of ex post evaluation exercises, and cannot be carried out within the project lifespan.

2.2. The framework methodology

The framework methodology aims at pursuing three main purposes.

Summative purposes

On the basis of the planned activities and means of measurement, **the logical framework matrix** (Section 3) will be used to monitor the consistency between planned and expected outputs, the consistency between planned and actual delivery dates, and the achievement of the performance indicators defined in the application. The summative evaluation looks at the final result and impact of an intervention on the target group, and is associated with objective, quantitative methods.

Formative purposes

Formative evaluation as a recursive process of collecting qualitative data, reflection and (potential) re-planning will take place all over the project lifespan. For formative evaluation, different tools will be used according to the target groups addressed and to the processes in place, to collect data from the partners, beneficiaries and the stakeholders involved in the project, to ensure the project being in line with the beneficiaries and stakeholders' needs. Formative evaluation lends itself to qualitative methods of inquiry.

Learning purposes

It will contribute to valorise the project progresses and results both at an internal level (within the consortium) and at an external level (with stakeholders and policy makers).

The methodology foresees a set of requirements to be: *Transparent; Easy to handle; Easy to understand; Consistent throughout the different phases of the project*, and will take into consideration:

- the achievement of the project objectives and the deadline for the procedures' fulfilment;
- the adopted working methodology;
- the organizational and management issues;
- the partnership performance;
- the project governance (e.g. decision-making, consultation, problem-solving);
- the efficiency of the communication measures and tools, both from the internal and the external point of view;

- the level of fulfilment of the activities planned to achieve the objectives pointed out;
- the project's strong and critical aspects.

The following tools are expected to be used:

- **Partners survey:** this activity will be carried out within the consortium, and will contribute to quality assurance purposes.
- **Feedback collection:** administered by project partners, to stakeholders and to beneficiaries at different stages of the project.
- **Interviews to partners and stakeholders:** to be managed by the external evaluator to detect specific comments and feedback on tasks and deliverables.
- **A set of indicators,** elaborated according to the **Logical Framework Matrix**, to measure the progress of the work and the extent to which it will deliver the expected outcomes, as well as the achievement of the performance indicators defined in the application.

Additional and/or different tools can be used according to detected needs during the project implementation, in order to ensure flexibility and efficacy of the evaluation exercises.

In September/October 2022, an **interim evaluation questionnaire** will be circulated among the partners to check and verify the correct coordination and management of the project, as well as the quality of the deliverables. After the collection of the questionnaires, an Interim report will be drafted to highlight the strong and critical aspects, and to issue recommendations on how to improve the project development and quality. Since a similar action is planned to be developed by the internal evaluation responsible, an intense collaboration will be planned in order to avoid duplications of questionnaires, and double work for both partners and evaluators. The following options can be taken into consideration: 1. Delivering a unique questionnaire to the partners; 2. Delivering two different questionnaires, with different questions; 3. The external evaluator will mainly work with specific interviews. Suitable solutions will be found and agreed by the involved actors.

Before the end of the project (December 2023), a **final evaluation questionnaire** will be shared among the partners to evaluate the project's correct development, as well as the quality of the deliverables. Then a Final Report will be drafted to analyse the collected information, and to summarise the main feedback gathered by the external stakeholders, with a special focus on the APPRAIS produced impact.

2.3. Main steps within the evaluation process

Evaluation is a continuous process that encompasses the project lifespan. At present, the following planning is foreseen:

What	Who will fill	Responsible	When
To evaluate the project meetings	Project partners	WP6 Leaders	After the meetings
To collect evaluation data during events	Attendees	WP6 Leaders and external evaluator	By 10 days after the event
To collect data after training events	Attendees	WP6 Leaders and External evaluator	By 10 days after the training event

What	Who will fill	Responsible	When
To analyse data of M1-21 and write the 1st Interim evaluation report	Project Partners	External Evaluator	October 2022
To analyse data of M1-36 and write the Final evaluation report	Project Partners	External Evaluator	December 2023

2.4. The Quality and Evaluation Team

A **Quality and Evaluation Committee** was formed at the beginning of the project and is composed by 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 working group is led by **P6 Salaheddine University and the co-leader P9, Halabja University**, being the strategic body responsible for assessing the relevance and appropriateness of the planned results, who will approve deliverables with reference to the qualitative and quantitative indicators of progress, including corrective measures if necessary, and recommendations for improvement.

The representatives of the Quality Control working group will get together twice a year throughout the project lifespan in order to overview the obtained outcomes and deliverables, as well as plan and organize further activities and tasks and ensure their successful completion.

This working group will be responsible for:

- ensuring achievement of project objectives, timely completion;
- ensuring documenting of all consortium meetings minutes;
- conducting surveys to study satisfaction levels of workshop/training participants conducted in the frames of the project;
- providing midterm and final reports on project progress.

The external evaluator will collaborate with the Committee leaders for the Quality and Evaluation activities, also through specific virtual meetings to be organized when needed.

2.5. Quality reviews of deliverables

The Quality Plan defines the approach to verify that deliverables are meeting project standards and quality expectations. It also defines the project indicators that will be used to monitor and control project performance and processes. The reviews aim to detect defects. Before a deliverable goes through the sign-off process, reviews are performed by the project team to:

1. Verify the completeness of a deliverable
2. Verify the accuracy of a deliverable
3. Verify that a deliverable meets project standards (for example, using the right template)
4. Verify that the content of a deliverable meets its objectives and is consistent with prior approved outputs

As a general quality standard, the following will be applied to all outputs implying documents delivery:

- Provision of document summary/introduction; - Version number, date, author
- Format standards compliance: FONT: Cambria, 11.
- Acceptable language, grammar and spelling;
- Objectives of the outputs covered;

- Acceptable quality of text (organisation, structure, diagrams etc.);
- Coverage of expected work;
- Comprehensiveness (no missing sections, missing references, unexplained arguments);
- Usability (output is clear and provided in a form that is useful to the reader).

According to the identified defects (critical, minor or low), the outputs/deliverables will be reviewed and modified, in order to achieve the expected level of quality.

2.6. Document structure, layout, storage and production deadlines

Several types of documents will be produced during the project's lifecycle. Their management with regards to their presentation, structure and layout depends on their nature. Examples of documents are: a) Agenda of meetings, b) Minutes of meetings, c) Presentations; d) Deliverables.

Agenda of the meetings

The agenda of meeting are the documents made in order to provide general information with regards to an upcoming meeting. The agenda contains information about the logistics of the meeting, the attendees, the meeting's objectives and the list of topics, which will be discussed during relevant meeting.

The following data has to be included in the agenda of meetings: Date, Starting and ending times for each day, Venue, Type of meeting, the list of topics to be discussed, the name of the persons in charge of the given presentation or discussion.

The agenda shall be stored in Google Drive under the subfolder Meetings. The agenda should be named according to the following convention:

APPRAIS_Meeting_Number_City_agenda - For example: APPRAIS_Meeting1_Rome_agenda.doc

The agenda is issued at least 7 calendar days preceding the relevant meeting. The agenda is the result of a collaboration and agreement between the project's coordinators and the representatives of the partner's institution organising the meeting. The preparation of the agenda is in charge of the project coordinator, who will deal with hosting partners for logistics.

Minutes of the meeting

The minutes of meetings are the documents made to have a sum-up of the presentation, discussions and decisions taken, which occurred during the relevant meeting.

The content of the minutes depends on the nature of the meeting and should contain the following items: Date, Venue, Type of meeting, List of attendees, Introduction, Items addressed, Decisions taken, Next tasks, Next meeting.

The Minutes shall be stored in the Google Drive under the subfolder Meetings. They should be named according to the following convention:

APPRAIS_Meeting_City_Number_minutes - For example: APPRAIS_Meeting1_Rome_minutes.doc

Presentations

The presentations prepared for meetings and public events shall be prepared using a specific template, to be located at the root of the Dissemination folder in Google Drive.

The presentations should be named according to the following convention:

APPRAIS_Presentation_[NAME OF EVENT]_YYYY_MM_DD

Deliverables

Each of the deliverables tackles a specific subject, and has its responsible partner who should produce it and directly co-ordinate the work of the different partners involved. Deliverable leader(s) have been designated for each WP, and this will be responsible for the production, in co-operation with other partners as designed.

Each deliverable shall be prepared with the following common structure

- Cover
- Copyright, Versioning and contribution history
- Table of contents (if needed)
- Abbreviations (if needed)
- Introduction
- Content: to be organised into hierarchical structure. Each hierarchical unit should have a unique identifier, such as section heading and/or a section number.
- Conclusions
- References (if needed)
- Annexes (if needed)



3. LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX

Wider Objective	Indicators of progress	Measuring tools
<p>The project will contribute to the modernization of the governance system of HEIs in Kurdistan region in Iraq and to the implementation of the Bologna process</p>	<p>Improved HEIs governance and developed institutional management systems in Kurdistan region of Iraq.</p> <p>Enhanced system of quality assurance by strengthening quality and relevance of learning and teaching</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Self and external institutional assessment before and after project implementation - Good governance guidelines handbook - Quality Assurance Directorates in each HEIs are functioning and operational - Number of changes, modifications occurred in the management structure, policies, procedures as a response for the recommendations of experts at each partner university from Kurdistan region
Specific Project Objectives	Indicators of progress	Measuring tools
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased awareness of university leadership toward university good governance practices - Number and quality of documented, approved and developed procedures, policies and manuals explaining the decision-making process among the institutions thanks to the institutional action plans - Increased institutional awareness of the importance to have a good governance roadmap for the development and implementation of the Bologna process by >20% above baseline by the end of the project; - All the 8 HEIs in Kurdistan will agree on a university roadmap that is validated in M15 - 32 top managers and university leaders from HEIs in Kurdistan upskilled on university management, strategic planning, quality assurance and credits recognition after the first basic training week in Norway >90% training activities are performed by M17 - 80 administrative and academic staff from HEIs in Kurdistan upskilled on university management, strategic planning, quality assurance after the three local training workshops in Kurdistan >90% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Internal institutional surveys conducted at the Kurdish HEIs to evaluate the awareness at the beginning and at the end of the project; - 8 Strategic Institutional Plans available and ready for consultation - Records and reports on the trainings; - List of university staff (academic and administrative) trained - Records and feedback (evaluation questionnaire) on the training cycle provided - List of participants in several activities and workshops organized during the project, especially those from higher administrative positions. - Events questionnaires to assess the impact of capacity building and dissemination impact - Training material, training agenda for the training activities of WP3 and WP4 - Summing up the number of institutional decisions taken as a response to improve the



	<p>training activities are performed by M19</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 24 administrative and academic staff (in particular QA directorate responsible) from HEIs in Kurdistan upskilled on quality assurance and administrative management after the field visit in Europe > 80 % training activities are performed by M22 - 24 university top managers in charge of international relations (deans, heads of IROs, vice-rector in charge of mobility and international cooperation) upskilled on credits recognition, learning and teaching mobility, on the overall management of Bologna process >80% training activities are performed by M25 - Online training platform visited by 80% of university staff of each HEIs in Kurdistan region and by 50% of university staff of external university partner of the project, from other HEIs of the country, by M36 - 160 university internal staff (20 people from each HEI) benefit from local ToT by M32 - 8 shared strategic institutional plans validated by the KRI Mi 	<p>governance framework at each partner institution</p>
<p>Outputs and outcomes</p>	<p>Indicator of progress</p>	<p>Measuring tools</p>
<p>- WP1: Updated needs assessment</p> <p>D1.1 Report on state of the art on governance framework including glossary</p> <p>- D1.2 Report on the field visits in KRI provinces</p> <p>- D1.3 Final report of the update needs analysis (desk research, HEIs self-evaluation and field visits reports)</p> <p>- WP2 Definition of a roadmap for a better university governance and implementation of bologna process at KRI HEIs</p> <p>- D2.1 Roadmap for better university governance designed</p> <p>- D2.2 Consultative workshop report</p>	<p>- Literature and methodology available and shared among partners from M2</p> <p>- All the Partner country HEIs will gather at M6 for the field visits of the WP leaders to assess the self-evaluation on the governance framework</p> <p>- At least 4 different governance models at the 4 EU universities reviewed to build a collective and comprehensive understanding about EU governance practices</p> <p>- At least 8 research papers/ case studies have been reviewed in order to design the self-evaluation tool</p> <p>- All KRI partners have participated in the gap analysis process provided all needed information and evidences to correctly assess their needs and draft reliable roadmap</p>	<p>- State of the art report on governance of HEIs in Kurdistan, published on APPRAIS website in M9</p> <p>- A document providing the national roadmap (D2.2) to be implemented at local-institutional level is subscribed by university managers and project coordinators and the Ministry involved in M15;</p> <p>- The agenda, programme, list of participants, pictures and the report of the basic training week is published on line on the APPRAIS website (D 3.1);</p> <p>- List of participants, agenda, pictures and reports of the three local training workshops are published online (D3.2)</p>



<p>- WP3 Strategic Planning, Management, Quality Assurance and recognition: Capacity Building action</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - D3.1 Report on the training week in Oslo University - D3.2 Report on the three local training workshops in Kurdistan performed - D3.3. Report on study visits in Pisa and Evora performed <p>- WP4 Bologna process implementation at KRI universities: Recognition of credits and learning mobility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - D4.1 Field visit for university staff to Italy and Spain - D4.2 Online training platform & handbook <p>- WP5 Restitution and harmonization phase towards a Shared Strategic Plan for University Reform</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - D5.1 Report on the restitution event - D5.2 Report on ToT activities performed at institutional and national level - D5.3 Strategic Plan approved and adopted by the Ministry <p>- WP7 Dissemination and exploitation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - D7.1 Dissemination and sustainability plan - D7.2 APPRAIS Website - D7.3 Project's visual identity and dissemination material - D7.4 APPRAIS Final conference <p>- WP8 Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - D8.1 Project Management Handbook - D8.2 Reports of plenary meetings - D8.3 Virtual meetings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - At least 26 people participated to the consultative workshop in Pisa in M14 in concurrence with the 2nd mid-term meeting of the project - Institutional plans are prepared and validated - 6 monitoring reports (delivered each six months throughout the project lifetime) - APPRAIS brochure and leaflets for all 14 partners of the consortium; - At least 100 participants at the final conference of the project - Kick-off meeting report - Minutes and reports of the 4 mid-term meetings - Final meeting report - List of attendees to the all partners meeting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - List of participants, agenda, pictures and reports of the field visits are published online (D3.3) - Training material used all the training sessions are published in the website of the project - Training online modules (MOOC) are recorded and available on the project's website for further consultation, besides to the UNIMED e-learning platform - Programme, list of participants, pictures and minutes of the consultation workshop of WP1 (D1.2), the restitution event of WP5 (D5.1) are online on the APPRAIS website - Strategic institutional action plans available - Project recommendations are published in the project website and widely disseminated - Internal and external quality monitoring reports - Publication and distribution of the project's visual and communication material (leaflets, postcards...) - Programme, list of participants and reports of the dissemination events (WP7) - Agenda, list of participants, pictures of all the management meetings (6 meeting in total)
--	---	--

4. QUALITY AND EVALUATION TOOLBOX

Annex 1 – Internal evaluation questionnaire for Partners

Who uses this tool: project partners to fill in.

When the monitoring take place: September 2022 - December 2023

Where is the tool stored: the partners will fill in the questionnaire; data collected are reported and uploaded onto the online working space of the consortium.

Partner, name and surname: _____

Period of evaluation: _____

The information will be treated confidentially. The key outcomes of this evaluation exercise will be used as prompts for discussion and reflection in the evaluation session to be held during project meetings, and will be summarised and included in the final evaluation report.

Using the following five-point scale please rate the quality of selected key aspects of the project: **5 = excellent; 4 = good; 3 = reasonable; 2 = hardly sufficient; 1 = insufficient**

1. GENERAL ASPECTS OF PROJECT DEVELOPMENT AND ROLE OF PARTNERS			
Dimensions	A) Overall Rating	B) Challenges experienced	C) Positive Aspects
Role of the co-ordinator in project development (e.g. project management performance, monitoring of work processes & deadlines)	①- ②- ③- ④- ⑤ <i>insufficient - excellent</i>		
Feasibility/practicality of project planning	①- ②- ③- ④- ⑤ <i>insufficient - excellent</i>		
Handling of administrative and financial matters	①- ②- ③- ④- ⑤ <i>insufficient - excellent</i>		
Project governance (e.g. decision-making, consultation, problem-solving)	①- ②- ③- ④- ⑤ <i>insufficient - excellent</i>		



Management of the partnership and sharing of tasks	①- ②- ③- ④- ⑤ <i>insufficient - excellent</i>		
Quality and timely answers provided by the coordinator to questions and issues	①- ②- ③- ④- ⑤ <i>insufficient - excellent</i>		

2. COMMUNICATION			
Dimensions	A) Overall Rating	B) Challenges experienced	C) Positive Aspects
The role of the coordinator in the communication process	①- ②- ③- ④- ⑤ <i>insufficient - excellent</i>		
Communication flows among partners	①- ②- ③- ④- ⑤ <i>insufficient - excellent</i>		
Effectiveness of the dissemination activities	①- ②- ③- ④- ⑤ <i>insufficient - excellent</i>		
Partners' active attitude (e.g. presenting proposals and themes for discussion)	①- ②- ③- ④- ⑤ <i>insufficient - excellent</i>		
Evaluation of the website	①- ②- ③- ④- ⑤ <i>insufficient - excellent</i>		



Evaluation of the dissemination events (and materials)	①- ②- ③- ④- ⑤ <i>insufficient - excellent</i>		
--	--	--	--

3. ADDED VALUE & OUTPUTS			
Dimensions	A) Overall Rating	B) Challenges experienced	C) Positive Aspects
Added value of project outcomes for the addressed beneficiaries	①- ②- ③- ④- ⑤ <i>insufficient - excellent</i>		
Overall Evaluation of WP1	①- ②- ③- ④- ⑤ <i>insufficient - excellent</i>		
Overall evaluation of WP2	①- ②- ③- ④- ⑤ <i>insufficient - excellent</i>		
Overall Evaluation of WP3	①- ②- ③- ④- ⑤ <i>insufficient - excellent</i>		
Overall Evaluation of WP4	①- ②- ③- ④- ⑤ <i>insufficient - excellent</i>		
Overall Evaluation of WP5	①- ②- ③- ④- ⑤ <i>insufficient - excellent</i>		

Please explain what are, in your opinion, the strengths and the weaknesses of the APPRAIS project:

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Annex 2 – Events Feedback Questionnaire

Who uses this tool: participants to events and other meetings

When the monitoring take place: after events

Example to be adapted to the event. It can be distributed together with other material at the beginning of each event: at the end of the event, the speaker can invite participants to give their feedback before leaving.

Event	Date			
Location				
Would you let us know your opinion about the event?				
	Not useful	Somewhat useful	Quite useful	Very useful
Did you find today's event useful?				
On the topics covered today, do you think the following has been useful to you?				
- Information on topics addressed				
- Information on learning opportunities				
- Information on				
Would you participate in other events about this topic in the future	No	Maybe	Yes	
Do you think there is any other issue that requires action in this topic? Please feel free to suggest any relevant subject that you think future actions should tackle.				
If you want to be kept informed about the news of the project, you can leave your e-mail address here:				
Thank you!				



Annex 3 – Deliverable Quality Table

Quality Control Check	Y/N	Reviewer recommendations/comments
Format standards complied with		
Language, grammar and spelling acceptable		
Objectives as described in the project proposal covered		
Expected work adequately covered		
Quality of text is acceptable (organisation and structure; diagrams; readability)		
Comprehensiveness is acceptable (no missing sections; missing references; unexplained arguments)		
Usability is acceptable (deliverable provides such information that is useful to the reader)		
Output specific quality criteria		
Output meets specific acceptance criteria		
Checklist completed by Name/Partner: Date:		



Annex 4 – Project Website Quality Table

Quality Control Check			
Concept	Description	Rate 1-10	Comments
Ease of use	Easy to read and understand Easy to operate and navigate		
Usefulness	The information provided is accurate, current and relevant It meets tasks needs and improves performance It ensures a good level of interactivity		
Visual aspects	Aesthetic and Visual appeal Creativity of the design Emotional effect using the website The web graphics are consistent with the project corporate image		
Suggestions for improvement			
Checklist filled in by: Name / Partner: Date:			