Quality Assurance Committee Report

Project Acronym:	BUGI
Project Full Title:	Western Balkans Urban Agriculture Initiative
Project No.:	586304-EPP-1-2017-BA-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP
Funding Scheme	Erasmus Plus
Coordinator:	University of Sarajevo
Project Start Date:	October 15, 2017
Project Duration:	36 months

Contents

DOCUMENT CONTROL SHEET

Title of Document:	**BUGI**
Work Package:	**WP4**
Last Version Date:	
Status:	
Document Version:	**v.1-**
File Name:	**Quality Assurance Committee Report**
Number of Pages:	
Dissemination Level:	**Internal**

VERSIONING AND CONTRIBUTION HISTORY

Version	Date	Revision Description	Partner responsible
v.0	30/06/2018	Draft version	P6 with the support of P1
v.1	15/11/2018	Updated version	P6 with the support of P1

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

SC   Steering Committee
QAC   Quality Assurance Committee
EACEA   Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency
GA   Grant Agreement
PA   Partnership Agreement
WP   Work package
P1, UNSA   University of Sarajevo
P2, UNMO   University "Džemal Bijedić" of Mostar
P3, UDG   University Donja Gorica
P4, UP   University of Prishtina
P5, UXZ   University "Haxhi Zeka" of Peja
P6, UNIBO   University of Bologna
P7, SWUAS   South Westphalia University of Applied Sciences
P8, UNILJ   University of Ljubljana

1. QUALITY ASSURANCE COMMITTEE STRUCTURE (QAC) AND TASK

The Quality Assurance Committee is independent internal management body established to ensure quality and transparency of BUGI Project work and outcomes.
Existing Structure: QAC has 4 members with previous experience in QA. To ensure objectivity, QAC members are not engaged in any other project activities. QAC reports to the Project Leader.
Members: Hysen Bytyqi (P4)
             Adnan Kafedžić (P1)
             Wolf Lorleberg (P7)
             Andrej Udovč (P8)

Purpose and objectives of QAC report

QAC reports aim is to provide the basis for a critical overview of the project progress which will allow to plan smooth implementation of future activities, envisage problems and suggest/define (if any) changes in planned project execution in order to reach the objectives in the best possible way. Set of measurable benchmarks and indicators are set to ensure that outputs are delivered in accordance to the work plan and support verification of the project outcomes.

QAC report is interim assessment of 6-month activities/results presented to Steering Committee and BUGI Consortium members. Interim reports are written and disseminated internally to the project partners.

Reports provided to the QAC

The following areas are evaluated:
- Quality of deliverables,
- Quality of process
    i)   Transnational partner meetings
    ii) Study visits
    iii) WP activities
- Quality of dissemination (website evaluation)

The Committee reviewed presentations on:
Internal evaluation: PARTNERS MEETINGS (Podgorica, Bologna, Pristina)
Internal evaluation: PROGRESS OF THE PROJECT (M6, M12)
Internal evaluation WP LEADERS AND COORDINATOR SELF-EVALUATION (M6)
Internal evaluation: STUDY VISITS AND TRAINING (Bologna, Ljubljana, Soest, Venezia)
External evaluation: PROJECT WEB SITE (M8)

2. Overview of BUGI Project for period from 15.10.2017 to 15.11.2018

2.1 Quality of delivery

WP1 P1		Project due date	Delivered	Timetable respected
1.1.	Survey guide	15.11.2017	Yes ☒ No ☐	Yes ☒ No ☐
1.2.	Regional and EU action plans and strategies report	01.01.2018	Yes ☒ No ☐	Yes ☒ No ☐
1.3.	Farms models in region	01.01.2018	Yes ☒ No ☐	Yes ☒ No ☐
1.4.	Food supply chains analysis	01.01.2018	Yes ☒ No ☐	Yes ☒ No ☐
1.5.	Consumers preferences surveys	01.01.2018	Yes ☒ No ☐	Yes ☒ No ☐
1.6.	City-adjusted farm strategies in B&H, MN and XK	01.03.2018	Yes ☒ No ☐	Yes ☒ No ☐
1.7.	Partners HEIs infrastructure and teacher's assessments ONGOING	01.07.2018	Yes ☐ No ☒	Yes ☐ No ☒
WP2 P6				
2.1.	Curriculum draft FINISHED NOT PUBLISHED	01.06.2018	Yes ☐ No ☒	Yes ☐ No ☒
2.2.	Learning projects design guide for teachers ONGOING	01.06.2018	Yes ☐ No ☒	Yes ☐ No ☒
2.3.	Skills and competence evaluation guide ONGOING	01.06.2018	Yes ☐ No ☒	Yes ☐ No ☒
2.4.	Master study and LLL program elaborate	01.05.2019	Not applicable	
2.5.	Module Placement Guide POSTPONED	01.08.2018	Yes ☐ No ☒	Yes ☐ No ☒
2.6.	Diploma supplement (DP) POSTPONED	01.11.2018	Yes ☐ No ☒	Yes ☐ No ☒
2.7.	Multilateral inter-institutional agreement POSTPONED	01.11.2018	Yes ☐ No ☒	Yes ☐ No ☒
WP3 P7				
3.1.	Infrastructure and teachings staff assessment ONGOING	01.06.2018	Yes ☐ No ☒	Yes ☐ No ☒
3.2.	Study visits and trainings	01.01.2019	Not applicable	
3.3.	PBL and EL in competence-based learning workshop	01.03.2019	Not applicable	
3.4.	Distance learning guide, manual and workshop	01.03.2019	Not applicable	
3.5.	Development of teaching/training tools	01.07.2019	Not applicable	
3.6.	Purchase and installation of equipment	01.09.2019	Not applicable	
3.7.	Curriculum accreditation	14.10.2020	Not applicable	
3.8.	Curriculum implementation	14.10.2020	Not applicable	
WP4 P6&P1				
4.1.	Quality performance framework	31.12.2017	Yes ☒ No ☐	Yes ☒ No ☐
4.2.	WPs quality evaluations and QAC functioning	14.10.2020	Not applicable	
4.3.	Evaluation questionnaires ONGOING	01.07.2020	Yes ☒ No ☐	Yes ☒ No ☐
4.4.	Evaluation reports (1 per transnational meeting, 1 per study visit, 1 wp leader evaluation, 1 per website evaluation) ONGOING	14.10.2020	Yes ☒ No ☐	Yes ☒ No ☐
4.5.	External evaluations and costs verification	01.08.2019	Not applicable	
		01.10.2020	Not applicable	
4.6.	Evaluation of curriculum and teaching tools	01.05.2020	Not applicable	

WP5 P8&P1				
5.1.	Dissemination Strategy	31.12.2017	Yes ☒ No ☐	Yes ☒ No ☐
5.2.	Project web site and social media channels ONGOING	14.10.2020	Yes ☒ No ☐	Yes ☒ No ☐
5.3.	Green Entrepreneurship	14.10.2020	Not applicable	
5.4.	Distance learning platform	14.10.2020	Not applicable	
5.5.	Project promotional materials	01.05.2019	Not applicable	
5.6.	Scientific contributions POSTPONED	15.07.2018	Yes ☐ No ☒	Yes ☐ No ☒
		15.07.2020	Not applicable	
5.7.	Info days, open door day and UA conference ONGOING	15.09.2018	Yes ☐ No ☒	Yes ☐ No ☒
		01.07.2018	Yes ☐ No ☒	Yes ☐ No ☒
		01.07.2020	Not applicable	
		01.09.2020	Not applicable	
5.8.	Interim and final report on dissemination and exploitation	15.04.2019	Not applicable	
		01.10.2020	Not applicable	
WP6 P1				
6.1.	Project management procedures ONGOING	31.12.2017	Yes ☒ No ☐	Yes ☒ No ☐
6.2.	Regular meetings ONGOING	01.11.2017	Yes ☒ No ☐	Yes ☒ No ☐
		01.05.2018	Yes ☒ No ☐	Yes ☒ No ☐
		01.11.2018	Yes ☒ No ☐	Yes ☒ No ☐
		01.05.2019	Not applicable	
		01.11.2019	Not applicable	
		01.05.2020	Not applicable	
		01.10.2020	Not applicable	
6.3.	Management and report on the project activities ONGOING	14.10.2020	Not applicable	
6.4.	Project finance and administration ONGOING	14.10.2020	Not applicable	
	Percentage of deliverables completed (with the respect to timetable)		**60%**	
	Original timetable respected? PARTLY ACHIEVED		Yes ☐ No ☒	
	If your answer is no, provide short explanation Some initial delay, due to the administrative procedure, has created a small postponement of the original time plan.			

QAC recommendations

2.2 Quality of the process

Please use   *Internal evaluation: PROGRESS OF THE PROJECT (M6, M12)*
                   Internal evaluation WP LEADERS AND COORDINATOR SELF-EVALUATION (M6)

Average score of the progress evaluation questionnaire: M6   4,13
Average score of the progress evaluation questionnaire: M12 4,23

Was the level of satisfaction above 3.5 (score from 1 to 5)   Yes ☒ No ☐
Did project partners proposed actions to improve the quality of process   Yes ☐ No ☐
If your answer is yes, please outline the suggestions received

_____

_____

_____

Average score of the WP leader and coordinator evaluation questionnaire: M6   3,73
Was the level of satisfaction above 3.5 (score from 1 to 5)   Yes ☒ No ☐
Did WP leaders proposed actions to improve the quality of process   Yes ☐ No ☐
If your answer is yes, please outline the suggestions received

_____

_____

_____

Workplan of the different WPs respected   Yes ☐ No ☐
If your answer is no, provide short explanation

_____

_____

_____

Please use   *Internal evaluation: PARTNERS MEETINGS (Podgorica, Bologna, Pristina)*

Average score of Internal evaluation questionnaire: Podgorica   4,80[1]
Average score of Internal evaluation questionnaire: Bologna   4,37
Average score of Internal evaluation questionnaire: Pristina   4,65

---

[1] ①-②-③-④-⑤

insufficient - excellent

Was the level of satisfaction above 3.5 (score from 1 to 5) Yes ☒ No ☐
Did project partners proposed actions to improve the quality of meetings? Yes ☐ No ☐
If your answer is yes, please outline the suggestions received:

_____
_____
_____

Please use Internal evaluation: STUDY VISITS AND TRAINING (Bologna, Ljubljana, Soest, Venezia)

Average score of Study visit questionnaire: Bologna,   3,65
Average score of Study visit questionnaire: Ljubljana   4,39
Average score of Study visit questionnaire: Soest   4,92
Average score of Study visit questionnaire: Venezia   4,56

Was the level of satisfaction above 3.5 (score from 1 to 5) Yes ☒ No ☐
Did project partners proposed actions to improve the quality of study visits? Yes ☐ No ☐
If your answer is yes, please outline the suggestions received:

_____
_____
_____

QAC recommendations

2.3   Quality of curriculum

Are curriculums content and objectives in line with Project objectives?	Not applicable
Are methodological & pedagogical models in line with Project objectives?	Not applicable
Are purchased teaching/training tools in line with Project objectives?	Not applicable
Did Project partners accredited and implemented curriculums?	Not applicable

Number of accredited curriculums

P 1	MA	Not applicable
	LLL	Not applicable
P 2	MA	Not applicable
	LLL	Not applicable
P 3	MA	Not applicable
	LLL	Not applicable
P 4	MA	Not applicable
	LLL	Not applicable
P 5	MA	Not applicable
	LLL	Not applicable

Number of students/trainees enrolled

P 1	MA	Not applicable
	LLL	Not applicable
P 2	MA	Not applicable
	LLL	Not applicable
P 3	MA	Not applicable
	LLL	Not applicable
P 4	MA	Not applicable
	LLL	Not applicable
P 5	MA	Not applicable
	LLL	Not applicable

QAC recommendations

2.4   Quality of dissemination and exploitation

Please use   External evaluation: WEBSITE (M8)

Average score of the website evaluation questionnaire: 3,76
Was the level of satisfaction above 3.5 (score from 1 to 5)   Yes ☒ No ☐
Did the expert proposed action to improve the quality of meetings?   Yes ☐ No ☐
If your answer is yes, please outline the suggestions received:

_____

_____

_____

QAC recommendations

Average score of external evaluation questionnaire: DISSEMINATION EVENTS
Not applicable yet
Average score of external evaluation questionnaire: Staff and Students satisfaction
Not applicable yet

2.5   Relevance

Is the project implemented in line with the initial proposal?   Yes ☐ No ☐
If no, please describe the changes (if any) that have occurred

_____

_____

QAC recommendations

3. Final Discussion and Conclusions

Please sum up your key remarks regarding each topic (quality of delivery, quality of the process, quality of dissemination, relevance):

As agreed with all partners, there very some delays encountered due to some external stake holders as well, like for example accreditation study program process and other procurement procedures, needed to be followed. However, there is e real hope that all activities foreseen under work packages will be completed in the project due time. The remaining project time need to be intensive and very collaborative within and among project partner(s) institutions in order to be able to harvest maximum out of the project opportunities. One of the most challenging issues is going to accreditation and implementation of the study program "Urban Agriculture" (i,e, students enrolment, updated course content development, etc).

Signatures

Wolf Lorleberg   Hysen Bytyqi

_____   _____

Adnan Kafedžić   Andrej Udovč

_____   _____

Annexes

Internal evaluation questionnaire: PARTNERS MEETINGS

Internal evaluation questionnaire: PROGRESS OF THE PROJECT

Internal evaluation questionnaire: WP LEADERS AND COORDINATOR SELF-EVALUATION

Internal evaluation questionnaire: STUDY VISITS AND TRAINING

External evaluation questionnaire: PROJECT WEB SITE