**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** |

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

[1. QUALITY ASSURANCE COMMITTEE STRUCTURE (QAC) AND TASK 4](#_Toc23238468)

[2. Overview of BUGI Project for period from 15.10.2017 to 01.11.2019 5](#_Toc23238469)

[3. Final Discussion and Conclusions 12](#_Toc23238470)

[Annexes 13](#_Toc23238471)

**DOCUMENT CONTROL SHEET**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Title of Document:** | **BUGI** |
| **Work Package:** | **WP4** |
| **Last Version Date:** | **31 October 2019** |
| **Status:** | **Draft** |
| **Document Version:** | **v.0.1** |
| **File Name:** | **Quality Assurance Committee Report** |
| **Number of Pages:** | **13** |
| **Dissemination Level:** | **Internal** |

**VERSIONING AND CONTRIBUTION HISTORY**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Version | Date | Revision Description | Partner responsible |
| v.0 | 31/10/2019 | Draft 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
  + 1. Transnational partner meetings
    2. Study visits
    3. WP activities
* Quality of dissemination (website evaluation)

The Committee reviewed presentations on:

Internal evaluation: PARTNERS MEETINGS (Podgorica, Bologna, Pristina, Sarajevo, Berlin)

Internal evaluation: PROGRESS OF THE PROJECT (M6, M12, M24)

Internal evaluation WP LEADERS AND COORDINATOR SELF-EVALUATION (M6, M24)

Internal evaluation: STUDY VISITS AND TRAINING (Bologna, Ljubljana, Soest, Venezia, Pordenone, Sarajevo, Berlin)

Internal evaluation: WORKSHOPS (Podgorica)

External evaluation: PROJECT WEB SITE (M8)

# 2. Overview of BUGI Project for period from 15.10.2017 to 01.11.2019

**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 | 01.07.2018 | Yes ⌧ No | Yes  No ⌧ |
| **WP2 P6** | | | | |
| 2.1. | Curriculum draft | 01.06.2018 | Yes ⌧ No | Yes  No ⌧ |
| 2.2. | Learning projects design guide for teachers | 01.06.2018 | Yes ⌧ No | Yes  No ⌧ |
| 2.3. | Skills and competence evaluation guide | 01.06.2018 | Yes ⌧ No | Yes  No ⌧ |
| 2.4. | Master study and LLL program elaborate | 01.05.2019 | Yes ⌧ No | Yes ⌧ No |
| 2.5. | Module Placement Guide | 01.08.2018 | Yes ⌧ No | Yes  No ⌧ |
| 2.6. | Diploma supplement (DP) | 01.11.2018 | Yes ⌧ No | Yes  No ⌧ |
| 2.7. | Multilateral inter-institutional agreement | 01.11.2018 | Yes ⌧ No | Yes  No ⌧ |
| **WP3 P7** | | | | |
| 3.1. | Infrastructure and teachings staff assessment | 01.06.2018 | Yes ⌧ No | Yes  No ⌧ |
| 3.2. | Study visits and trainings ONGOING | 01.01.2019 | Yes  No ⌧ | Yes  No ⌧ |
| 3.3. | PBL and EL in competence-based learning workshop | 01.03.2019 | Yes ⌧ No | Yes ⌧ No |
| 3.4. | Distance learning guide, manual and workshop | 01.03.2019 | Yes ⌧ No | Yes ⌧ No |
| 3.5. | Development of teaching/training tools ONGOING | 01.07.2019 | Yes  No ⌧ | Yes  No ⌧ |
| 3.6. | Purchase and installation of equipment ONGOING | 01.09.2019 | Yes  No ⌧ | Yes  No ⌧ |
| 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 ONGOING | 14.10.2020 | Yes ⌧ No | Yes ⌧ No |
| 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 | Yes ⌧ No | Yes ⌧ No |
| 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 POSTPONED | 01.05.2019 | Yes  No ⌧ | Yes  No ⌧ |
| 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 |
|  | Regular meetings ONGOING | 01.11.2017 | Yes ⌧ No | Yes ⌧ No |
|  | 01.05.2018 | Yes ⌧ No | Yes ⌧ No |
|  | 01.11.2018 | Yes ⌧ No | Yes ⌧ No |
| 6.2. | 01.05.2019 | Yes ⌧ No | Yes ⌧ No |
|  | 01.11.2019 | Yes ⌧ No | Yes ⌧ No |
|  | 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)** | | | 80% |
|  | 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, now almost fully recovered. | | | |

|  |
| --- |
| 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**

**Average score of the progress evaluation questionnaire: M24 4,39**

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:

Simplification of procedures. Respect of deadlines. Tighter cooperation within the single WP. Communication flow. Publish data on Facebook. Skype calls to enhance monitoring and exchange. Improve planning, administrative and technical capacity, creation of project identification units, better coordination and distribution of responsibility to project implementation staff.

**Average score of the WP leader and coordinator evaluation questionnaire: M6 3,73**

**Average score of the WP leader and coordinator evaluation questionnaire: M24 4,01**

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:

Communication is a big problem, must be improved. Some WB partners do not respect deadlines, replies are missing.

Workplan of the different WPs respected 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, that the partners are progressively recovering.

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

**Average score of Internal evaluation questionnaire: Podgorica 4,80**

**Average score of Internal evaluation questionnaire: Bologna 4,37**

**Average score of Internal evaluation questionnaire: Pristina 4,65**

**Average score of Internal evaluation questionnaire: Sarajevo 4,80**

**Average score of Internal evaluation questionnaire: Berlin 4,82**

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:

We need to improve day-to-day communication and remained each other on deadlines and obligation, have open discussions to prevent problems and motivate each other to deliver good results.

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

**Average score of Study visit and Training: Bologna 3,65**

**Average score of Study visit and Training: Ljubljana 4,39**

**Average score of Study visit and Training: Soest 4,92**

**Average score of Study visit and Training: Venezia 4,56**

**Average score of Study visit and Training: Pordenone 4,69**

**Average score of Study visit and Training: Sarajevo 4,84**

**Average score of Study visit and Training: Berlin 4,73**

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:

In BUGI the focus is on urban agriculture and the study program should keep this focus as much as possible. However, since Urban Agriculture is not yet a well-established there are other topics that emerged as interesting and which are listed as follows: Plant breeding - including vegetables; Adapting teaching tools to vulnerable social categories and to team work.

For countries where Urban Agriculture is already a real business sector the topics requested are: Vertical farming systems and other tools used by in-door farmers to grow more with fewer surfaces; High-tech of urban agriculture production, processing and distribution; Adapting food technology system to existing urban plans food technology system to existing urban plans

|  |
| --- |
| QAC recommendations |

**2.3 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:

A clearer indication of contact details to the lead partners (Sarajevo University) with name, email address, phone, etc. More updates; what are you doing (e. g. offering monthly news).

Keep the text shorter, and simplier, now is too technical and long. Description of WPs is too technical, better to focus on activities. Web visitors want to know what they can expect from the project (courses? reports? publications? educational materials) and this is not clear.

|  |
| --- |
| QAC recommendations |

*Please use External evaluation: Workshops (M24)*

**Average score of Workshop: Podgorica 4,81**

Was the level of satisfaction above 3.5 (score from 1 to 5) Yes ⌧ No

Did the participants proposed action to improve the quality of events? Yes  No ⌧

If your answer is yes, please outline the suggestions received:

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |
| --- |
| QAC recommendations |

**Average score of external evaluation questionnaire: Staff and Students satisfaction**

**Not applicable yet**

**2.4 Relevance**

Is the project implemented in line with the initial objectives? 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): |

**Signatures**

Wolf Lorleberg Hysen Bytyqi

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Adnan Kafedžić Andrej Udovč

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
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