

**ENVIRONMENTAL RISK ASSESSMENT AND
MITIGATION ON CULTURAL HERITAGE
ASSETS IN CENTRAL ASIA
ERAMCA
ERASMUS+ CBHE PROJECT NR. 609574**



**Deliverable D7.1
Quality and Evaluation Plan**

Date	Version	Author(s)
29.03.2020	Draft sent to PL	UNIMED – Fulvio Rinaudo
14.04.2020	Final version	UNIMED – Fulvio Rinaudo

Table of Content

Table of Content	2
1. Introduction	4
2. The evaluation strategy within the ERAMCA project	4
2.1. Summative purposes.....	5
2.2. Formative purposes	5
2.3. Measuring impact purposes.....	5
3. The subjects of evaluation (what is under evaluation)	5
3.1. Internal processes	5
3.2. External processes.....	6
3.3. Impact evaluation.....	6
4. Methods and tools	7
4.1. Internal processes methods and tools	7
4.1.1. Partners’ survey	7
4.1.2. Coordination meetings questionnaire	7
4.2. External processes methods and tools.....	7
4.2.1. Events feedback.....	7
4.2.2. Master courses	8
4.2.3. Training of teachers and staff	8
4.3. Impact evaluation methods and tools	8
4.3.1. Questionnaire to Professors	8
4.4. Questionnaire to Administrative and Technical Staff	9
5. The role of players	9
5.1. Internal process evaluation.....	10
5.2. External process evaluation	10
5.3. Impact evaluation.....	10
6. Main steps to monitoring and evaluation	10
7. Reporting	11
8. Annexes	11
8.1. Annex 1: Calendar of planned meetings	11
8.2. Annex 2: Partners’ survey	12
8.3. Annex III: Meeting Evaluation Questionnaire	14
8.4. Annex IV: Event feedback questionnaire	17
8.5. Annex V: Master courses questionnaire	18
8.6. Annex VI: Training Evaluation questionnaire	20



8.7.	Annex VII: Learning material	22
8.8.	Annex VIII: Questionnaire to Professors	24
8.9.	Annex IX: Questionnaire to Administrative and Technical Staff	25
8.10.	Annex X: Final results and project added value overall	26

List of Tables

Table 1. Internal processes subject to monitoring and evaluation	5
Table 2; External processes subject to monitoring and evaluation	6
Table 3: Short-term impact evaluation.....	6
Table 4: Monitoring and evaluation planning.....	10

1. Introduction

This Evaluation Plan is elaborated by UNIMED (subcontracted for the Quality Assessment of the project) in close collaboration with Politecnico di Torino, leader of WP7 “Quality Plan”, for the project “ERAMCA – Environmental Risk Assessment and Mitigation on Cultural Heritage assets in Central Asia”, in the frame of an ERASMUS+ Capacity Building in the field of Higher Education grant with the reference number 609574-EPP-1-2019-1-IT-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP.

ERAMCA is an ERAMUS+ project that to mix European experience in Environmental Cultural Heritage (CH) risk assessment and reduction actions with the specific constraints for Central Asia region, to offer a possible and feasible interdisciplinary approach, which will grow up in joint actions at national level, thanks to the collaboration of local expert and young researchers that will continue to develop the strategy of ERAMCA project in the future years.

The aim of the quality plan is to monitor the achievement of project goals, objectives, strategies and evaluation methods. The issues to be tackled are the ones explained in the project. The quality plan has been created based on the information contained in the project proposal and agreements made with the project coordinator. The evaluation plan has been implemented with the purpose to:

- Design an evaluation strategy to support the process and progress of the project and define the evaluation priorities based on the project objectives;
- Identify evaluation methods and tools to be used in the evaluation;
- Establish the necessary processes for measuring fulfilment of the objectives;
- Define the approach to analyse the relevance, progress, success of the project.

Monitoring and evaluation activities help to improve performance and achieve results. While monitoring is a tool serving foremost the management purpose, evaluation contributes to both the management and to assess whether the project has produced the desired effects.

To monitor means to observe, and to check progress against plans. Monitoring of activities and outputs means to observe whether intended activities are performed, products are delivered and whether implementation is on track. Monitoring reports on the operational progress of the project will enable the management to:

- assess whether the project is proceeding according to the agreed work schedules, so that the necessary actions may be taken;
- propose and participate in any necessary reviews of the project as a result of these assessments.

For the purpose of the monitoring of the ERAMCA project, the instruments described in chapter 3 of this document will be used.

To evaluate means assessing, as systematically and objectively as possible, an ongoing or completed project. Evaluations appraise data and information that inform strategic decisions, thus improving the project or programme in the future.

Monitoring is integrated into the evaluation process. During an evaluation, information from previous monitoring processes will be used to understand the ways in which the project developed and stimulated the foreseen effects. Information gathered in relation to these aspects during the monitoring and evaluation process will provide the basis for the evaluative analysis.

In order to ensure a comprehensive quality assessment, the ERAMCA project also foresees the involvement of an External Evaluator. The aim the latter is to evaluate the internal performance and the external impacts of the project, and to perform quality control on main deliverables.

2. The evaluation strategy within the ERAMCA project

The aim of the evaluation is to support project coordinator and WP leaders in ensuring highest quality of project outputs, activities and results, as well as in improving project performances. It should support decision making by delivering necessary evidence to introduce any significant changes, should they be needed. The evaluation will

increase the quality of project activities and outputs and measures to what extent they reach the short-term project goals and results set in the application.

The methodology aims at pursuing both summative and formative goals. The overall approach to evaluation stresses the interrelation between monitoring, assessment and project implementation. The evaluative analysis is not separate from the project, but rather is part of it from the beginning. Planning, evaluation, and implementation are all parts of a whole, and they work best when they work together.

Information on whether goals are being met and on how different aspects of the project are working is essential to a continuous improvement process. In addition, and equally important, the external evaluation will provide new insights or new information that were not anticipated. What are frequently called “unanticipated consequences” of a project are among the most useful outcomes of the assessment enterprise.

2.1. Summative purposes

For summative purposes, a logic model will be used. Based on the planned activities and means of measurement, a logical framework matrix 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.

2.2. 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.

2.3. Measuring impact purposes

In order to explore the short-term impact, in addition to regular activities of collecting feedbacks and analysing data from beneficiaries and concerned stakeholders, further evaluation exercises will be carried out during the last six months of the project.

3. The subjects of evaluation (what is under evaluation)

According to the purposes, the following subjects are addressed:

3.1. Internal processes

Table 1. Internal processes subject to monitoring and evaluation

Process	Target	Investigated dimension	Tool
Project management and consortium dynamics	WP Leaders and project partners	Internal communication and related tools	On-line Questionnaires (partners' survey)
Project management and consortium dynamics	WP Leaders and project partners	Management and sharing of responsibilities	On-line Questionnaires (partners' survey)
Project management and consortium dynamics	WP Leaders and project partners	Effectiveness of the adopted/developed tools in implementing the project	On-line Questionnaires (partners' survey)
Project management and consortium dynamics	WP Leaders and project partners	Perception of local/transnational relationship	On-line Questionnaires (partners' survey)
Project management and consortium dynamics	WP Leaders and project partners	Coordination meetings	Questionnaires (coordination meeting questionnaires)

3.2. External processes

Table 2. External processes subject to monitoring and evaluation

Process	Target	Investigated dimension	Tool
Events feedback	Beneficiaries Stakeholders Networks	Communication Common understanding Level of commitment Active participation	Questionnaire/On-line questionnaire at the end of the event
Master Courses	Professors Students	Perceived relevance Perceived learning (for student) Perceived usefulness Active participation	Questionnaire at the end of the courses
Training of teachers and staff	Professors Trainers Staff	Perceived relevance Perceived learning Perceived usefulness Active participation	Questionnaire at the end of the training (additional questions on general questionnaire for Train the trainers)
Dissemination overall, all levels	Beneficiaries Stakeholders Networks Online communities	Level of dissemination at local level Level of dissemination at national and international level Players in dissemination (boundaries effect) Participation in events	Reporting tools, analytics, other sources

3.3. Impact evaluation

Table 3. Short-term impact evaluation

Process	Target	Investigated dimension	Tool
Perceived impact of the Master courses	Professor, Students	Relevance to the professional profile Added value	Questionnaire or semi-structured interview
Perceived impact of the training session	Professors, tutors, trainers	Relevance to the professional profile Relevance to the sector Added value	Questionnaire or semi-structured interview
Perceived impact of the project from an organisational point of view	Technical and admin persons working at the university	Impact on internal processes and procedures	Questionnaire

In addition to field data as above described, prospective impact will also include analysis of the data collected over the project lifespan, to define prospective impact in the overall objectives addressed by the project, such as:

- changes in involved higher education institutions (improved level of competences and quality learning offer; enhanced relevance to the labour market; increased cooperation with external stakeholders);

- changes in higher education system (improved procedures and processes to deal with new learning offer and increased relationships with other educational institutions).

4. Methods and tools

4.1. Internal processes methods and tools

4.1.1. Partners' survey

The Partners' Survey is meant for collecting the perceptions of the members of the consortium in areas related to project management, such as effectiveness of coordination, communication between partners, awareness about roles and responsibilities, perceived performance and progression with reference to planned activities, assessment of the implementation of work packages, effectiveness and efficiency of dissemination and communication, perceptions on sustainability.

The evaluation method is represented by an online questionnaire delivered in Google Form. The evaluation will be done in the form of a self-assessment by participants and it will provide qualitative results.

The online questionnaire has been drawn consisting of a series of questions grouped in thematic modules that the respondent has to answer in a set format. A distinction is made between closed-ended and open-ended questions.

The response options for a closed-ended question are exhaustive and mutually exclusive. The types of response for closed-ended questions are rate scale responses presented with a continuous scale based on 5 levels: "fully agree"; "agree"; "average"; "not agree"; "not agree at all".

Instead, an open-ended question asks the respondent to formulate his/her own answer in his/her own words.

The partners will have to fill out the questionnaire designed by POLITO in the online tool which is administrated by the external evaluator each six months. This way, the answers provided to the questions are anonymous but the evaluator can check if all the partners fill out the questionnaire completely and correctly.

The online questionnaire is provided as Annex II.

4.1.2. Coordination meetings questionnaire

This questionnaire is aimed at collecting feedback from participants to project meetings.

The questionnaire is organised in a given set of close-ended questions referring to two main areas of investigation, namely practical organisation of the meeting and satisfaction with the meeting in terms of content and outcomes. Three further open-ended questions explore the strengths and weaknesses of the meeting, and ask about suggestions for improvement.

The response options for a closed-ended question are exhaustive and mutually exclusive. The types of response for closed-ended questions are rate scale responses presented with a continuous scale based on 5 levels: "fully agree"; "agree"; "average"; "not agree"; "not agree at all".

Instead, an open-ended question asks the respondent to formulate his/her own answer in his/her own worlds.

The questionnaire is provided as Annex III.

4.2. External processes methods and tools

4.2.1. Events feedback

This tool aims at collecting feedbacks from participants to the events, in order to check the relevance of the project, its perceived usefulness, and its potential impact in the addressed universities' communities.

The collection of data is carried out by means of a questionnaire, that can be administered directly at the end of the event (paper based), or online after the end of the event by contacting registered participants.

The questionnaire is organised in a given set of close-ended questions referring to two main areas of investigation, namely practical organisation of the event and satisfaction with the event in terms of relevance and outcomes. A further open-ended question asks about comments and/or suggestions for improvement.

The response options for a closed-ended question are exhaustive and mutually exclusive. The types of response for closed-ended questions are rate scale responses presented with a continuous scale based on 5 levels: “fully agree”; “agree”; “average”; “not agree”; “not agree at all”.

Instead, an open-ended question asks the respondent to formulate his/her own answer in his/her own words.

The questionnaire is provided as Annex IV.

4.2.2. Master courses

This tool aims at collecting feedbacks from teachers and students, in order to check the relevance of the master courses, and the perceived meaningfulness and relevance of them.

The collection of data is carried out by means of a questionnaire that can be administered directly at the end of the modules, by means of an online tool, or on paper

The questionnaire is organised in a given set of close-ended questions referring to three main areas of investigation, namely (a) Logistical organisation; (b) Courses; (c) General aspect. A further open-ended question asks about comments and/or suggestions.

The response options for a closed-ended question are exhaustive and mutually exclusive. The types of response for closed-ended questions are rate scale responses presented with a continuous scale based on 5 levels: “fully agree”; “agree”; “average”; “not agree”; “not agree at all”.

Instead, an open-ended question asks the respondent to formulate his/her own answer in his/her own words.

The questionnaire is provided as Annex V.

4.2.3. Training of teachers and staff

This tool aims at collecting feedbacks from teachers and staff, in order to check the relevance of the training course, and the perceived meaningfulness of them.

The collection of data is carried out by means of a questionnaire that can be administered directly at the end of the modules, by means of an online tool, or on paper.

The questionnaire is organised in a given set of close-ended questions. A further open-ended question asks about comments and/or suggestions.

The response options for a closed-ended question are exhaustive and mutually exclusive. The types of response for closed-ended questions are rate scale responses presented with a continuous scale based on 5 levels: “fully agree”; “agree”; “average”; “not agree”; “not agree at all”.

Instead, an open-ended question asks the respondent to formulate his/her own answer in his/her own words.

The questionnaire is provided as Annex VI.

4.3. Impact evaluation methods and tools

4.3.1. Questionnaire to Professors

Administered questionnaires, or semi-structured interviews addressed to those in charge of university governance and management will be used to evaluate the short-term impact of the project. Collection of data is expected to be carried out during the last six months of the project.

Interviews will address the following themes:

- (a) Perceived impact of the project for quality of education;
- (b) Perceived relevance of the project.

The questionnaire is organised in a given set of close-ended questions referring to two main areas of investigation, namely Impact and Relevance. A further open-ended question asks about comments and/or suggestions for improvement.

The response options for a closed-ended question are exhaustive and mutually exclusive. The types of response for closed-ended questions are rate scale responses presented with a continuous scale based on five levels.

Instead, an open-ended question asks the respondent to formulate his/her own answer in his/her own words.

The possibility to replace the questionnaire with a semi-structured interview will be considered at month 30 of the project.

The questionnaire draft is provided as Annex X.

4.4. Questionnaire to Administrative and Technical Staff

Administered questionnaires addressed to the administrative and technical staff of the involved universities will be used to evaluate the short-term impact of the project implementation. Collection of data is expected to be carried out during the last six months of the project.

Interviews will address the following themes:

- (a) Perceived improvement (change) in procedures and processes;
- (b) Perceived relevance of the project for administrative and technical staff.

The questionnaire is organised in a given set of close-ended questions referring to two main areas of investigation, namely Change and Relevance. A further open-ended question asks about comments and/or suggestions for improvement.

The response options for a closed-ended question are exhaustive and mutually exclusive. The types of response for closed-ended questions are rate scale responses presented with a continuous scale based on 5 levels.

Instead, an open-ended question asks the respondent to formulate his/her own answer in his/her own words.

The questionnaire draft is provided as Annex XI.

5. The role of players

Monitoring and evaluation concern in principle all project partners, as co-responsible for delivering planned outputs in effective and efficient way. However, to facilitate the flow of information and ensure a constant check of project progressions and achievements, the following procedures are established:

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

The main concern of corrective actions on a project management basis is the quality and timeliness of project deliverables. Deviations from plan of formal project output will be documented by the project manager. Based on each monitoring report the project manager will decide whether an issue can be settled within a work package or whether interdependencies with other work packages are concerned.

If only one WP is concerned, the work package leader will supply an updated work plan for the work package which will substitute the original plan. If the work of other work packages or the success of the whole project is endangered because of late or poor performance of a work package, the project manager will inform immediately the Steering Committee, that will elaborate an updated project plan.

5.1. Internal process evaluation

Each WP leader is responsible to monitor the progress of its own WP. The project Coordinator is responsible to monitor the overall progress of the project. In case of deviations from the original plans within a specific WP, corrective actions should be taken through a bottom-up approach and should primarily be adopted within the respective work package itself.

POLITO is in charge to manage the collection of data through questionnaires, through activities described in the previous section. Questionnaires' results will be presented and discussed during the project meetings, alongside with intermediate evaluation activities results.

The QAC will prepare an intermediary report of the project as well as a final report considering all the activities, results and achievements of the project. The committee will work closely with all WP leaders to gather all the necessary elements to judge the proper implementation of project objectives, listen to partners and ensure compliance with procedures and deadlines.

5.2. External process evaluation

The partners are in charge to collect feedbacks during events and/or to administer questionnaires and/or interviews to beneficiaries and stakeholders at the end of the workshops/events and in any convenient moment during the project lifespan.

The external evaluator is responsible for the activities of quality control, under the coordination of the Quality Committee. The external evaluator objective is to evaluate the internal performance and the external impacts of the project, and to perform quality control on main deliverables.

5.3. Impact evaluation

ERAMCA partners are in charge to give the questionnaires and to carry out report to beneficiaries and stakeholders, and to deliver the reporting form in English.

The external evaluator is responsible for elaborating and analysing data collected, and to provide feedback to partners by making available the results.

6. Main steps to monitoring and evaluation

Key activities of monitoring and evaluation are planned according to the timing described in Table 4.

Table 4: Monitoring and evaluation planning

What	Where	Who provides the output/data	To whom the output/data are sent	When
To review and validate evaluation tools according to feedback collected	N/A	Consortium	Project Coordinator	By 15 days after the delivery of the Evaluation Plan
To evaluate the project meetings	Online	Project partners	POLITO	After the meetings
To collect evaluation data during events	Countries of the consortium	Project partners	POLITO	By 15 days after the events
To evaluate learning resources and learning activities (Master Courses)	Countries of the consortium	Appointed partners	POLITO	According to the resources development and training implementation

What	Where	Who provides the output/data	To whom the output/data are sent	When
To evaluate learning resources and learning activities (Training of trainers)	Countries of the consortium	Appointed partners	POLITO	According to the resources development and training implementation
To analyse six-monthly data and provide six-monthly evaluation reports	N/A	POLITO	Project Coordinator	Every six months
To provide the final evaluation report	N/A	POLITO	Project Coordinator	January 2023

7. Reporting

The Evaluation Reports will be generated to indicate status and make recommendations. External evaluator will provide periodical reports that:

- Qualify and evaluate the outcomes achieved by ERAMCA since its inception and their impact, according to the period of evaluation (activities already carried out);
- Make recommendations as appropriate for refining ERAMCA 's activities to achieve better outcomes and outcomes better aligned with the high-level objectives;
- Make recommendations in relation to future monitoring and evaluation activities for ERAMCA as seems appropriate.

The external evaluation will report to the project coordinator summarising the information and focussing on critical issues. The external evaluation will prepare a draft report for presentation to the ERAMCA partnership and finalisation in the light of this discussion.

The external evaluation will be independent in its evaluations. The external evaluation will ensure the transparency in the reporting of the monitoring and evaluation work by providing for each evaluation:

- questionnaire(s) or tools created for the assessment;
- answers and feedback collected without any modification;
- consolidated reports about the feedback collected.

8. Annexes

8.1. Annex 1: Calendar of planned meetings

These dates and places are indicative, they can be changed according to the scheduling of meetings planned by the WP leaders for their activities.

Meeting No.	Date	WP	Objectives	Outcome
1	13/16.02.2020	9	Kick-off meeting	Meeting minutes (D9.1)
2	15.05.2020	9	Virtual meeting	Meeting minutes (D9.12)
3	13/17.09.2020	1/9	Strategy Forum Workshop First mid-term meeting	Workshop minutes (D1.5) Meeting minutes (D9.6)
4	15.10.2020	9	Virtual meeting	Meeting minutes (D9.13)
5	13/16.01.2021	9	Second mid-term meeting	Meeting minutes (D9.7)
6	15.05.2021	9	Virtual meeting	Meeting minutes (D9.14)
7	13/16.07.2021	9	Third mid-term meeting	Meeting minutes (D9.8)
8	15.10.2021	9	Virtual meeting	Meeting minutes (D9.15)

Meeting No.	Date	WP	Objectives	Outcome
9	13/16.01.2022	9	Fourth mid-term meeting	Meeting minutes (D9.9)
10	15.05.2022	9	Virtual meeting	Meeting minutes (D9.16)
11	13/16.07.2022	9	Fifth mid-term meeting	Meeting minutes (D9.10)
12	15.10.2022	9	Virtual meeting	Meeting minutes (D9.17)
13	13/16.11.2022	8	Final Workshop	Meeting minutes (D8.6)
14	12/15.01.2023	9	Final meeting	Meeting minutes (D9.11)

8.2. Annex 2: Partners' survey

[Partner/Name&Surname – this will be confidential with the external evaluator]

Date:

Period of evaluation:

Relevance of the project					
Please indicate how much you agree with the following statements by circling (circulating?) your response using the scale provided, where 1 = not agree at all to 5 = fully agree.					
Relevance of the project results (so far) for my organisation	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Please explain your answer to the question above:</i>					
Relevance of the project results (so far) for the Cultural Heritage sector	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Please explain your answer to the question above:</i>					
Relevance of the project results (so far) for my region/State	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Please explain your answer to the question above:</i>					
Quality of the project implementation					
Please indicate how much the following activities have been implemented by selecting your response in the provided scale, where 1 = not agree at all to 5 = fully agree					
Keeping agreed deadlines and following procedures (e.g. work packages, administrative and financial matters)	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Please explain your answer to the question above:</i>					
Promoting national and international cooperation between partners	1	2	3	4	5



<i>Please explain your answer to the question above:</i>					
Leading/contributing to deliverables	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Please explain your answer to the question above:</i>					
Dealing with any problems and difficulties	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Please explain your answer to the question above:</i>					
Upholding fairness and diversity principles (cultural diversity among partners, fairness in the relationships among partners)	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Please explain your answer to the question above:</i>					
Efficacy of working methods	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Please explain your answer to the question above:</i>					
Efficiency of working methods	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Please explain your answer to the question above:</i>					
Communication among partners	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Please explain your answer to the question above:</i>					
Communication with the project manager/coordinator	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Please explain your answer to the question above:</i>					



Dissemination					
Please indicate how much the following activities have been implemented by selecting your response in the provided scale, where 1 = not agree at all to 5 = fully agree					
Implementing the dissemination strategy	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Please explain your answer to the question above:</i>					
Effectiveness of the dissemination activities	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Please explain your answer to the question above:</i>					
Creating synergies with the regional and national stakeholders (bilateral relationships, initiatives, projects)	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Please explain your answer to the question above:</i>					
Creating synergies with relevant European and international projects (e.g. other Erasmus+ projects; other international projects)	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Please explain your answer to the question above:</i>					

8.3. Annex III: Meeting Evaluation Questionnaire

Meeting Evaluation Questionnaire focuses on the organisation and contents of the meeting. It consists of four Sections: General Aspects, Logistic and Organisation, Contents and Suggestions.

Partners Meeting No/title: _____

Location: _____

Date: _____

PARTNER / PARTICIPANT DATA:

Name: _____

Organisation: _____

Country: _____

Please indicate how much you agree with the following statements by circling your response using the scale provided, where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree.					
GENERAL ASPECT	SD	D	N	A	SA
The objectives of the meeting were clear.	1	2	3	4	5
The issues on the agenda were consistent with the meeting objectives.	1	2	3	4	5
The meeting was useful for helping our organisation to carry out the expected project activities.	1	2	3	4	5
The materials produced before and during the meeting are clear and useful to develop the expected project activities.	1	2	3	4	5
All the partners contributed to the success of the meeting and shared decision-making.	1	2	3	4	5
The opinions of all the partners were taken into consideration in an equal and unbiased manner.	1	2	3	4	5
The meeting was useful for establishing good working relationships among the partners.	1	2	3	4	5
The meeting time was used effectively.	1	2	3	4	5
The meeting met my expectations.	1	2	3	4	5

Please indicate how much you agree with the following statements by circling your response using the scale provided, where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree.					
LOGISTIC AND ORGANISATION	SD	D	N	A	SA
The agenda (and related materials) were circulated to the partnership prior to the meeting in adequate advance?	1	2	3	4	5
Meeting time was convenient for me?	1	2	3	4	5
Sufficient time was allocated to each issue on the agenda?	1	2	3	4	5
The infrastructure provided was satisfactory (IT arrangement, PC, Internet connection, etc.)?	1	2	3	4	5
The meeting took place in a suitable room?	1	2	3	4	5



Please indicate how much you agree with the following statements by circling your response using the scale provided, where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree.

CONTENTS	SD	D	N	A	SA
The Project Coordinators significantly contributed to achieve the meeting objectives?	1	2	3	4	5
After the Meeting, to which extent are ERAMCA expected activities and results clear to you?	1	2	3	4	5
After the Meeting, to which extent are work plan and deadlines clear to you?	1	2	3	4	5
After the Meeting, to which extent is each partner's role and responsibility within the next project activities clear to you?	1	2	3	4	5
After the Meeting, to which extent are the decisions taken clear to you?	1	2	3	4	5

Which kind of risks do you see for the success of the project?

SUGGESTIONS

Is there any suggestion you would like to give to help the smooth and successful development of the project activities?

Is there any suggestion you would like to give to help to improve the next partners meeting?

8.4. Annex IV: Event feedback questionnaire

Name of the event:

Location: <Organisation, Address, Country>

Date: <DD/MM/YY>

FEEDBACK FORM

Please answer the following questions by rating on the available choices	Not at all	A little	Average	Yes	Very
Did the event meet your expectations?					
Do you think you have learnt anything during the event?					
Is the addressed topic relevant to your work/professional life?					

Please rate the quality of the following items	Very poor	Poor	Average	Good	Very good
Information provided before the event					
Materials delivered during the event					
Presentations and speeches					

Please rate the following items with regard to present/future perceived usefulness in your professional life (or daily work)	I am not sure	Not useful	Somewhat useful	Quite useful	Very useful
The project overall					



The discussion during the event					
Sharing with colleagues, with other stakeholders, networking					

Is there anything you do want to add? (e.g. suggestions, proposals, general comments, etc.)	
--	--

If you want to be involved or kept informed about the progression of the project, you can leave your e-mail address here	
---	--

8.5. Annex V: Master courses questionnaire

Logistical organisation					
Please answer the following questions by rating on the available choices	Not at all	A little	Average	Yes	Very
Are you satisfied with the overall logistics of the master course?					
Are you satisfied with the infrastructures provided?					
Are you satisfied with equipment provided?					
Is the organization of the course satisfactory (timelines, sequence of courses, etc.)?					
Do you have any comments/suggestions?					

Courses					
Please answer the following questions by rating on the available choices	Not at all	A little	Average	Yes	Very
Are you satisfied with the organisation of the teaching course among four Universities?					
Do you think that the collaboration of teachers coming from different Universities has been a value added for the quality of the course?					
Are you satisfied with the quality of the master course?					
Were the students' knowledge and skills adequate to the master's programme?					
Do you think that the master course was useful for the students?					
Are you satisfied with the teaching methods you used in your modules or courses?					

Do you have any comments on the organisation of the teaching course?	
Do you have any comments on the teaching methods adopted?	

General aspect					
Please answer the following questions by rating on the available choices	Not at all	A little	Average	Yes	Very
Do you think that the master's mission is accomplished?					
What is your overall level of satisfaction?					
Have your expectations about the master courses been satisfied?					



<p>Is there anything you want to add? (Suggestions, proposals, general comments, etc.)</p>	
--	--

8.6. Annex VI: Training Evaluation questionnaire

Please fill out this questionnaire and return it. The information helps us to evaluate the quality of the Training. The information will be treated confidentially.

Location: _____

Date: _____

Logistic and organisation					
Please answer the following questions by rating on the available choices	Not at all	A little	Average	Yes	Very
Are you satisfied with the overall logistics of the training?					
Are you satisfied with the infrastructures and facilities provided?					
Do you think that the materials distributed were helpful?					
Was the organization of the training satisfactory (timelines, sequence of courses, etc.)?					
Do you have any comments/suggestions?					

Training					
Please answer the following questions by rating on the available choices	Not at all	A little	Average	Yes	Very
Are you satisfied with the quality of the training?					
Do you think that the trainers were well prepared and able to answer any questions?					
How do you assess the impact of this training on your activities?					
Do you think that the training helped you to strengthen your knowledge and skills?					
Have your expectations about the training been satisfied?					
Do you think to share the skills acquired with colleagues at your university?					
Were the trainers generally available?					

Overall evaluation					
Please answer the following questions by rating on the available choices	Not at all	A little	Average	Yes	Very
Do you think that the training's mission is accomplished?					
What is your overall level of satisfaction?					

<p>Name three things of the training that you found particularly useful</p>	<p>1-</p> <p>2-</p> <p>3-</p>
<p>Is there anything you want to add? (Suggestions, proposals, general comments, etc.)</p>	<p>1-</p> <p>2-</p> <p>3-</p>

8.7. Annex VII: Learning material

Quality Control Check – LEARNING MATERIALS						
Learning Material Title						
Version Checked	<i>[No. of the version; language]</i>					
Content						
Question	Rate 1-5					Comments
Are the learning objectives clear?	1	2	3	4	5	
Is the content current, relevant, and accurate?	1	2	3	4	5	
Is the content appropriate to the needs of the targeted group?	1	2	3	4	5	



Use						
Question	Rate 1-5					Comments
Does the material present information in appealing ways?	1	2	3	4	5	
Does the material provide flexibility in its use?	1	2	3	4	5	
Does the material support individual, self-regulated learning?	1	2	3	4	5	
Formats and interaction						
Question	Rate 1-5					Comments
Does the material present appropriate formats (graphs, text, video, etc.)?	1	2	3	4	5	
Is the format appropriate to the content?	1	2	3	4	5	
Does the online material provide easy navigation? <i>[not applicable for offline materials, if any]</i>	1	2	3	4	5	
Suggestions for improvement and any additional comment						
Filled in by: Name: Role: Date: Signature:						

8.8. Annex VIII: Questionnaire to Professors

Name and surname (it will not be published, confidential between the evaluator and the respondent):

.....

Higher Education Institution:

Date:

Impact					
Please indicate how much you agree with the following statements by circling your response using the scale provided, where 1 = not agree at all to 5 = fully agree.					
Internal procedures of the university have been modified according to the project?!	1	2	3	4	5
Processes related to the project implementation required changes in regular processes and procedures.?	1	2	3	4	5
The team to which I belong at the university has changed the way of working and/or the organisational structure in relation to the project activities	1	2	3	4	5
The collaboration of teachers coming from different Universities has been a value added for the quality of the course	1	2	3	4	5
I'm satisfied with the teaching methods you used in your modules or courses	1	2	3	4	5
I have learnt something thanks to the project and the process of project implementation	1	2	3	4	5
Relevance					
Please indicate how much the following activities have been implemented by selecting your response in the provided scale, where 1 = not agree at all to 5 = fully agree					
The participation to the European/international projects is relevant to university?	1	2	3	4	5
The participation to the European/international projects is relevant to my unit/team (to the administrative-technical staff)	1	2	3	4	5
The participation to the European/international projects is relevant to my own work	1	2	3	4	5
The work carried out with the ERAMCA project is relevant to my university	1	2	3	4	5
The work carried out with the ERAMCA project is relevant to me	1	2	3	4	5

Additional comments

8.9. Annex IX: Questionnaire to Administrative and Technical Staff

Name and surname (it will not be published, confidential between the evaluator and the respondent):

.....

Higher Education Institution:

Date:

Change					
Please indicate how much you agree with the following statements by circling your response using the scale provided, where 1 = not agree at all to 5 = fully agree.					
Internal procedures of the university have been modified according to the project!	1	2	3	4	5
Processes related to the project implementation required changes in regular processes and procedures	1	2	3	4	5
The team to which I belong at the university has changed the way of working and/or the organisational structure in relation to the project activities	1	2	3	4	5
I have changed my way of working (of doing things) thanks to the process of project implementation	1	2	3	4	5
I have learnt something thanks to the project and the process of project implementation	1	2	3	4	5
Relevance					
Please indicate how much the following activities have been implemented by selecting your response in the provided scale, where 1 = not agree at all to 5 = fully agree					
The participation to the European/international projects is relevant to university	1	2	3	4	5
The participation to the European/international projects is relevant to my unit/team (to the administrative-technical staff)	1	2	3	4	5
The participation to the European/international projects is relevant to my own work	1	2	3	4	5
The work carried out with the ERAMCA project is relevant to my university	1	2	3	4	5
The work carried out with the ERAMCA project is relevant to me	1	2	3	4	5

Additional comments

--

8.10. Annex X: Final results and project added value overall

Final results and project added value overall					
Please indicate how much the following activities have been implemented by selecting your response in the provided scale, where 1 = not agree at all to 5 = fully agree					
Quality of the results	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Please explain your answer to the question above:</i>					
Involvement/participation of the users/stakeholders in the development of the results	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Please explain your answer to the question above:</i>					
Dissemination of the project results	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Please explain your answer to the question above:</i>					
Regional value of the project results	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Please explain your answer to the question above:</i>					
National value of the project results	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Please explain your answer to the question above:</i>					
Knowledge and expertise gained by working on the project	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Please explain your answer to the question above:</i>					