QUALITY AND ASSURANCE PLAN (QAP)

University of Nis

Strengthening of master curricula in water resources management for the Western Balkans HEIs and stakeholders

www.swarm.ni.ac.rs

PROJECT INFO

Project title	Strengthening of master curricula in water resources management for the Western Balkans HEIs and stakeholders
Project acronym	SWARM
Project reference number	597888-EPP-1-2018-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP
Funding scheme	Erasmus+ Capacity building in the field of higher education
Web address	www.swarm.ni.ac.rs
Coordination institution	University of Nis
Project duration	15 November 2018 – 14 November 2021

DOCUMENT CONTROL SHEET

Work package	WP5 Quality assurance and monitoring
Ref. no and title of activity	A5.1 Development of the Quality and Assurance Plan
Title of deliverable	Quality and Assurance Plan
Lead institution	Universidade de Lisboa
Author(s)	Maria Manuela Portela, Elisabeth Sundheim Hoff, Maria Mavrova-Guirguinova, Barbara Karleuša, Milan Gocić
Document status	Draft
Document version and date	v.03, 01 February 2019
Dissemination level	International

VERSIONING AND CONTRIBUTION HISTORY

Version	Date	Revision description	Partner responsible
v.01	03.01.2019	Draft	Norwegian University of Life Sciences (P3)
v.02	27.01.2019	Draft	UL/IST (P7)
v.03	01.02.2019	Draft	UNI (P1)
v.04	09.02.2019	Draft	UL/IST (P7)
v.05	13.03.2019	Final version	UL/IST (P7)

Contents

List of abbreviations

EACEA	Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency
ENQA	European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education
HEI	Higher Education Institution
IST	Instituto Superior Técnico, Portugal
LFM	Logical Framework Matrix
LLL	Lifelong learning
NEO	National Erasmus Office
NMBU	Norwegian University of Life Sciences, Norway
PMC	Project Management Committee
QAC	Quality Assurance Committee
QAP	Quality and Assurance Plan
SC	Steering Committee
SWARM	Strengthening of master curricula in water resources management for the Western Balkans HEIs and stakeholders
UACEG	University of Architecture, Civil Engineering and Geodesy, Bulgaria
UNI	University of Nis, Serbia
UL	University of Lisbon, Portugal
UNIRIFCE	University of Rijeka, Croatia
WB	Western Balkan
WP	Work package
WPL	Work package leader
WRM	Water Resources Management

1. Introduction

Quality assurance and monitoring is essential to ensure that project objectives and results defined in the project proposal can be achieved and delivered within the project implementation period at a high-quality level. Therefore, it is of significant importance for the quality of the project as a whole, to set up quality control and assurance mechanisms and procedures to be followed throughout the whole project implementation and by all partners.

This document presents the Quality and Assurance Plan for Erasmus+ KA2 CBHE project *597888-EPP-1-2018-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP* "Strengthening of master curricula in water resources management for the Western Balkans HEIs and stakeholders" (SWARM). It is developed in the scope of the WP5 (Quality assurance and monitoring) of the Project in compliance with the Project description and all applicable rules and guidelines.

The Quality and Assurance Plan (QAP) defines the main quality control mechanisms and procedures to be followed by the partners of the SWARM project to ensure the optimal quality of the project activities, results and management in line with the SWARM project Grant Agreement, the SWARM Partnership Agreements and Guidelines for the Use of the Grant (version 02: 09 January 2018). The main objective of SWARM is to strengthen the master curricula in water resources management for the Western Balkans HEIs and stakeholders.

The QAP defines procedures for internal and external monitoring, quality management and quality requirements for the project deliverables. It provides 15 templates as annexes of the QAP.

The QAP constitutes a working document which can be adapted and revised throughout the implementation of the project upon agreement by all parties. This may apply in cases such as where e.g. the procedures laid out in the QAP turn out to be not feasible for their purpose.

2. Quality assessment and assurance

Assessment and assurance of the SWARM project quality defines quality standards, methods for quality assessment and methods for detect and correct the occurred problems during the project realization. Internal and external monitoring of the SWARM project will be used to ensure the project efficiency, progress and constant improvement in line with defined standards and time schedule. According to the recommendations derived from permanent quality control, corrective actions will be taken on time to keep the project in the right direction.

The quality assurance activities will be based on qualitative data (i.e. meeting the specified deadlines, achievement of targets and indicators) and on quantitative data (i.e. answers to questionnaires and reports). Data will be gathered from all project partners and key stakeholders.

2.1 Quality Assurance Committee

To ensure the quality of the SWARM project, internal work quality standards and procedures will be agreed upon and established for the Consortium partners by the Quality Assurance Committee (QAC), which is established during the kick-off meeting to monitor project's performance and to achieve the quality objectives of the project. Besides the Project Coordinator, the QAC consists of four members representing the partner HEIs (UL, NMBU, UNIRIFCE, and UACEG) (Table 1). The lead Partner for the Quality Plan Work Package (WP5) is Universidade de Lisboa (UL) via its school of engineering, Instituto Superior Técnico, IST.

Table 1 Quality Assurance Committee team

Organisation	Name and surname	E-mail
UL	Maria Manuela Portela	maria.manuela.portela@ist.utl.pt
UNI	Milan Gocić	milan.gocic@gaf.ni.ac.rs
NMBU	Elisabeth Sundheim Hoff	elisabeth.sundheim.hoff@nmbu.no
UACEG	Maria Mavrova-Guirguinova	margir_fhe@abv.bg
UNIRIFCE	Barbara Karleuša	barbara.karleusa@uniri.hr

The QAC team is a direct support to the Project Coordinator in monitoring and assessing the quality of the project and its results, ensuring that all its activities are carried out properly according to European Standards and Erasmus+ Programme Guide and also ensuring proper execution of the SWARM project to achieve its objective. It should also develop the Quality and Assurance Plan in communication with all project partners. The duty of the QAC is to design a proper evaluation process and be responsible for creating a set of indicators.

The QAC will monitor the project at different points using different types of evaluation practices and tools, such as report analyses, questionnaires, and checklists, devised to assess on an ongoing basis project relevance, efficiency and impact, to measure progress throughout its life cycle, to determine if the project responds to main target groups' needs, to measure the level of satisfaction of beneficiaries of project activities, and to evaluate unexpected results and control all processes. QAC activities will include evaluation of offered new courses, improved teaching and lab facilities, training of teaching staff, student feedback, achievement of objectives, and impact of the project at the single HEI and at national level.

Therefore, the quality assurance tasks of the QAC are as follows:

➢ Establishing the internal work quality standards and procedures;

➢ Monitoring and reviewing, once a year (October), the project management assessment prepared from contact persons from each partner institution written using Annex QA9;

➢ Preparing once (October) a year regular report to the Steering Committee (SC) using Annex QA10 about the project management assessment;

➢ Monitoring and reviewing twice a year (March and September) the questionnaires and the reports on the work package assessment (Annex QA11) done by the WP leaders and contact persons from each partner institution;

➢ Supporting the Project Coordinator in the establishment of independent monitoring evaluations by expert(s) (mid-term and at the end of the project),

➢ Analysing of EACEA evaluation and NEO monitoring reports.

➢ Evaluating the quality of the project deliverables, for its completion in due time as well as for its completeness, clarity and comprehensiveness.

The principle of the QAC's approach to Quality Assurance for the project will be light-touch self-evaluation, with the main purpose of identification of shortfall in the direction of the project and any issues that might militate against the full achievement of project objectives.

2.1.1 Quality Assurance Committee meetings and reporting

The University of Lisbon, via Instituto Superior Técnico, UL/IST, will encourage the discussion of items related to quality assurance (challenges, shortcomings, open questions compromising the quality of deliverables, etc.) via QAC meetings and reports that are followed up together with the Project Coordinator and partners. QAC meetings will take place during a project meeting with all partners. If needed, meetings will be organised via Skype with individual partners on a specific topic.

The role of UL/IST is to prepare and moderate the meeting together with the Project Coordinator, while partners are responsible to contribute to the meeting by preparing questions and solutions. The QAC meetings will happen regularly (e.g. twice a year) in order to discuss and establish patterns on quality in the project. The results of the QAC meetings and field visits will be included into the Interim and Final project reports. The drafts of the meetings reports will be discussed with the Project Coordinator and the final version made available to all partners. The reports should include an analysis of the status of development and quality of project deliverables, conclusion and recommendations for the upcoming project period.

3. Tools and procedures for quality assurance

Tools and procedures for quality assurance have to ensure

➢ the quality of the SWARM project implementation, and

➢ the quality of the SWARM project deliverables.

3.1 Quality of the SWARM project implementation

All partners are responsible for quality of the SWARM project implementation in order to achieve overall broader and specific objectives. They should respect defined procedures and tools for quality assurance, in fully respect to the signed partnership agreements.

The quality of the achieved SWARM objectives, i.e. strengthening of master curricula in line with the Bologna requirements and national accreditation, and development of trainings for WB teaching staff at program partner HEIs and for professionals from companies in water sector, will be evaluated using defined templates for self-evaluation of master curriculum (Annexes QA5 and QA6) and self-evaluation of trainings (Annexes QA7 and QA8) under the responsibility of the respective tasks leaders. A summary of these evaluations will be part of the Progress and Final reports. Results of evaluations of master curricula and trainings will be used for further improvement and assurance of sustainability of project results.

The SWARM management structure consisting of Steering Committee (SC), Project Management Committee (PMC), and Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) is responsible for the quality of entire SWARM project implementation.

The quality control of the project's progress will be done every 6 months by the Consortium and/or SC resulting in critical assessment of realized activities until then and planning efficient implementation of activities in the following period.

At the end of each project year contact person from each partner institution should fill the Questionnaire on the project management assessment (Annex QA9) which provides for every question the expression of a judgment for each of the following three elements:

➢ expectation (what is your level of expectation for the project management),

➢ satisfaction (how much you are satisfied with the project management) and

➢ importance (how much important you consider project management).

The QAC in collaboration with the Project Coordinator will prepare report for the SC meeting in line with the Annex QA10.

Besides this evaluation, each WPL takes also into consideration the indicators and respective objectives that are described in the Logical Framework Matrix (LFM) (also provided at the website of the project along with the work plan - http://www.swarm.ni.ac.rs/project/lfm-workplan) as well as the qualitative and quantitative indicators listed in the chapter "Overview of short and long-term impact indicators" of the approved proposal.

3.2 Quality review of the SWARM deliverables

The results of the SWARM project are of diverse nature and consist of both concrete (tangible) results as well as of skills and personal experiences that both project organizers and participants to the activities have acquired (intangible results). The tangible SWARM results include:

➢ research reports,

➢ evaluation reports,

➢ products such as handbooks, curricula,

➢ SWARM unique set of courses,

➢ electronic tools for dissemination purposes such as a project website and project platform,

➢ newsletters or different types of produced promotional materials.

The SWARM intangible results include:

➢ knowledge and experience gained by participants, learners or staff during trainings, seminars or meetings,

➢ increased skills or achievements of WB teaching staff,

➢ improved cultural awareness,

➢ better language skills.

Intangible results are often more difficult to measure. The use of interviews, questionnaires, observations or self-assessment mechanisms will be used to record this type of result.

The deliverables of SWARM project consist of the results of the 7 Work Packages: 1 – Analysis of water resources management in the Western Balkan region, 2 - Development of competence-based curricula aligned with EU trends, 3 – Development of trainings for professionals in water sector, 4 – Implementation of developed master curricula and trainings, 5 - Quality assurance and monitoring, 6 – Dissemination and Exploitation, 7 – Project Management.

In order to assure a high level of quality regarding the results of the project, each deliverable is evaluated for its completion in due time as well as for its completeness, clarity and comprehensiveness.

The main deliverables to be produced during the SWARM lifetime are presented in Table 2.

Table 2 SWARM project activities and deliverables

No.	Activity	Deliverable
1.1	Identification of WB regional issues related to WRM	Report on WB regional issues related to WRM
1.2	Analyse of EU innovations in water policy and EU recommendations and legislation in water sector	Report on EU water policies and innovation and EU recommendations and legislation in water sector
1.3	Analyse of existing curricula related to WRM in both EU and WB partner countries	Report on master curricula related to WRM in EU and WB partner countries
1.4	Identification of needed laboratory resources in WB HEIs and alignment with formed EU HEIs WRM laboratory equipment list	EU HEIs WM laboratory equipment lists; Report on needed resources for harmonization of WB laboratory
1.5	Workshop on innovative practices in the EU water sector: barriers and opportunities	Workshop organized; Report on innovative practices for WRM in EU
2.1	Development of specific competencies and learning outcomes of curricula in WB	Catalogue of competencies
2.2	Development of courses content and syllabi	SWARM unique set of courses
2.3	Innovation of existing and development of new master curricula for WRM in WB	Report on SWARM master curricula
2.4	Accreditation of master curricula	Master curricula accredited
2.5	Theme-based training of teaching staff for acquiring new teaching and learning methods	Teaching staff trained
2.6	Purchasing of literature, software and laboratory equipment, installation and activation	Laboratories equipped
3.1	Introduction with LLL courses for professionals in water sector in EU	Report on LLL courses for professionals in EU water sector
3.2	Analyse of water sector needs for LLL courses in WB	Survey of water sector needs in WB
3.3	Development of trainings' content and corresponding educational material	Trainings' material prepared
4.1	Implementation of developed master curricula	Master curricula implemented
4.2	Implementation of trainings for professionals in water sector	Participants trained
4.3	Self-evaluation of master curricula	Quality report on master curricula
4.4	Self-evaluation of trainings for professionals in water sector	Quality report on trainings
5.1	Development of the Quality and Assurance Plan	Quality and Assurance Plan
5.2	Regular Quality Assurance Committee meetings	Minutes of the meetings (Six Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) meetings)
5.3	External evaluation of the project	Report on the external quality evaluation
5.4	External financial control	Report on the financial audit
5.5	Inter-project coaching	Report on the inter-project coaching
6.1	Creation of the Dissemination & Exploitation Plan	Dissemination and exploitation plan

No.	Activity	Deliverable
6.2	Development of project website and promotional materials	Promotion material created
6.3	Info days for student enrolment	Info days organized
6.4	Roundtables with non-academic sector	Roundtables organized
	Winter/summer schools	Dissemination and exploitation plan
6.5	Winter/summer schools	Winter/summer schools organized
6.6	Symposium for promoting WRM in WB	Report on organized symposium
7.1	Kick-off meeting	Minutes of the meeting
7.2	Brussels kick-off meeting	Minutes of the meeting
7.3	Development of the Project management guide	Project management and reporting guide
7.4	Regular Steering Committee & Project Management meetings	Minutes of the meetings
7.5	Day-to-day coordination of project activities	Project correspondence
7.6	Submission of interim and final reports	Interim and final reports

General expectations for all deliverables regarding their quality are their relevance to the achievement of main and specific objectives of the project as well as the compliance with the time framework set in the project Application Form.

Quality of deliverables will be assessed regarding to what extent they reached relevance of project objectives with the possibility of their future improvement. For this purpose Annex QA13 should be used.

3.2.1 Quality of produced SWARM documents

All partners will use a consistent format for all documents (reports, publications, plans, word document, power point presentations) in order to ensure a common appearance of deliverables as well as to ensure that a minimum amount of information will appear consistently in all documents produced by the SWARM project. Templates are provided at the website www.swarm.ni.ac.rs **(examples in** Annexes DE1 and DE2)

Learning materials for professionals will be assessed by QAC and stakeholders who will participate at trainings.

All documents will be stored on SWARM website and platform for visibility and use for all partners when needed.

When partners produce documents, they are obliged to put Erasmus+ logo consisting of sentence "*Co-funded by Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union*" on the cover or the first page. They must use following disclaimer on the inner pages:

3.2.2 Quality of promotional materials

The Project Coordinator is responsible for design and print of all promotional material such as flyers, poster, roll-up, folder, notebook, brochure, etc. for dissemination during the SWARM project events (partners meetings, trainings, workshop, consortium meetings, etc.) and other general events such as conferences, symposia, workshops, open days, etc. The draft version will be sent to all partners for comments and suggestions, before printing, publishing and distribution. The materials will be disseminated by all project partners at those events that are relevant to reach the project's target groups.

3.2.3 Quality of website and other computer-mediated tools

The Project Coordinator will be responsible for setting up and maintaining the SWARM website (www.swarm.ni.ac.rs) with all information and materials received from project partners. All partners are asked to promote the SWARM project on their websites and social networks such as Facebook, Twitter and LinkedIn profiles/groups by providing short description of the project, logo, and link to the SWARM website. Following the project's web dissemination strategy, news about the SWARM project will be published in the different languages of the project consortium: English, Serbian, German, Norwegian, Greek, Bulgarian, Croatian and Bosnian.

All partners should regularly provide information for dissemination on the website. The website will be linked to all partners' websites and other interested stakeholders and social networks.

3.2.4 Quality of events

Quality of events (meetings, trainings, workshop, info days, roundtables, etc.) is assured by accurately defined documents and procedures for preparation, realization and post-event activity.

In the preparation phase, event dates should be agreed upon and pre-announced at least 3 months beforehand. The respective HEI leader (organizer) is responsible for initiating event organization. Events should be organized in line with the minimization of expenses and travel time of partners.

A pre-determined number of team members from each partner organization is required to attend event, as prescribed by the project proposal, project and financial plan. All event participants are required to participate in a cooperative manner. If a planned participant is unable to attend an event, they must inform the meeting organizer beforehand, and/or provide a substitute member to take their place.

Organizer of the event is obliged to provide participants with a full information package (draft agenda, letter of invitation if required and note on venue, traffic, and hotels) at least 4 weeks before the event. The draft agenda must circulated so that the partners will have the opportunity to add items relevant for them, but no later than 5 days before the start of the event. The final agenda (Annex QA1) should be distributed to all participants 2 days in advance. During the meeting the Consortium can add new items on the agenda following a unanimous decision.

PowerPoint presentations should be prepared using the defined template (Annex DE2 and at the website of the project), available at the website of the project (www.swarm.ni.ac.rs), and sent to the host/coordinator the day before the event (at the latest) to ensure a smooth and quick progression of events. To ensure the success of the project it is important that partners send representatives who are able to contribute to the event or benefit from it (e.g. in case of workshop and trainings). Participants should arrive at the event well informed and prepared.

For the winter and summer schools, students should be selected based on several criteria. There should be an open call for students to participate, and depending on interest, one or more of the following factors should be emphasized when selecting:

➢ Marks,
➢ English proficiency (must take into account national legislation – B1 level) – must ensure proper understanding and participation in the mobility,
➢ Motivational letter,
➢ Students who have not participated in Erasmus mobility before should be prioritised.

During the event, SWARM participants should be registered using attendance list (Annex QA2) with the ability to get printed material. Posters, roll-up and other promotional materials shall be displayed during the event. The event must respect the scheduling time. Some event details will be recorded.

Events should be evaluated based on a template (evaluation list and evaluation report – QA3 and QA4) filled by the participants of the event.

After the event, minutes of meetings and event report need to be created by event organizer and made available during 10 working days after the event. Event report (Annex QA4) should include the collected statistical data from the event evaluation lists (Annex QA3), a summative narrative of the data and recommendations for the implementation of upcoming events within the SWARM project. The results of the evaluation may be presented at the following event for further improvement of upcoming events.

Based on obligations of the beneficiaries defined in article I.10.8 and II.7, of the Grant Agreement, related to information requirements, the partners should inform the public, press and media (internet included) of the event, which must visibly indicate "*with the support of the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union*". They must also display the graphic logos of the project and Erasmus+ Programme.

4. Internal evaluation

The aim of internal evaluation is to steer the SWARM project into the right direction through the definition of the effective methods for quality assessment, controlling and improving project implementation. Internal quality evaluation concerns all aspects of the SWARM project including financial and administrative, management, deliverables, dissemination, academic dimension, impact and relations with EU. It involves teaching staff, students, administrative and technician staff, professionals from water sector. Internal quality monitoring will be conducted using adequate tools such as evaluation forms, questionnaires and different evaluation reports.

All partners are responsible for regular internal evaluation of compliance with the Logical Framework Matrix (LFM), work plan and budget. The Project Coordinator will inform on regular basis partners about evaluation results and agree remedial actions.

Risk monitoring, as a part of internal quality management, is the process that should continuously anticipate issues that could jeopardize the successful project realization (potential financial risks, project management risks, postponing of defined deadlines) and define controlling mechanism and solutions. Contingency Plan, a section of the SWARM Project management and reporting guide, identifies potential risks and defines how to minimize the possible risks of the SWARM project realization. Quality control mechanisms of all segments and phases of SWARM project realisation is established and incorporated in Contingency Plan to identify deviations from the work plan, results of internal and external evaluation, student evaluation and regular reporting.

The management structure of the SWARM project is obligated to objectively judge project achievements and give recommendations for improving project quality standards. Following the biannual reviews, the QAC will prepare once a year (October) the evaluation report for the Steering Committee (QA10), which in turn will notify all the partners on the issues related to project quality. The QAC report will focus on the project outputs and outcomes, and consider performance measures of all project activities.

4.1 Responsibilities for internal evaluation of deliverables

Chain of responsibilities for internal evaluation of deliverables starts with the authors of deliverables, leaders of task and WPs, followed by reviewers of the deliverables, Project Coordinator control and SC supervising and adoption of deliverables on SC meeting.

Table 3 summarizes the QAC person(s) assigned to the supervision of the internal evaluation of deliverables.

Table 3 QAC responsible person(s) for internal evaluation of deliverables

No.	Activity	QAC responsible person
1.1	Identification of WB regional issues related to WRM	Maria Manuela Portela/Elisabeth Sundheim Hoff
1.2	Analyse of EU innovations in water policy and EU recommendations and legislation in water sector	Elisabeth Sundheim Hoff/Barbara Karleuša
1.3	Analyse of existing curricula related to WRM in both EU and WB partner countries	Maria Mavrova-Guirguinova/Maria Manuela Portela
1.4	Identification of needed laboratory resources in WB HEIs and alignment with formed EU HEIs WRM laboratory equipment list	Barbara Karleuša
1.5	Workshop on innovative practices in the EU water sector: barriers and opportunities	Elisabeth Sundheim Hoff /Maria Manuela Portela
2.1	Development of specific competencies and learning outcomes of curricula in WB	Elisabeth Sundheim Hoff/Barbara Karleuša
2.2	Development of courses content and syllabi	Maria Mavrova-Guirguinova
2.3	Innovation of existing and development of new master curricula for WRM in WB	Elisabeth Sundheim Hoff/Barbara Karleuša
2.4	Accreditation of master curricula	Barbara Karleuša
2.5	Theme-based training of teaching staff for acquiring new teaching and learning methods	Maria Manuela Portela
2.6	Purchasing of literature, software and laboratory equipment, installation and activation	Milan Gocić/Maria Mavrova-Guirguinova
3.1	Introduction with LLL courses for professionals in water sector in EU	Elisabeth Sundheim Hoff
3.2	Analyse of water sector needs for LLL courses in WB	Barbara Karleuša
3.3	Development of trainings' content and corresponding educational material	Maria Mavrova-Guirguinova/Maria Manuela Portela
4.1	Implementation of developed master curricula	Maria Mavrova-Guirguinova
4.2	Implementation of trainings for professionals in water sector	Elisabeth Sundheim Hoff
4.3	Self-evaluation of master curricula	Maria Manuela Portela/ Maria Mavrova-Guirguinova
4.4	Self-evaluation of trainings for professionals in water sector	Maria Manuela Portela/ Maria Mavrova-Guirguinova
5.1	Development of the Quality and Assurance Plan	Maria Manuela Portela/ Milan Gocić/Elisabeth Sundheim Hoff/Maria Mavrova-Guirguinova/Barbara Karleuša
5.2	Regular Quality Assurance Committee meetings	Maria Manuela Portela/ Milan Gocić/Elisabeth Sundheim Hoff/Maria Mavrova-Guirguinova/Barbara Karleuša
5.3	External evaluation of the project	Milan Gocić
5.4	External financial control	Milan Gocić
5.5	Inter-project coaching	Maria Manuela Portela/Milan Gocić/Elisabeth Sundheim Hoff/Maria Mavrova-Guirguinova/Barbara Karleuša

No.	Activity	QAC responsible person
6.1	Creation of the Dissemination & Exploitation Plan	Elisabeth Sundheim Hoff
6.2	Development of project website and promotional materials	Milan Gocić
6.3	Info days for student enrolment	Maria Mavrova-Guirguinova
6.4	Roundtables with non-academic sector	Barbara Karleuša
6.5	Winter/summer schools	Elisabeth Sundheim Hoff
6.6	Symposium for promoting WRM in WB	Maria Mavrova-Guirguinova
7.1	Kick-off meeting	Barbara Karleuša
7.2	Brussels kick-off meeting	Milan Gocić/Maria Manuela Portela
7.3	Development of the Project management guide	Elisabeth Sundheim Hoff
7.4	Regular Steering Committee & Project Management meetings	Maria Mavrova-Guirguinova
7.5	Day-to-day coordination of project activities	Barbara Karleuša
7.6	Submission of interim and final reports	Maria Manuela Portela/Elisabeth Sundheim Hoff/Maria Mavrova-Guirguinova/Barbara Karleuša

The Task Leader appointed by the responsible partner with the corresponding WP Leader should guarantee the quality and timeliness of the deliverables. The deliverables should be in line with the prescribed SWARM Application Form and the deliverable's template (Annex DE1 and www.swarm.ni.ac.rs). The Task Leader is responsible for assigning parts of the work to other partners involved in the activity and their coordination and for the submission of the draft deliverable to the WP Leader, QAC and the Project Coordinator. It should report to the WP Leader for any problems occurring during the implementation of the activity.

The QAC assigns each realized deliverable to the appointed reviewer, who must not be an author of the deliverable. Within two weeks, the reviewer should prepare a review report with comments in accordance with the Deliverable evaluation (Annex QA13) and send to the WP Leader. The WP Leader in cooperation with authors has one more week to implement the reviewer comments, prepare a corrected draft delivery and send written objections to the reviewer. In this case, the reviewer will have another week to send back final comments to the WP Leader. If final reviewer's comments are adequately included in the new version of the deliverable, the WP Leader sends it as a final deliverable version to the Project Coordinator and SC.

The Project Coordinator has an opportunity to give comments on the draft deliverable. In case of profound disagreement between reviewers and WP Leaders, the Project Coordinator will undertake the necessary actions to intensify the solution and has right to make the final decision.

The Steering Committee (SC), as the highest level of final decisions, accepts and officially approves the deliverables. When a deliverable has passed all previous controls without the need for

major modifications and it is accepted by SC, it can be treated as the final deliverable and, accordingly, included in the project.

4.2 Impact assessment of the project activities

The term impact is used to assess intermediate and long-term effects of an activity contributed by all SWARM partners. The satisfaction of the project beneficiaries will be investigated because of its crucial role in controlling the project results. Targeting analysis will take into account the purposes of the activities (new master curricula, trainings for professionals in water sector and all SWARM events) and the specificity of the target groups (students, training participants, event participants and stakeholders). Feedback templates (self-evaluation list of master curriculum and self-evaluation list of trainings) are tailored in order to get a complete analysis of the satisfaction of the target group. The SWARM participants, using the event evaluation form, will evaluate the different project events (workshop, meetings). The statistical evaluation with graphical presentations of acquired information will be included into the reports (Self-evaluation report of master curriculum, Self-evaluation report of training and Event report).

The time allowed for providing feedback will be communicated in advance and should be related to the size and complexity of the document and to the resources needed for review. It is advised to take into account that partners may not be available to provide feedback over religious or national holidays.

4.3 Periodic internal project quality evaluation

Gathering information for measurement of the project performance during its implementation (i.e. tools for verification of project realization and results in line with work plan and Logical Framework Matrix) are defined through the different kind of evaluation and reporting documents i.e. annexes of this Quality and Assurance Plan.

Periodic internal quality control is ensured with: annually Questionnaire on the project management assessment, biannually Questionnaire on the work package assessment, Deliverable evaluation, and Technical and Financial reports.

5. External monitoring

Evaluation of the project activities and results will also be performed by independent external expert(s) who will carry out independent comprehensive monitoring evaluations to review and report on the progress of the project twice during the course of the project: at the mid-point of the project and six months prior to the end of the project. The evaluations intend to make sure that the project is carried out according to plan and to provide advice to improve the quality of the project realization. Financial evaluation will take place twice during the course of the project: at the mid-point of the project and two months prior to the end of the project.

The external monitoring of the project includes assessment of various project aspects:

➢ Relevance of the project in terms of its goals and achievements,

➢ Efficiency (are the activities within the work-packages done on time),

➢ Effectiveness in terms of how well the project specific objectives are met,

➢ Impact level in departments, faculty, university, and

➢ Sustainability of the project after its completion.

The external monitoring performed by the National Erasmus Office (NEO) and EACEA comprises three types of monitoring, based on the deliverables' achievement:

➢ Preventive (in the first project year),

➢ Advisory (after the first project year), and

➢ Control (after the end of the project – sustainability check).

Considering all aspects and findings within the course of the three previous types of monitoring, the NEO will send a report to EACEA.

The external evaluation of the project aims to:

➢ Provide an outside critical view of the project approach and methodology and give suggestions for their improvement during and after the project implementation,

➢ Monitor the effectiveness of the project activities and the quality of the project results during and after the project implementation,

➢ Evaluate the project progress and overall satisfaction of all partners involved with project management and financial handling,

➢ Evaluate the single phases of the project,

➢ Evaluate the milestones of the project (e.g. creation of the Guidelines and Plans),

➢ Measure the impact of the project activities.

5.1 Criteria for the selection of external evaluator

5.1.1 Description of the external evaluation task

The external evaluator (person not involved in the SWARM project Consortium) will have access to the internal reports from the partners and will receive the project outputs. He/she will also be included in the e-mail correspondences for monitoring of the activity of the partners and will have access to the collaboration platform. The external evaluator will be responsible for giving feedback to the partners after each report has been received and for making recommendations that can be used for corrective actions to ensure best possible results.

Two external Quality Assurance Reports will be delivered by the external quality evaluator at the middle and six months prior to the end of the funding period of the project: one interim external evaluation report to be used for the project's Interim Report and for making improvements and one Final Quality Assurance Report before end of the funded period to be used for the project's Final Report. The external evaluator is furthermore expected to be available for virtual meetings with the coordination team and/or the whole consortium.

5.1.2 Profile of the external evaluator

The potential candidate should have a strong background in project related topics and objectives such as development of master curricula. He/she should demonstrate in his/her application that he/she has sound knowledge and understanding of the project topic and field of activity. Prior involvement into the implementation of EU-funded projects connected to the projects topic as coordinator or partner, past experiences with projects addressing the projects' partner countries (Serbia, Kosovo* , Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Montenegro) as well as involvement with National Authorities responsible for Higher Education are highly appreciated. Past experience conducting external evaluation or as reviewer is an asset. A candidate should also have excellent knowledge of English language (both verbal and written).

5.1.3 Responsibilities of the external evaluator

The main responsibilities of the external evaluator of the project will be to:

➢ Prepare an external evaluation plan along with the necessary questionnaires and documents, needed for the plan implementation;
➢ Consult the internal evaluation reports;
➢ Participate in at least one coordination meeting within the project;
➢ Prepare the evaluation reports, including recommendations to the partners for improvement

of performance and overall assessment of the project implementation and impact.

5.1.4 Evaluation budget

UNI will subcontract the external audit agency (bodies not involved in the SWARM project Consortium) for the purpose of external review of the project and for external financial control. The SWARM project allows for a maximum contract price of EUR 6.000 (incl. all related costs) for the external evaluation for quality and the same price for the financial evaluation. The tender procedure will be transparent, fair and based on principles of equal treatment, which also means candidates are able to propose different financial offers according to their own estimated costs. All the candidates are expected to specify at least the following items in their offer: planned working days for (1) interim external evaluation report, (2) final external evaluation report, (3) online meetings with coordination team, (4) per month in order to follow the projects progress. The candidates will be requested to specify his/her VAT status. The contract will be awarded to the bid offering best value for money (best price-quality ratio).

5.1.5 Cross-project evaluation

In addition to the external evaluator, SWARM should also meet with members of a running and/or completed project in a similar field to share ideas, review activities and management of the project. This evaluation should be held in the second project year.

5.2 Academic quality assurance

QAC is not responsible for the quality assurance of the academic content of the project outcomes (new master curricula). WP2 and WP4, as leaders for those outcomes, must ensure that the quality standards defined in the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (2015), established by ENQA will be met. National Quality Agencies (Commission for accreditation and quality assurance) in WB countries involved in the project (Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo*, Montenegro) will carry out external quality assurance of new master curricula and make approval decision for their future exploitation.

6. Quality plan schedule

Quality plan schedule of WP5 is presented in Table 4.

Table 4 Quality plan schedule of WP5

Reference no. and title of WP5 activity	Due date	Expected deliverable
5.1 Development of the Quality and Assurance Plan	14-04-2019	Plan
5.2 Regular Quality Assurance Committee meetings	14-10-2021	Reports
5.3 External evaluation of the project	14-06-2020	Reports
5.4 External financial control	14-11-2021	Report
5.5 Inter-project coaching	14-05-2020	Event/Report

Annexes

Different supporting documents have been elaborated for the overall enhancement of the project quality plan:

- ➢ Annex QA1 – Agenda event template
- ➢ Annex QA2 – Attendance list
- ➢ Annex QA3 – Event evaluation list template
- ➢ Annex QA4 – Event report form
- ➢ Annex QA5 – Self-evaluation list of master curriculum
- ➢ Annex QA6 – Self-evaluation report of master curriculum
- ➢ Annex QA7 – Self-evaluation list of training
- ➢ Annex QA8 – Self-evaluation report of training
- ➢ Annex QA9 – Questionnaire on the project management assessment
- ➢ Annex QA10 – Report on the project management assessment
- ➢ Annex QA11 – Questionnaire on the work package assessment
- ➢ Annex QA12 – Report on the work package assessment
- ➢ Annex QA13 – Deliverable evaluation

- ➢ Annex DE1 – WORD template
- ➢ Annex DE2 – PowerPoint template

Annex QA1 – Agenda template

QA1 - Agenda event template

Project title: Strengthening of master curricula in water resources management for the Western Balkans HEIs and stakeholders

Acronym: SWARM

Project number:

597888-EPP-1-2018-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

Work package	Title
Ref. No	
Activity	Title
Ref. No	

Dates	day and day month year (Arrival date: day month, Departure date: day month year)
City	
Meeting venue	
Address	

Day, Date	
Venue and address	
10:00-10:30	SWARM participants registration
First Session -	
10:30-10:40	Welcome speeches	
10:40-11:00		
11:00-11:30		
11:30-12:00	Coffee break
Second Session -	
12:00-12:30		
12:30-12:50		
12:50-13:10		
13:10-14:00	Buffet lunch (Rectorate Building Restaurant)
Third Session –	
14:00-15:30		
15:30-16:00	Conclusions of the day
19:30	Social event

Annex QA2 – Attendance list template

Type of event	
Venue	
Date	
Organizer	

No.	Name	Institution acronym	E-mail	Signature	I would like to opt out from being photographed at the event
1		P1-UNI			
2		P2-BOKU			
3		P3-NMBU			
4		P4-AUTh			
5		P5-UACEG			
6		P6 - UL			
7		P8-UNS			
8		P9-UNSA			
9		P10-UNMO			
10		P11-UPKM			
11		P12-TCASU			
12		P13-UoM			
13		P14 – PWMC VV			
14					
15					
16					
17					

University of Nis

Strengthening of master curricula in water resources management for the Western Balkans HEIs and stakeholders

No.	Name	Institution acronym	E-mail	Signature	I would like to opt out from being photographed at the event
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					
29					
30					
31					
32					
33					
34					
35					
36					
37					
38					
39					
40					
41					
42					
43					
44					

Annex QA3 – Event evaluation list template

EVENT

EVALUATION LIST

Type of event	
Venue	
Date	

General organisation of the event

Grading	Very poor	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Logistic preparation and organization of event	1	2	3	4	5
Content of the agenda	1	2	3	4	5
Arrangements of the event (venue, equipment, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5

Comment:

General working communication

Grading	Very Poor	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Communication before the event	1	2	3	4	5
Duration and timetable of the event	1	2	3	4	5
Quality of materials provided during the event	1	2	3	4	5
Quality of presentations	1	2	3	4	5
Communication between the organizer and the other partners	1	2	3	4	5
Engagement of the participants in the activities and discussions	1	2	3	4	5

University of Nis

Strengthening of master curricula in water resources management for the Western Balkans HEIs and stakeholders

Project number: 597888-EPP-1-2018-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP   www.swarm.ni.ac.rs

Overall success of the event

Grading	Very Poor	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Mode of reaching the decisions at the event	1	2	3	4	5
Opportunities to express your opinion and influence decisions	1	2	3	4	5
Objectives in the agenda regarding the SWARM project are reached	1	2	3	4	5
Discussion of tasks for the upcoming activities and events	1	2	3	4	5
Assignment of follow-up tasks	1	2	3	4	5

Comment:

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your comments are important to us and provide us with valuable feedback on the quality of the event, which will be taken into account when organising future events.

QA4 – EVENT REPORT FORM

Type of event	
Venue	
Date	
Organizer	
Reporting date	
Report author(s)	

EVENT DESCRIPTION

with special reference to goals and outcomes

Number of participants at the event	
Participants (organisations)	
Event description:	

Attachments

Agenda (pdf)	Title
Attendance list (pdf)	Title
Photos (jpg)	Title(s)
News form (pdf)	Title
Deliverable (pdf)	Title of document
Presentations (pdf)	Title(s)
Other personal remarks	

Organisation details

Date of event material release	
Date of participants list's finalisation	
Date of agenda finalisation	
Number of participants (according to the attendance list)	
Comments	

Problems encountered during the event preparation phase

Please add your comments, if any:

Strengths and limitations of the event (please include comments received)

Strengths of the event and contributions or activities by participants	
Suggestions for the improvement	
Any further comments	

Evaluation details

Results of evaluation of the general organisation of the event

Description
Table/Figure

The general organisation of the event

Grading	Very poor	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Logistic preparation and organization of event					
Content of the agenda					
Arrangements of the event (venue, equipment, etc.)					

Add Figure

Results of evaluation of general working communication

Description

Table/Figure

General working communication

Grading	Very poor	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Communication before the event					
Duration and timetable of the event					
Quality of materials provided during the event					
Quality of presentations					
Communication between the organizer and the other partners					
Engagement of the participants in the activities and discussions					

Add Figure

Results of evaluation of overall success of the event

Description

Table/Figure

Overall success of the event

Grading	Poor	Very poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Mode of reaching the decisions at the event					
Opportunities to express your opinion and influence decisions					
Objectives in the agenda regarding the SWARM project are reached					
Discussion of tasks for the upcoming activities and events					
Assignment of follow-up tasks					

Add Figure

Please indicate your suggestions for further event's improvement:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

SELF-EVALUATION LIST
OF MASTER CURRICULUM

Institution	
Date	
Semester	

General evaluation of master curriculum

Grading	Very poor	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
How do you rate the quality of teaching on new master study programme?	1	2	3	4	5
How do you assess the interest of teaching staff in the quality of master study programme?	1	2	3	4	5
Rate quality of teaching material	1	2	3	4	5
How do you assess access to literature?	1	2	3	4	5
Rate learning obligations	1	2	3	4	5
Assessing the fulfilment of expectations regarding master curriculum	1	2	3	4	5

Comment:

General expectations

Grading	Very Poor	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Overall impression	1	2	3	4	5
Scope of material	1	2	3	4	5
Laboratory equipment	1	2	3	4	5
Practical exercises	1	2	3	4	5
My expectations were met	1	2	3	4	5

Comment:

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your comments are important to us and provide us with valuable feedback on the quality of the new developed master curriculum.

SELF-EVALUATION REPORT

OF MASTER CURRICULUM

Type	Master curriculum
Institution	
Reporting date	
Report author(s)	

MASTER CURRICULUM DESCRIPTION

with special reference to goals and outcomes

Number of *enrolled students*	
Master curriculum description:	

University of Nis

Problems encountered during the event preparation phase

Please add your comments, if any:

Evaluation details

Results of general evaluation of master curriculum

Description

Table/Figure

General evaluation of master curriculum

Grading	Very poor	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
How do you rate the quality of teaching on new master study programme?					
How do you assess the interest of teaching staff in the quality of master study programme?					
Rate quality of teaching material					
How do you assess access to literature?					
Rate learning obligations					
Assessing the fulfilment of expectations regarding master curriculum					

Add Figure

Results of general expectations

Description

Table/Figure

General expectations

Grading	Very poor	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Overall impression					
Scope of material					
Laboratory equipment					
Practical exercises					
My expectations were met					

Add Figure

Please indicate your suggestions for further event's improvement:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Annex QA7 – Self-evaluation list of training

SELF-EVALUATION LIST OF TRAINING

Venue	
Date	

General organization of training

Grading	Very poor	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Relevance of the topic	1	2	3	4	5
Usefulness of the acquired knowledge	1	2	3	4	5
Rating of the methodology of working with participants	1	2	3	4	5
Rating of prepared training materials	1	2	3	4	5
Rating organization	1	2	3	4	5
Rating of working conditions	1	2	3	4	5
Rating interactivity in training	1	2	3	4	5
Rating transferability of acquired knowledge	1	2	3	4	5
Rating of satisfaction of participation in training	1	2	3	4	5
Assessing the fulfilment of expectations regarding training	1	2	3	4	5

Comment:

General participant expectations

Grading	Very Poor	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Overall impression	1	2	3	4	5
Scope of material	1	2	3	4	5
Examples	1	2	3	4	5
Practical exercises	1	2	3	4	5
My expectations were met	1	2	3	4	5

Comment:

Evaluation of trainers

Grading	Very Poor	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Quality of presentations	1	2	3	4	5
Quality of prepared material	1	2	3	4	5
Enabling active participation of participants	1	2	3	4	5

Comment:

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your comments are important to us and provide us with valuable feedback on the quality of the new developed master curriculum.

Annex QA8 – Self-evaluation report of training

SELF-EVALUATION REPORT

OF TRAINING

Type	Training
Institution	
Reporting date	
Report author(s)	

TRAINING DESCRIPTION

with special reference to goals and outcomes

Number of *participants at the training*	
Training description	

Attachments

Attendance list (pdf)	Title
Photos (jpg)	Title(s)
Presentations (pdf)	Title(s)
Other personal remarks	

Organisation details

Invitation sent to	
Date of training material release	
Date of participants list's finalisation	
Number of participants (according to the participants list)	
Comments	

Problems encountered during the training preparation phase

Please add your comments, if any:

Strengths and limitations of the training (please include comments received)

Strengths of the event and contributions or activities by participants	
Suggestions for the improvement	
Any further comments	

Evaluation details

Results of evaluation the general organization of the training

Description
Table/Figure

General organization of training					
Grading	Very poor	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Relevance of the topic					
Usefulness of the acquired knowledge					
Rating of the methodology of working with participants					

	Very poor	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Rating of prepared training materials					
Rating organization					
Rating of working conditions					
Rating interactivity in training					
Rating transferability of acquired knowledge					
Rating of satisfaction of participation in training					
Assessing the fulfilment of expectations regarding training					

Add Figure

General participant expectations

Description

Table/Figure

General participant expectations

Grading	Very poor	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Overall impression					
Scope of material					
Examples					
Practical exercises					
My expectations were met					

Add Figure

Evaluation of trainers

Description

Table/Figure

Evaluation of trainers

Grading	Very poor	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Quality of presentations					
Quality of prepared material					
Enabling active participation of participants					

Add Figure

Please indicate your suggestions for further event's improvement:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Annex QA9 – Questionnaire on the project management assesment

QUESTIONNAIRE ON
THE PROJECT MANAGEMENT ASSESSMENT

Overall assessment of project management

Grading	Very poor	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Structure of project time schedule	1	2	3	4	5
Communication between partners	1	2	3	4	5
Timeliness of feedbacks from the coordinator when requested	1	2	3	4	5
Incisiveness of coordination	1	2	3	4	5
How do you rate overall the project management for the period of the last year?	1	2	3	4	5

Comment:

Evaluation of level of involvement

Grading	Very Poor	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Actively involved in the project development	1	2	3	4	5
Satisfied with the implementation of the project activities	1	2	3	4	5
Distribution among partners of tasks sharing	1	2	3	4	5

Comment:

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your comments are important to us and provide us with valuable feedback on the quality of the project management.

Annex QA10 – Report on the project management assessment

REPORT ON

THE PROJECT MANAGEMENT ASSESSMENT

Evaluation details

Results of evaluation the overall assessment of project management

Description

Table/Figure

Overall assessment of project management

Grading	Very poor	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Structure of project time schedule					
Communication between partners					
Timeliness of feedbacks from the coordinator when requested					
Incisiveness of coordination					
How do you rate overall the project management for the period of the last year?					

Add Figure

University of Nis

Strengthening of master curricula in water resources management for the Western Balkans HEIs and stakeholders

Evaluation of level of involvement

Description

Table/Figure

General participant expectations

Grading	Very poor	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Actively involved in the project development					
Satisfied with the implementation of the project activities					
Distribution among partners of tasks sharing					

Add Figure

Please indicate your suggestions for further project management improvement:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Annex QA11 – Questionnaire on the work package assessment

QUESTIONNAIRE ON

THE WORK PACKAGE ASSESSMENT

Work package	
Work package leader	
Date	

Overall assessment of work package management

Grading	Very poor	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Structure of work package time schedule	1	2	3	4	5
Communication with task leaders	1	2	3	4	5
Timeliness of feedbacks from the task leaders when requested	1	2	3	4	5
Timeliness of providing deliverables	1	2	3	4	5

Comment:

University of Nis

Strengthening of master curricula in water resources management
for the Western Balkans HEIs and stakeholders

Project number: 597888-EPP-1-2018-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP   www.swarm.ni.ac.rs

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Evaluation of level of involvement</td></tr>
<tr><td align="right">Grading</td><td>Very Poor</td><td>Poor</td><td>Good</td><td>Very Good</td><td>Excellent</td></tr>
<tr><td>Work package leader is actively involved in the project development</td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr>
<tr><td>Satisfied with the implementation of the work package activities</td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr>
<tr><td>Distribution among partners of tasks sharing</td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr>
</table>

Comment:

Please describe the main problems encountered and recommend a solution if possible:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your comments are important to us and provide us with valuable feedback on the quality of the work package management.

Annex QA12 – Report on the work package assessment

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

REPORT ON

THE WORK PACKAGE ASSESSMENT

Evaluation details

Results of evaluation the overall assessment of work package management

Description

Table/Figure

Overall assessment of work package management

Grading	Very poor	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Structure of work package time schedule					
Communication with task leaders					
Timeliness of feedbacks from the task leaders when requested					
Timeliness of providing deliverables					

Add Figure

University of Nis

Evaluation of level of involvement

Description

Table/Figure

Evaluation of level of involvement

Grading	Very poor	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Work package leader is actively involved in the project development					
Satisfied with the implementation of the work package activities					
Distribution among partners of tasks sharing					

Add Figure

Please indicate your suggestions for further work package management improvement:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Annex QA13 – Deliverable evaluation

DELIVERABLE EVALUATION

Work package	
Deliverable Name	
Date of Review	
Reviewer's Name and Organization	

Format of deliverable

	Yes	No	Comment
Does the document meet the commitments from Application Form?			
Does the document contain: WP number, Deliverable name, Version, Author Name and Date?			
Does the document contain all the necessary official logos of the project and the Erasmus+ program?			
Does the document include a Table of Contents?			
Does the document use the fonts and paragraphs defined in the official template?			
Does the spelling, grammar etc. of the document is appropriate?			

Comment:

University of Nis

Strengthening of master curricula in water resources management for the Western Balkans HEIs and stakeholders

Contents of deliverable

Grading	Very Poor	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Clarity of the contents of the document	1	2	3	4	5
How does the content of the document match the description in the Application Form?	1	2	3	4	5
How is the treatment of the contents of the document regarding the required depth?	1	2	3	4	5

Comment:

Conclusion

	Yes	No	Comment
Document accepted, no changes required			
Document accepted but changes required			
Document not accepted, it must be reviewed after changes are implemented			

Annex DE1 – WORD template

REPORT ON XXXXXXX XXXXXX XXXX XXXXXX XXXXX XXXX XXXX XXXXXX XXXXX XXXX XXXXXXX XXXXXXX

University of Nis

Strengthening of master curricula in water resources management for the Western Balkans HEIs and stakeholders

www.swarm.ni.ac.rs

PROJECT INFO

Project title	Strengthening of master curricula in water resources management for the Western Balkans HEIs and stakeholders
Project acronym	SWARM
Project reference number	597888-EPP-1-2018-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP
Funding scheme	Erasmus+ Capacity building in the field of higher education
Web address	www.swarm.ni.ac.rs
Coordination institution	University of Nis
Project duration	15 November 2018 – 14 November 2021

DOCUMENT CONTROL SHEET

Work package	
Ref. no and title of activity	
Title of deliverable	
Lead institution	
Author(s)	
Document status	
Document version and date	
Dissemination level	

VERSIONING AND CONTRIBUTION HISTORY

Version	Date	Revision description	Partner responsible
v.01			

Contents

Heading First

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit, sed do eiusmod tempor incididunt ut labore et dolore magna aliqua. Ut enim ad minim veniam, quis nostrud exercitation ullamco laboris

nisi ut aliquip ex ea commodo consequat. Duis aute irure dolor in reprehenderit in voluptate velit esse cillum dolore eu fugiat nulla pariatur. Excepteur sint occaecat cupidatat non proident, sunt in culpa qui officia deserunt mollit anim id est laborum.

1.1 Heading Second

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit, sed do eiusmod tempor incididunt ut labore et dolore magna aliqua. Ut enim ad minim veniam, quis nostrud exercitation ullamco laboris nisi ut aliquip ex ea commodo consequat. Duis aute irure dolor in reprehenderit in voluptate velit esse cillum dolore eu fugiat nulla pariatur. Excepteur sint occaecat cupidatat non proident, sunt in culpa qui officia deserunt mollit anim id est laborum.

1.1.1 Heading the third

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit, sed do eiusmod tempor incididunt ut labore et dolore magna aliqua. Ut enim ad minim veniam, quis nostrud exercitation ullamco laboris nisi ut aliquip ex ea commodo consequat. Duis aute irure dolor in reprehenderit in voluptate velit esse cillum dolore eu fugiat nulla pariatur. Excepteur sint occaecat cupidatat non proident, sunt in culpa qui officia deserunt mollit anim id est laborum

Annex DE1 – PowerPoint template

Strengthening of master curricula in water resources management
for the Western Balkans HEIs and stakeholders

www.swarm.ni.ac.rs

Strengthening of master curricula in water resources management
for the Western Balkans HEIs and stakeholders

www.swarm.ni.ac.rs