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# 1. INTRODUCTION

BUGI - Wester Balkans Urban Agriculture Initiatives – (586304-EPP-1-2017-1-BA-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP)is an ERASMUS+ Capacity Building project in the field of Higher Education, funded by the European Commission in 2017 and running until the end of 2020. The project aims to develop new Urban Agriculture master study curriculum and LLL program in 5 Western Balkans Higher Education institutions: University of Sarajevo (coordinator), University of Mostar (Bosnia and Herzegovina), University of Donja Gorica (Montenegro), University of Prishtina and Haxhi Zeka (Kosovo), in cooperation with University of Bologna (Italy), University of South Westphalia (Germany) and University of Ljubljana (Slovenia).

The new curriculum will be competence-based and interdisciplinary and will be built taking into consideration national strategies, as well as farmers and entrepreneurial sector needs analysis; it will foster HEIs internationalization, provide learning flexibility and mobility and promote transfer of knowledge, skills and technologies among partner universities. Project outcomes will enhance **urban sustainability and green economy development** in WB countries with inclusion of entrepreneurial sector.

# 1.1 Specific Aims and Objectives

BUGI will develop:

* a new UA master study curriculum and LLL program, based on national strategies, farmers and entrepreneurial sector needs analysis;
* new city-adjusted farm strategies, providing modern teaching tools and foster the transfer of knowledge, skills and technologies to 5 WB HEIs.
* new, competence-based curriculum that will be interdisciplinary so as to foster HEIs internationalization process and provide learning flexibility and mobility.

Specific objectives:

* Define knowledge, skills and competences needed to meet national and entrepreneurial sector needs.
* Develop sustainable business models based on analyse of defined needs.
* Developed master study curriculum and LLL programs utilising competence based learning methodology and foster collaboration with entrepreneurial sector.
* Develop context-related competences descriptions systems to evaluate student competences and connection them to ECTS and diploma supplement.
* Foster internationalisation and collaboration between partner HEIs and provide learning flexibility and inter disciplinary.
* Facilitate transfer of knowledge, technology and good practice, and augment teaching staff expertise in the field teaching process, distance learning, competence-based learning.
* Develop new teaching material and infrastructure needed to deliver hand-on experience.
* Conduct campaigns to inform on UA, sustainable development and green economy.
* Exploit outcomes for development of new urban policies.

# 1.2 The BUGI consortium

The consortium of BUGI is formed by 8 project partners (HEIs) **including WB Region 1 countries: Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo and Montenegro**

Table 1: BUGI Consortium

# 1.3 The BUGI activities

The activities of the project are structured in six work packages. WP leader and vice leader (from program and partner countries) together with WP working groups will be responsible for the timely and quality activities implementation.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **WP1**:  **Needs analysis** including desktop research on documents (reports, action plans and strategies) and on-line information, surveys, farm strategies and internal assessment report. All information is needed for the design of a new curriculum and LLL program modules. Three expert working groups will be constituted for competence need analysis. (1) Business and networking; (2) Agriculture and food processing; (3) Urban planning, ecology, energy efficiency | P7 Leader  P4 vice leader |
| **WP2:**  **Curriculum draft**, competence-based learning methodology and tools of implementation, curriculum and LLL program elaborate, student placement, diploma supplement and multilateral inter institutional agreement. | P6 Leader  P5 vice leader |
| **WP3**:  Study **visits, trainings and workshops,** purchase and installation of equipment and teaching tools, and work on accreditation and implementation of curriculum and LLL program pilot phase (at UNSA). During the pilot phase, up to 50 students and 200 trainees will be enrolled. | P8 Leader  P3 vice leader |
| **WP4:**  Quality performance framework, reports, evaluations, peer reviews, surveys especially evaluation of curriculum and teaching tools, as well as other QA related work. | P6 Leader  P1 vice leader |
| **WP5:**  Implementation of all dissemination and exploitation tools, maintain project products, organize events, and help promote project outcomes to relevant stakeholders. | P8 Leader  P2 vice leader |
| **WP6:**  Project Management and coordination. | P1 |

# 1.4 The BUGI project management approach

The BUGI project management approach emphasises participation and interaction between the different stakeholders and at the same time provides lines for decision-making and accountability. Sufficient flexibility will be assured thanks to the linkage between project management, evaluation and dissemination Activities. This will make it possible to endorse necessary changes in the work plan as the project develops.

The project organisational structure is going to be articulated as follows:

1. **The Steering Committee (SC),** elected at the first (kick-off) meeting. Each partner will be represented by one SC member according to their internal rules. At the top level, SC will provide for strategic project management and ensure that the project is progressing according to the work plan. The SC will decide on project action plans for implementation, dissemination and QA for each year, and adopt all internal strategies, QA reports and plans for corrective measures. With the respect to proposed plans, project activities and financial realization will be implemented and adequate documentation will be provided. The work of SC is supported by all partner HEIs coordinator and administrator (project officers). The Lead partner will provide main project office that will execute all SC plans and ensure day-to-day work. SC will meet every 6 months (6 times) face-to-face and every 3 months online between regular meetings (6 times) to ensure successful project implementation. Meetings will be used to present and evaluate project progress, to analyse possible deviations from the prescribed activities and expected results, and to agree on potential risk management mechanisms.

2. **A Quality Assurance Committee (QAC)** will be elected at the first (kick-off) meeting. QAC will have 4 members (2 from partner and 2 from program HEIs) with previous experience in quality assurance and will not be engaged in any other project activities. QAC will meet face-to-face twice a year and minimum once between face-to-face meetings. At all meetings an interim assessment of 6-month activities/results will be carried out. Interim reports will be written and disseminated internally to the project partners.

Appointed members of the QAC are:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Partner Organisation** | **Country** | **Member name** | **Email** |
| 1. SWUAS | Germany | Wolf Lorleberg | [lorleberg.wolf@fh-swf.de](mailto:lorleberg.wolf@fh-swf.de) |
| 2. UL | Slovenia | Andrej Udovč | [andrej.udovc@bf.uni-lj.si](mailto:andrej.udovc@bf.uni-lj.si) |
| 3. UNSA | Bosnia and Herzegovina | Adnan Kafedžić | [adnan.k@unsa.ba](mailto:adnan.k@unsa.ba) |
| 4. UP | Kosovo | Hysen Bytyqi | [hysen.bytyqi@unu-pr.edu](mailto:hysen.bytyqi@unu-pr.edu) |

QAC will evaluate:

A - **Quality of deliverables** (timely realization of the activities, developed teaching tools and training materials, number of trainings, study visits and participants, reports, guides, etc.).

B - **Quality of processes** (staff and students satisfaction surveys, coordination within and among working groups and effectiveness of the whole process, trainings participants evaluations and recommendations, etc.).

C - **Quality of curriculum** (content and objectives, adopted methodological and pedagogical models, accreditation, etc.)

D - **Quality of dissemination and exploitation** of project results and budget realization (dissemination and exploitation strategy, project visual identity products, financial statements, equipment inventory, etc.).

QAC will deliver the current Quality and Evaluation Framework used to describe internal and external evaluation methodology and activities: reporting forms and procedures and other QA tools. QAC will establish internal peer reviewer’s pool. The QAC will prepare operational plan with milestones to be followed by all project partners.

**3. Project administrative office** will be at Lead partner coordinator (UNSA). Each HEI will appoint project administrator. Each HEI team leader and administrator will be in direct contact with main administrator office at UNSA. Together they will manage day-to-day work.

The Project Applicant and Co-ordinator in BUGI lies in the same institution: UNIVERZITET U SARAJEVU (Bosnia Herzegovina). The Project Co-ordinator has the ultimate responsibility for the overall management of the project, with particular reference to liaison with EACEA, and with responsibility for production and delivery of project outputs. The Project Co-ordinator has the decisive responsibility for strategic management of the project and has a broker role between project actors and project activities. In the event of a disagreement within the consortium regarding the work-plan, Consortium Agreement or any other relevant issue, such disagreements will in the first instance be resolved by a decision of a simple majority of the full Steering Committee. In the event of an inability on the part of the Steering Committee (SC) to come to a decision, the final decision will be made by the Project Co-ordinator if necessary upon consultation with EACEA.

# 2. QUALITY ASSURANCE & EVALUATION AIMS AND PURPOSE

The present document is the first deliverable of Work Package 4 - Quality Assurance and Monitoring – aimed at ensuring high quality project implementation and results, through regular internal and external quality assurance, control and monitoring mechanisms. D4.1 Quality Performance Framework in fact describes purposes, actors to be involved, procedures, methods, instruments and tools of internal and external evaluation and quality assurance activities, as to build a common framework for regular monitoring and evaluation of the project performance, progress and outcomes. It is designed to promote and encourage critical overview and self-reflection by all partners involved, in order to enhance project implementation, anticipate and detect risks and problems and suggest changes in planned activities, if necessary.

# 2.1 Purpose of quality assurance and evaluation

Quality assurance and evaluation activities are designed to support a smooth and fruitful project development and high quality results and outcomes. Through WP4 on “Quality assurance and monitoring” in fact a set of mechanics, procedures and tools will be established to provide internal and external evaluation, quality control and monitoring, in close link with the project coordination and overall management. Project performance related to the quality of: i) deliverables, ii) process, iii) curricula and iv) dissemination & exploitation activities, as well as v) the soundness and efficiency of financial management, will be monitored and assessed through periodical activities and reports, as to support the project overall coordination and management.

The methodologies, solutions and tools set up by the present document globally refer to a threefold set of purposes: a) operational, b) summative, and c) learning purposes.

1. **Operational purposes**: refers to how the project is being developed, implying a clear reference to the project management style, to the quality of partners’ participation, to the quality and efficiency of the communication and information management system, to the respect of deadlines, etc. The evaluation activities assure that the project management and the other partners continuously monitor the quality of the complex process being enacted. This dimension is primarily of interest for internal actors (i.e. the project partners);
2. **Summative purposes**: refer to the traditional approach to evaluation i.e. to judging and assessing the match between the expected results, the invested resources, and the goals achieved. This dimension of evaluation is of interest for both, internal actors and external stakeholders. The attention mainly of the latter focuses on the quality and usability of the outcomes;
3. **Learning purposes**: refer to the overall assessment of the ‘lesson(s)’ that can be drawn from the project. The important element is that a ‘lesson’, or a multiplicity of lessons, can be sketched and can serve for future initiatives. This dimension of evaluation is relevant to a variety of actors:
   * Internal actors, for whom it is a conclusive step
   * External stakeholders, for whom it represents an overview of the quality, sustainability and potential of dissemination of the project results.

According to these set of purposes, thus we can distinguish different dimensions of evaluation and quality assurance mechanisms and activities:

1. **Internal**: the evaluation is done in form of self-evaluation and self-reflection by project partners involved in the activities, through questionnaires and / or informal meetings and discussions. Within this dimension, partners are asked to reflect and assess their own results and work processes, to share opinions and doubts, to anticipate problems and solutions. This dimension is mainly focussed on project management performance and communication flow. (See for examples Annexes I, II, III, IV).
2. **External**: the evaluation in this case is done by: i) external experts who are invited to analyse and assess the project results and outcomes, from their own perspective as to highlight areas of improvement, weak and strong aspects, and the relevance for the field of interest; ii) target groups and project beneficiaries (students, trainers, teachers, researchers) who will be enabled to express their opinion on the project outcomes and products, in terms of satisfaction, utility, usability, etc.. The soundness of the project methodology and the quality of project outcomes, as well as all aspects related to sustainability and impact pertain to this dimension of the evaluation. (See for examples Annexes V and VI).

Within the BUGI project also a third – intermediate - dimension applies, which partly is internal and partly external and is realised through the Quality Assurance Committee (QAC). The QAC in fact involves representatives from the partner organisations who are not directly engaged in the project activities. QAC members are required to assess the quality and the relevance of project outcomes and results in terms of usability, sustainability and impact for the partner organisations. In the present framework, the QAC activities will be considered as a part of the **internal dimension** of the evaluation process.

# 2.2 Evaluation objects and criteria

The development of an evaluation system that can accommodate the scope and complexity of the overall project activities is crucial for the success of the project. Within this context, the evaluation system will focus on the following objectives:

* Contributing to the continuous and regular monitoring of the BUGI project progress, with linkages and interactions with the project and quality management procedures;
* Promoting reflexive learning in the project in order to allow partners to progressively improve self-efficacy, quality of collaboration and all transversal competences that affect the quality of results.

The objects considered for evaluation will focus on:

* **Project management**: the evaluation approach proposed places great emphasis on linkages between evaluation itself and activities that are traditionally associated with project management. In addition, synergies will be developed between the Evaluation and Management activities, in order to ensure continuous monitoring of processes and outputs. The following aspects of the project management will be evaluated:
  + **Plenary project meetings**: all project meetings will be evaluated by project partners in terms of organisational aspects and in terms of contents and results, as well (Annex I).
  + **Internal management processes**: e.g. coordination and decision making processes; collaboration and communication among partners; active participation and level of contribution in project activities; respects of deadlines and internal monitoring (Annex II, III).
* **Quality of the outcomes**: the quality of outcomes will undergo a process of both internal and external evaluation. The actors involved in the internal monitoring of quality will be the QAC members. External evaluation will be performed either by a) external experts appointed by the project coordinator, and b) by users of products and services developed by the project (students, trainers, teachers, etc.) who will be involved in the external evaluation processes (through interviews, focus groups, as well as through other online and offline feedback mechanisms).
* **Dissemination and exploitation**: dissemination plays a key role within the development of the project. Dissemination is both an ongoing feature of project development and implementation, and a concerted task at the end of the project. In addition, the work plan provides for the development of dissemination activities, which will allow for a co-ordinated dissemination strategy involving all partners (including a promotional strategy for the project). The evaluation will focus on:
  + Project web site as main communication tool of the project, which will be linked to the main social networks (Annex V).
  + Dissemination events organized during the project life spam in the partner countries to promote the project results and activities (Annex VI).

For each object above mentioned a set of criteria has been identified which will be further analysed and turned into indicators by the QAC and the WP leaders.

At the **project management level**, the evaluation will refer to the following criteria:

* Feasibility of project plan
* Handling of administrative and financial matters
* Project governance (e.g. decision-making, consultation, problem-solving)
* Accord and shared visions of partners regarding activities and outputs
* Communication flows among partners

In addition, each partner organisation will be requested to self-evaluate the

* Progress of the project in terms of WPs development and results achieved by the partnership at the given project stage

Monitoring and evaluation will feed back into project management providing it with instruments for project self-review (i.e. periodic self-assessment by individual partners through the ‘Internal Evaluation Questionnaire’).

Moreover, and as mentioned already, the foreseen transnational partners meetings will include specific sessions aimed at reviewing project activities and products and at highlighting strengths and weaknesses of the consortium work.

Financial economic efficiency will be checked in the framework through a regular monitoring process carried out by the coordinator P1 UNSA according to the specific management project rules and also by external experts appointed on this purpose.

At **outcomes level**, the evaluation will refer to the following criteria (provisional)

* Quality of the educational materials in terms of usefulness, comprehensiveness, clarity
* Effectiveness of the teachers training and study visits organization
* Usefulness, clarity, comprehensiveness of the content of the study curriculum and LLL programme: including educational material, efficacy of the online environment, competence of teachers, etc.
* Teaching methodologies, ratio of practical information & theory
* Level of satisfaction of participants
* Level of participation and active involvement of participants
* Knowledge acquired by participants

At **dissemination level**, the evaluation will refer to the following criteria

* Effectiveness and attractiveness of the web site design
* Clearness and usefulness of the web site contents
* Soundness of the texts and languages
* Links to the main social networks
* Accessibility of the materials/resources
* Completeness, usefulness and accurateness of the information provided
* Multimedia aspects; interactivity
* Number of people reached through dissemination events
* Satisfaction of participants.

Figure 1: Objects and dimensions of the evaluation Photo by [Štefan Štefančík](https://unsplash.com/photos/UCZF1sXcejo?utm_source=unsplash&utm_medium=referral&utm_content=creditCopyText) on [Unsplash](https://unsplash.com/search/photos/teamwork?utm_source=unsplash&utm_medium=referral&utm_content=creditCopyText)

# 2.3 BUGI performance and impact indicators

Quantitative Performance indicators, as well as impact indicators, are an integrative part of the application form and are provide by the project applicant.

Evaluation has to make sure that the following indicators are monitored and reached with the project life span.

The KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS (Point C.7 CBHE indicators Application form)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Expected number of new/updated courses to be DEVELOPED / ACCREDITED / IMPLEMENTED / DELIVERED : | 10 |
| Volume (in ECTS) of new/updated courses: | 120 |
| Number of planned (/expected) learners / trainees enrolled (per intake / course delivery: | 10 |
| % of the new curriculum planned to be taught in foreign language of the total of new curriculum developed by the project | 25% |
| Expected number of partner country "HEIs' students" to be trained | 50 |
| Expected number of partner country "HEIs' academic staff" to be trained | 200 |
| Expected number of partner country "non-HEI individuals" to be trained (priv. sector, NGOs, civil servants, etc.) | 200 |

IMPACT INDICATORS QUANTITATIVE (Point C.7.2 Impact and sustainability indicators Application form)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Impact on individual level | PCs | Total 5 countries |
| Number of direct beneficiaries in the Partner country(ies) per year: academic staff from HEIs | 5 | 25 |
| Number of direct beneficiaries in the PCs (/year): administrative staff from HEIs | 3 | 15 |
| Number of direct beneficiaries in the PCs (/year): HE students | 50 | 250 |
| Number of direct beneficiaries in the PCs (/year): non HE individuals | 200 | 1000 |

# 2.4 The actors involved in internal and external evaluation

Quality assurance and evaluation activities within the BUGI project will be carried out by different actors, according to the purposes and the dimension of the different activities: partners (coordinators, WP leaders, all partners, members of the QAC); external experts and final users / project beneficiaries (students, entrepreneurs, professors, researchers).

Here below the main tasks and activities for each typology of actors involved in each dimension of the quality assurance and evaluation are described.

## Actors involved in the internal evaluation

**BUGI PARTNERS**

Representatives of all BUGI partners organisations are involved in the quality assurance and internal evaluation activities, with different tasks according to their role in the project.

The project **Coordinator UNSA** will be required:

* To contribute, as co-leader of WP4 QA, to the definition of quality assurance and evaluation procedures, tools and mechanisms;
* To self-evaluate its own performance as coordinator (WP6 leader) by highlighting strength and weak points, difficulties and problems it might encounter and identify possible solutions;
* To evaluate the progress of the project against the envisaged indicators and milestone and to anticipate / solve problems and delay in cooperation with WP leaders;
* To read, approve and put into practice the recommendations highlighted in the interim evaluation reports by QAC members and WP4 co-leader UNIBO.

**WP leaders will be required to:**

* To contribute to the definition procedures and tools for quality assurance and evaluation of outcomes and results of their respective WP;
* To self-evaluate their own performance as WP leaders by highlighting strength and weak points, difficulties and problems, they might encounter and identify possible solutions and lessons learnt;
* To evaluate the progress of the project against the envisaged indicators and milestone and to anticipate / solve problems and delay in cooperation with the coordinator;
* To read, approve and put into practice the recommendations highlighted for the results of their own WPs in the interim evaluation reports by QAC members and WP4 leader P6 UNIBO and P1 UNSA.

**All partners will be required to:**

* Self-evaluate their own contribution to the progress of the project, active participation in transnational meetings and activities, the work carried out and the results achieved at national level, at the given stage
* Evaluate the coordination and management of project and the WPs, the communication and the decision-making mechanisms as well as the relevance and sustainability of the project results for their own organisations.

**Quality Assurance Committee members:**

QAC members (2 from partner and 2 from program HEIs) will be requested to:

* Establish specific guidelines and performance indicators for evaluation of the progress and results of project activities. These indicators are presented in Chapter 4;
* Collect and analyse interim Quality Assurance and Evaluation reports and the results of the internal and external evaluation activities and to provide recommendations for further improvement and possible solutions to identified problems;
* Analyse and evaluate the project deliverables from all WPs and provide short reports and recommendations for improvement of quality and usability.

## Actors of the external evaluation

**External Experts** will b**e** appointed by the project coordinator in order:

* To evaluate the adequacy and appropriateness of the core educational deliverables and curricula/ programs and teaching tools;
* To assess the suitability of project’s activities, deliverables and costs outlined in project application;
* To check whether the project activities have been realized according to project plan in due course with no delays with a negative impact on the project results and to the established quality indicators;
* To deliver reports providing feedbacks on the outputs and recommendations on potential improvements.

**Target groups / final beneficiaries** (students, trainers, teachers, ...) will be invited:

* To assess the quality, the usefulness, the relevance and the usability of the project outcomes, activities and results, and especially the teaching materials, curriculum, courses offered.
* To evaluate efficacy of the communication activities and channels used by the project (web site navigation, events organisation, etc.).

# 3. OPERATIONAL PLAN

## Methods and sources of information

In order to ensure a coherent and consistent **internal evaluation** activity, specific evaluation sessions will be embedded in all the project meetings (Annex I). During transnational partners meetings, a self-evaluation online questionnaire about the project progress will circulate to be filled in by partners and to report on issues and problems that might arise. The questionnaire will be updated according to the different project phases and activities (see Annex II). Short interim evaluation reports will be issued by P6 UNIBO (IT), highlighting results of the survey, and delivered to the QAC for discussion and approval.

Yearly evaluation reports will be produced summarizing the results of both internal and external evaluation and will be discussed, integrated and approved by QAC.

Sources of information for the **external evaluation** will be mainly: reports from external experts evaluation; feedbacks from students and teachers on teaching materials, courses and programmes; questionnaires collected from participants to dissemination events (see example at Annex V) as well as from users of the web site (see Annexes).

## Workplan WP4

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Deliverable** | **Planned Date** | **Delivery date** |
| D4.1 Quality performance framework | 31-12-2017 | March 2018 |
| D4.2 WPs quality evaluations and QAC functioning | 14-10-2020 |  |
| Meeting FF1 | Apr 2018 | May 2018 |
| Meeting FF2 | Oct. 2018 | November 2018 |
| Meeting FF3 | Apr. 2019 | June 2019 |
| Meeting FF4 | Oct.2019 |  |
| Meeting FF5 | Apr. 2020 |  |
| Meeting FF6 | Oct. 2020 |  |
| D4.3 Evaluation questionnaires | 01-07-2020 |  |
| D4.4. Evaluation reports | 14-10-2020 |  |
| D4.4.1 Evaluation report n.1 | Oct. 2018 | November 2018 |
| D4.4.2 Evaluation report n.2 | Oct.2019 |  |
| D4.4.3 Evaluation report n.3 | Oct. 2020 |  |
| D4.5.1 External evaluations and costs verification | 01-08-2019 |  |
| D4.5.2 External evaluations and costs verification | 01-10-2020 |  |
| D4.6 Evaluation of curriculum and teaching tools | 01-05-2020 |  |

# 4. Quality performance indicators for evaluation of the progress and results of project activities identified by the Quality Assurance Committee

Analysing the information collected during the different evaluation exercises carried out by the BUGI project, the Quality Assurance Committee has identified a set of indicators to measure the quality performance of the project activities. The last analysis performed by the QAC includes all the evaluation documents received by 30 April 2019, before the partner meeting held in Sarajevo last 10-11 June 2019. In particular, the work of the Committee is based on the review of the following documents:

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

Internal evaluation: PROGRESS OF THE PROJECT

Internal evaluation WP LEADERS AND COORDINATOR SELF-EVALUATION

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

External evaluation: PROJECT WEB SITE

In particular the following areas have been evaluated:

* Quality of deliverables,
* Quality of process
  + 1. Transnational partner meetings
    2. Study visits
    3. WP activities
* Quality of dissemination (website evaluation)

**4.1 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 ONGOING | 01.01.2019 | Yes  No ⌧ | Yes  No ⌧ |
| 3.3. | PBL and EL in competence-based learning workshop ONGOING | 01.03.2019 | Yes  No ⌧ | Yes  No ⌧ |
| 3.4. | Distance learning guide, manual and workshop ONGOING | 01.03.2019 | Yes  No ⌧ | Yes  No ⌧ |
| 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 |
|  | 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 | 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  The QAC asks the BUGI partners to rapidly recover the delay accumulated since the start of the project, and complete the ONGOING and PARTLY ACHIEVED activities before the next partner meeting in Berlin, next 1 November 2019. |

**4.2 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

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[[1]](#footnote-1)**

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

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

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  The high average score achieved by all the internal evaluations carried out till now shows a high cohesion among the partner organisations, who have progressively improved their capacity to tackle difficulties and identify effective correction actions.  Despite these positive aspects, it must be remarked that some important delays due to the late start of the project implementation have not been yet recovered. |

**4.3 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  This section was not object of the work performed by the QAC. |

**4.4 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  Even if level of satisfaction about the project website has achieved the requested threshold, nevertheless we request to the partner organisations a major effort to keep the information continuously updated, and increase the attractiveness of the project website, that must not be a mere tool for presenting the project activities, but should emphasise the relevance and innovation potential of the project activities for the partner Balkan countries. |

**Average score of external evaluation questionnaire: DISSEMINATION EVENTS**

**Not applicable yet (first event foreseen for mid 2019)**

**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  The general impression is that the project is achieving the initial goals and the project activities are developing according to the initial objectives, however some more impetus should be given to the pace of the activities.  The following table present the list of measurable and qualitative indicators that must be well kept in mind for the effective finalization of the BUGI project within the planned timeplan, for the different project WPs. |

**WP 1 PREPARATION (title: Needs analysis)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| OBJECTIVES | RESULTS/ OUTCOMES | MEASURABLE INDICATORS | QUALITATIVE INDICATORS - INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL EVALUATION |
| To define knowledge, skills & competences needed by postgraduates / trainees to meet national and EU strategies and entrepreneurial sector needs, fostering collaboration with different stakeholders especially from entrepreneurial sector.  To analyse existing business models, preferences and capacities with respect to defined needs and to create sustainable business models and revenue oriented strategies. | **D.1.1 Survey guide** will deliver methodological framework and instruments used by WP1  **D.1.2 Regional and EU action plans and strategies report** related to UA in Partner Countries and 1 at EU level | 1 survey guide  1 integrated regional report including well defined list of national and regional priorities | Presentation Quality and Structure  Reliability (accuracy, and completeness) |
| **D.1.3 Farms models in regions** – the Report will analyze present business models in partner countries, their characteristic, success factors and problems. | 1 integrated regional report | Presentation Quality and Structure  Reliability (accuracy, and completeness) |
| **D.1.4 Food supply chains analysis**  The aim of this report is to identify food supply chains in region and theirs characteristics, advantages and disadvantages. Report will analyze short food supply chain as one of the important characteristic of UA as well as potential of alternative food supply chains and shared economy models | 1 integrated report | Presentation Quality and Structure  Reliability (accuracy, and completeness) |
|  | **D.1.5 Consumers preferences survey**  To be implemented online (social medias, project Website) and in the form of interviews face-to-face in all partner countries. The consumer motives and preferences regarding price, attitudes and habits, distribution, products and promotion will be identified in order to shape the curriculum | 1 survey | Presentation Quality and Structure  Reliability (accuracy, and completeness) |
|  | **D.1.6 City-adjusted farm strategies** in B&H, MN and XK  This report will analyze and propose different business models for UA in partner countries and explore their advantages and disadvantages. | 1 report | Presentation Quality and Structure  Reliability (accuracy, and completeness) |
|  | **D.1.7. Partners HEIs infrastructure and teacher’s assessments**  Each partner HEI will deliver a report on infrastructure capacities (facilities, laboratories, etc). Report will assess teachers knowledge regarding specific topics in UA (AU related businesses models, specific | 1 Report per partner | Presentation Quality and Structure  Reliability (accuracy, and completeness) |

**WP 2 Development (title: curriculum modules and LLL centre programs development)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| OBJECTIVES | RESULTS/ OUTCOMES | MEASURABLE INDICATORS | QUALITATIVE INDICATORS - INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL EVALUATION |
| To design and implement of new master study curriculum and LLL programs at partners HEIs.  To establish 4 expert groups for curriculum writing and ECTS design. | Two years study program with 120 ECTS *(****E****uropean* ***C****redit* ***T****ransfer and Accumulation* ***S****ystem credits)* with basic obligatory modules and closed list of elective modules  **D2.1 Curriculum Draft** in English  New study contents will be divided into the **5 modules:**  1. Introduction to UA  2. Food production systems;  3. UA Entrepreneurship: Societal demands and business models;  4. Urban planning and resources;  5. Use of technologies and ICT in UA | 5 modules | Presentation Quality and Structure  Relevance (training needs) |
| **D2.2 Learning project design guide** for teachers (guide PBL and EL) in all partner languages | 1 learning project design guide | Reliability |
| **D2.3 Skills and competence evaluation guide** Reference systems for validation learning outcomes | 1 Skills and competence evaluation guide | Quality and usability |
|  | **D2.4 Master study and LLL program** Each partner HEI will choose the number of proposed modules and modes (basic and advance) within module, according to their national and HEI strategies. Competence based learning using PBL and EL will be established as teaching methodology | 1 Master study and LLL program /per partner HEI | Reliability (=consistency, completeness and accuracy) |
|  | **D.2.5 Module Placement Guide**  Verify readiness of students for *advanced* course mode | 1 Module Placement Guide | Reliability (=consistency, completeness and accuracy) |
|  | **D.2.6 Diploma supplement (DP):** Diploma supplement providing a standardized description of the nature, level, context, content and status of the studies | 1 Diploma supplement (DP) for partner HEIs in their official language and English | Reliability (=consistency, completeness and accuracy) |
|  | **D.2.7 Multilateral inter-institutional agreement**:  Inter-institutional agreement. The university partners will work on a common ECTS credit design and transfer system thus allowing credit mobility | 1 inter-institutional agreement | Reliability (=consistency, completeness and accuracy) |

**WP3 Development (title: Developing capacities and facilities)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| OBJECTIVES | RESULTS/ OUTCOMES | MEASURABLE INDICATORS | QUALITATIVE INDICATORS - INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL EVALUATION |
| To deliver a report on teaching/training infrastructure and the level of teachers’ knowledge and skills needed to meet defined learning outcomes. According to that report, each partner HEIs will perform internal assessments  To design and implement teachers training on competence based learning.  To implement teachers’ training for distance and blended learning courses. | **D3.1 Infrastructure and teachings staff assessment**  Part of this report will define teaching staff required knowledge and skills regarding the use of this equipment. This part of report will be used to plan teachers training. | 1 report | Presentation Quality and Structure  Relevance (training needs) |
| **D3.2 Study visits and training** | 6 study visits with training for 5 participants from 5 HEIs will deliver 150 trainings + 3 day workshop? | Reliability (=Completeness) |
| **D3.3 PBL and EL in competence based learning workshop** | 1 learning workshop shop from 5 HEIs 25 teaching staff will participate | Reliability (=Completeness) |
|  | **D3.4 Distance learning guide, manual and workshop** | 1 **training course**, **1 guide for students in partner** HEIs languages and **1 teaching staff manual** in partner HEIs languages. All together from 5 HEIs 25 teaching staff will participate | Reliability (=consistency, completeness and accuracy) |
|  | **D3.5 Development of teaching/training tools** | Teaching and training tools will be designed/ purchased for partner HEIs. |  |
|  | **D3.6 Purchase and installation of equipment** | Equipment (laboratory equipment, supplements for agriculture machinery, glasshouses and greenhouses, IT and other specialized equipment, agricultural and horticultural tools) necessary for the practical education for master studies and LLL programs will be purchased. |  |
|  | **D3.7 Curriculum accreditation** | **1 national accreditation** during the academic year 2019/2020. |  |
|  | **D3.8 Curriculum implementation** | 5 partner countries HEIs will implement **pilot** phase of new UA master study curriculum and LLL program. **Each HEI will enrol up to 10 students in master study curriculum.** All together up to **50 students** |  |

**WP4 QUALITY PLAN (title: Quality assurance and monitoring)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| OBJECTIVES | RESULTS/ OUTCOMES | MEASURABLE INDICATORS | QUALITATIVE INDICATORS - INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL EVALUATION |
| The WP aim is to ensure quality of curricula and LLL programs, teaching material contests, methodologies, and project overall defined outcomes, timetables and budget. | **D4.1 Quality performance framework**  Including agreed procedures, methods, standards, reports and instruments to be used in the evaluation activities | 1 QPF | Presentation Quality and Structure |
| **D4.2** WPs quality evaluations and QAC functioning | 1 operational plan with milestones to be followed by all project partners in the QPF | Presentation Quality and Structure |
| **D4.3 Evaluation questionnaires** | Evaluation questionnaires | Presentation quality and Relevance |
|  | **D.4.4 Evaluation reports**  QAC will perform 6 months progress reports and annual in-depth progress evaluations reports | 1 progress report every six months  1 annual in-depth progress report | Reliability (=consistency, completeness and accuracy) |
|  | **D.4.5 External evaluations and costs verification**  The two subcontracted experts will be asked to provide written reports on the adequacy and appropriateness of the core educational deliverables and curricula/ programs and teaching tools in first external evaluation | 1 report | Reliability (=consistency, completeness and accuracy) |
|  | **D.4.6 Evaluation of curriculum and teaching tools**  Besides external evaluation, appointed experts, peer reviewers will evaluate curriculum and modules within, teaching tools and LLL programs during the process of implementation. |  |  |

**WP5 DISSEMINATION & EXPLOITATION**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| OBJECTIVES | RESULTS/ OUTCOMES | MEASURABLE INDICATORS | QUALITATIVE INDICATORS - INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL EVALUATION |
| The WP aim is to ensure visibility of the project activities, outcomes, achievements, and regular information dissemination for specific and general public, enhancing communication with target groups according to a dissemination Strategy. | **D5.1 Dissemination Strategy**  Background analysis goals, objectives, expected results and their timeline; Project beneficiaries, partners, potential public decision making bodies | 1 report | Presentation Quality and Structure |
| **D5.2** **Project web site** and social media channels | 1 project website | Presentation Quality and Structure |
| **D5.3 Green Entrepreneurship**  This initiative will work as virtual association of UA farmers as well as other farmers in region. This e-portal will be linked to the official project Website and used for project dissemination | 1 Regional Green Entrepreneurship e-portal | Presentation quality |
|  | **D.5.4 Distance learning platform** | 1 Distance learning platform | Presentation quality |
|  | **D.5.5 Project promotional materials** | **1 brochure for promoting the master study**;  **1 general informative** brochure regarding UA and Community Supported Agriculture with project information/description will be created in partner HEIs languages. | Reliability (=consistency, completeness and accuracy |
|  | **D.5.6 Scientific contributions** | At least **2 papers** on project activities and results will be submitted for presentation at relevant international conferences and/or publishing in relevant scientific magazines (peer-reviewed). | Reliability (=consistency, completeness and accuracy |
|  | **D.5.7 Info days, open door day and UA conference** | **1 3-days international UA conference**  **1 open door event**  **3 public campaigns** will be organized in partners’ HEIs campuses | Relevance |
|  | **D.5.8 Interim and final report** on dissemination and exploitation | **1 interim report on dissemination and exploitation**  **1 final report on dissemination and exploitation** | Reliability (=consistency, completeness and accuracy |

# ANNEXES

## Annex I: internal evaluation questionnaire PARTNERS MEETINGS

This questionnaire will be distributed immediately after or during each transnational partners meeting to allow evaluation of the meetings in terms of organisation, content, usefulness.

MEETING n X- Venue and date

Partner’s name:

Organisation:

Please mark with an X the following items about the meeting (number meetings)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. ORGANISATIONAL ISSUES | Very useful | Useful | Not useful | Do not know |
| Booking & pre-event organisation |  |  |  |  |
| Organisation on the day (Agenda) |  |  |  |  |
| Venue facilities |  |  |  |  |

Comments regarding organisational issues: Is there anything you would propose to organise in a different way?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2. CONTENT OF THE EVENT | Very useful | Useful | Not useful | Do not know |
| Relevance of topics covered |  |  |  |  |
| Usefulness of presentations |  |  |  |  |
| Communication skills of presenters |  |  |  |  |
| Presentation of innovative ideas |  |  |  |  |
| Adapt to meeting contents |  |  |  |  |

Comments regarding contents: Are there specific issues you would like to deal in the next meeting?

3. WERE ALL YOUR QUESTIONS AND QUERIES ABOUT THE PROJECT SOLVED?

🞏 YES 🞏 NO

If the answer is no, please specify:

4. PLEASE RATE THE FOLLOWING TOPICS:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| TOPIC | RATING |
| Feasibility of project planning | ➀-➁-➂-➃-➄  unsatisfactory - excellent |
| Handling of administrative and financial matters | ➀-➁-➂-➃-➄  unsatisfactory - excellent |
| Project governance (e.g. decision-making, consultation, problem-solving) | ➀-➁-➂-➃-➄  unsatisfactory - excellent |
| Accord and shared visions of partners regarding ACTIVITYs | ➀-➁-➂-➃-➄  unsatisfactory - excellent |
| Communication flows among partners | ➀-➁-➂-➃-➄  unsatisfactory - excellent |
| Added value of the project compared to similar initiatives which you know of/you participate in | ➀-➁-➂-➃-➄  unsatisfactory - excellent |

5. Please explain what are, in your opinion, the strengths and the weaknesses of BUGI, in terms of internal processes (e.g. collaboration processes, contribution to project development, harmonisation of ideas, involvement of target group, relevance and expertise of involved partners, etc.):

STRENGTHS:

WEAKNESSES:

THANKS A LOT!

## Annex II: internal evaluation questionnaire: PROGRESS OF THE PROJECT

This questionnaire will be distributed to partners about every 6 months, in order to allow self-reflection and evaluation. The questionnaires will be treated confidentially by UNIBO as WP4 leader and the results merged in the Evaluation report in an anonymous way.

Instruction for completing the questionnaire: the questionnaire wants to collect feedback from the whole team of the partner organisation working in the project and to give occasion to meet and discuss about the project implementation. Therefore, we suggest that all persons of the partner organisation working in the BUGI project meet and fill in the questionnaire all together. Suggested procedure: One person reads aloud the questions and the team members discuss on what answer to give to each ones, as to best represent the different opinion of the individuals. In case of non-homogeneous opinions team members share the different points of view until they agree on the score to be given. Relevant discrepancy in individual opinions within the team should be described in the free comment section of the questionnaire.

**PARTNER ORGANISATION (1 questionnaire per partner organisation)**

**Date:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **HOW MUCH DO YOU AGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS?** | **I don’t agree at all** | **I don’t agree** | **I neither agree nor disagree** | **I agree** | **I fully**  **agree** |
| I (we) have a clear understanding of the overall project aims and objectives, as well as of the expected results |  |  |  |  |  |
| The work plan is feasible |  |  |  |  |  |
| The tasks are well distributed among partners |  |  |  |  |  |
| I (we) know and understand the task and the role assigned to my organisation in the different WPs and I’m (we’re) working accordingly |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project governance (e.g. decision-making, consultation, problem-solving) is smooth and transparent |  |  |  |  |  |
| The administrative and financial matters are handled efficiently by the coordinator |  |  |  |  |  |
| I (we) have been given clear instructions and guidelines on financial and administrative management procedures and rules |  |  |  |  |  |
| There is accord and shared visions among partners regarding activities and outputs |  |  |  |  |  |
| The internal communication flow is fluent and regular and I (we) actively contribute to it |  |  |  |  |  |
| I (we) regularly receive updates from WP leaders about deadlines and instruction on activities to carry out |  |  |  |  |  |
| I (we) can rely on the support of the coordinator and WP leader in case of problems |  |  |  |  |  |
| I (we) feel that my work is appreciated by partners and by the coordinators |  |  |  |  |  |
| I’m (we’re) satisfied with the quality of the outcomes and results achieved so far by the project |  |  |  |  |  |
| I (we) think my (our) organisation is actively contributing to the progress of the project |  |  |  |  |  |

* Did you encounter any problem in the last period? Please describe with clear reference to the WP and the tasks concerned. Please also explain how did you solve them or how do you plan to solve them
* Is there anything you would like to change / improve / be different? Please explain with clear reference to the WP concerned.
* Other comments (please highlight here if there are discrepancy in the team about any answer above).

## Annex III: internal evaluation questionnaire: WP LEADERS AND COORDINATOR SELF -EVALUATION

This questionnaire will be distributed to WP leaders about every 6 months, in order to allow self-reflection and evaluation. The questionnaires will be treated confidentially by UNIBO as WP4 leader and the results merged in the Evaluation report in an anonymous way.

Suggestion for the completion of the questionnaire: the questionnaire is meant to be completed by the officially appointed WP leader, if necessary with support by the persons who cooperate to the WP development and implementation of the work.

Only one questionnaire should be filled in per each WP and the answers given should represent the opinion agreed by the team members.

**WP:**

**LEADING PARTNER ORGANISATION:**

**Date:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Don’t agree at all** | **Don’t agree** | **Neither agree nor disagree** | **Agree** | **Fully**  **agree** |
| I have a clear idea of what are the expected activities and results from this WP |  |  |  |  |  |
| The work plan agreed for this WP is feasible |  |  |  |  |  |
| The results and outcomes expected by this WP are feasible |  |  |  |  |  |
| The tasks are well distributed among partners |  |  |  |  |  |
| All partners actively contribute to this WP |  |  |  |  |  |
| All partners have a clear idea of what are the expected activities and results of this WP |  |  |  |  |  |
| All partners know what are their respective tasks and roles in this WP |  |  |  |  |  |
| All partners regularly communicate with me and among each other’s on this WP |  |  |  |  |  |
| All partners usually consult me in case of problems and delay |  |  |  |  |  |
| I gave (I’m going to give) partners with clear instructions and guidelines on activities, roles, tasks and expected results of this WP |  |  |  |  |  |
| I regularly send to partners emails and communications about approaching deadlines and activities, as to help them in planning the work |  |  |  |  |  |
| I regularly ask partners to inform me on the state of advancement of the activities they are carrying out within this WP |  |  |  |  |  |
| II feel that my work is appreciated by partners and by the coordinator |  |  |  |  |  |
| I’m satisfied with the quality of outcomes and the results achieved so far within this WP |  |  |  |  |  |

* Did you encounter any problem in the last period? Please describe with clear reference to the WP and the tasks concerned. Please also explain how did you solve them or how do you plan to solve them
* Is there anything you would like to change / improve / make different? Please explain with clear reference to the WP concerned.
* Other comments (please highlight here if there are discrepancy in the team about any answer above).

## Annex IV: evaluation questionnaire: QUALITY OF THE STUDY VISIT

The present questionnaire aims at collecting the points of view of participants’ attending the events/study visits organised by the project, on three key evaluation domains:

* how useful was the study visit/training for acquiring new skills
* how effective were the training materials and methods
* how was the event organised, also providing suggestions for improvement

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

Participant’s name : \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Organisation: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Using the following five-point scale please rate the quality of selected key aspects.

1 = insufficient; 2 = hardly sufficient; 3 = reasonable; 4 = good; 5 = excellent;

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1. Usefulness of training for acquiring new skills** | | | | |
| **Dimensions** | **A) Overall Rating** | **B) Problems Encountered** | **C) Positive Aspects** | **D) Additional Comments** |
| **Correspondence of study visit and training with my current / future job** | ➀-➁-➂-➃-➄  insufficient - excellent |  |  |  |
| **Correspondence of study visit and training with my interests** | ➀-➁-➂-➃-➄  insufficient - excellent |  |  |  |
| **Training has met my expectations** | ➀-➁-➂-➃-➄  insufficient - excellent |  |  |  |

Please, use this space if you wish to add further remarks (free text):

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2. EFFECTIVENESS OF training materials and methods** | | | | |
| **Dimensions** | **A) Overall Rating** | **B) Problems Encountered** | **C) Positive Aspects** | **D) Additional Comments** |
| **Quality of the training methodology** | ➀-➁-➂-➃-➄  insufficient - excellent |  |  |  |
| **Quality of presenter/lecturer/trainer/facilitator(s) was/were knowledgeable.** | ➀-➁-➂-➃-➄  insufficient - excellent |  |  |  |
| **Quality of the materials received** | ➀-➁-➂-➃-➄  insufficient - excellent |  |  |  |
| **Adequacy of the duration of training/presentations** | ➀-➁-➂-➃-➄  insufficient - excellent |  |  |  |

Please, use this space if you wish to add further remarks (free text):

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **3. organisation of the event, suggestions for improvement** | | | | |
| **Dimensions** | **A) Overall Rating** | **B) Problems Encountered** | **C) Positive Aspects** | **D) Additional Comments** |
| **The locations were adequate for the purpose** | ➀-➁-➂-➃-➄  insufficient - excellent |  |  |  |
| **Equipment / devices used were adequate for the purpose** | ➀-➁-➂-➃-➄  insufficient - excellent |  |  |  |
| **What can we organise better next time?** |  |  |  |  |

Please, use this space if you wish to add further remarks (free text):

Thank you for your feedback.

## Annex V: external evaluation questionnaire: DISSEMINATION EVENTS

This represents an example of questionnaire to adapted to the project and translated in partners languages for collecting feedbacks from participants in dissemination events organised by the BUGI project. Each partner, organising a dissemination event in the frame of the project, should translate and print on paper the questionnaire to be distributed to participants. The results should be then collected and summarised by project partners using an ad hoc created Excel file or online questionnaire to be provided by P6 UNIBO (IT).

**TITLE OF THE EVENT**

**DATE & PLACE**

**HOW DO YOU RATE THE FOLLOWING ASPECTS OF THE EVENT**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Very**  **Poor** | **Poor** | **Neither poor nor good** | **Good** | **Very**  **good** |
| Organisation |  |  |  |  |  |
| Location / place |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pace of delivery |  |  |  |  |  |
| Content |  |  |  |  |  |
| Methodology |  |  |  |  |  |

**TO WHAT EXTENT DO YOU AGREE WITH THE FOLLONWING STATEMENTS**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Don’t agree at all** | **Don’t agree** | **Neither agree nor disagree** | **Agree** | **Fully**  **agree** |
| Attending this event worth my time |  |  |  |  |  |
| The content of the presentations is relevant to me |  |  |  |  |  |
| Presentations were interesting and easy to follow |  |  |  |  |  |
| The speakers are experts in their fields |  |  |  |  |  |
| Active involvement of participants has been encouraged |  |  |  |  |  |
| I would like to learn more about Urban Agriculture |  |  |  |  |  |
| I would like to learn more about innovative enterprises, business ideas and initiatives in Urban Agriculture |  |  |  |  |  |
| I think that Urban Agriculture can make my town more liveable and improve quality of life of citizens |  |  |  |  |  |
| I would like to be kept informed about the BUGI project activities and results |  |  |  |  |  |

* Would you like to receive BUGI updates and the quarterly newsletter? If yes, please give us your email address
* Do you have further feedbacks, comments, suggestions?

## Annex VI: external evaluation questionnaire: PROJECT WEB SITE

This is an example of questionnaire for collecting feedbacks from web site visitors and users. The questionnaire, duly adapted to the project needs and web site characteristics, will be available on line in EN and in all project languages and accessible from the BUGI web site, as well as through link to be diffused via email.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Website** | **Don’t agree at all** | **Don’t agree** | **Neither agree nor disagree** | **Agree** | **Fully**  **agree** |
| The language used is easy to understand and clear\* |  |  |  |  |  |
| The website navigation is easy and smooth\* |  |  |  |  |  |
| The overall design is attractive\* |  |  |  |  |  |
| The information are useful and recently updated\* |  |  |  |  |  |
| The language used is easy to understand and clear\* |  |  |  |  |  |
| Thanks for your feedbacks |  | | | | |

## Annex VII: external evaluation questionnaire: QUALITY OF DELIVERABLES WP 1

1. Quality of the methodological framework and instruments for WP 1 specified in the **survey guide (D.1.1)** used by WP1 ?

*➀-➁-➂-➃-➄ where 1 is and 5 is excellent*

Comments: ….

1. Does the **report (D.1.2**) represent a clear and exhaustive description of relevant action plans and strategies related to UA?

*➀-➁-➂-➃-➄ where 1 is and 5 is excellent*

Comments: ….

1. How do you evaluate the completeness and pertinence of the knowledge, skills, and competence required by employees and farmers identified in the **report of working group 1 “Farm models” (D.1.3)**

*➀-➁-➂-➃-➄ where 1 is and 5 is excellent*

Comments: ….

1. How do you evaluate the completeness and pertinence of the knowledge, skills, and competence required by employees and farmers identified in the **report of working group 2 “Food supply chains”** **(D.1. 4)?**

*➀-➁-➂-➃-➄ where 1 is and 5 is excellent*

Comments: ….

1. How do you evaluate the completeness and pertinence of the knowledge, skills, and competence required by employees and farmers identified in the **report of working group 3 “Consumer preferences” (D.1.5)?**

*➀-➁-➂-➃-➄ where 1 is and 5 is excellent*

Comments: ….

1. How do you evaluate the quality and pertinence of the City-adjusted farm strategies and business models presented in **deliverable D.1.6)?**

*➀-➁-➂-➃-➄ where 1 is and 5 is excellent*

Comments: ….

1. How do you evaluate the quality, accuracy, and completeness of the information regarding the state of the art of teachers’ knowledge regarding specific topics in UA in **deliverable D.1.7?**

*➀-➁-➂-➃-➄ where 1 is and 5 is excellent*

Comments: ….

## Annex VIII: external evaluation questionnaire: QUALITY OF DELIVERABLES WP 2

* Is the common curricula draft **(D.2.1)** well-structured and does it reflect the objectives and priorities of each partner countries’ needs?

**➀-➁-➂-➃-➄ where 1 is strongly disagree, 2 disagree, 3 is neither agree or disagree, 4 is agree and 5 is strongly agree**

Comments: ….

* Does the **Learning projects design guide for teachers (D.2.2)** deliver a reliable framework for introducing Problem Based Learning and Experiential Learning in the context of specific learning projects?

**➀-➁-➂-➃-➄ where 1 is strongly disagree, 2 disagree, 3 is neither agree or disagree, 4 is agree and 5 is strongly agree**

Comments: ….

* How do you evaluate the quality and usability of the **evaluation framework guide for students’ skills and competence evaluations**. **(D.2.3)**

**➀-➁-➂-➃-➄ where 1 is poor, 2 is fair, 3 is good, 4 is very good and 5 is excellent**

Comments: ….

* How do you evaluate the quality and reliability (=consistency, completeness and accuracy) of the **New curriculums and LLL programs (D.2.4)**? Do they enable interdisciplinary competence based learning using PBL and EL? How is the mix of distance and blended learning?

**➀-➁-➂-➃-➄ where 1 is poor, 2 is fair, 3 is good, 4 is very good and 5 is excellent**

Comments: ….

* How do you evaluate the completeness and usability of the **“Module Placement Guide (D.2.5**) to assess student’s current readiness to access the advanced mode and guarantee a transparent registration procedure/administrative work?

**➀-➁-➂-➃-➄ where 1 is poor, 2 is fair, 3 is good, 4 is very good and 5 is excellent**

Comments: ….

* Does the **Diploma supplement (D.2.6)** provide a standardized description of the nature, level, context, content and status of the studies and an accurate description of acquired competencies according to the EUROPASS cluster?

➀***-***➁***-***➂***-***➃***-***➄ ***where 1 is strongly disagree, 2 disagree, 3 is neither agree or disagree, 4 is agree and 5 is strongly agree***

Comments: ….

* Does the **inter-institutional agreement (D2.6)** prepared by university partners work on common ECTS credits design and transfer system that allows credit mobility?

➀***-***➁***-***➂***-***➃***-***➄ ***where 1 is strongly disagree, 2 disagree, 3 is neither agree or disagree, 4 is agree and 5 is strongly agree***

Comments: ….

## Annex IX: evaluation questionnaire: STAFF AND STUDENT SATISFACTION CURRICULUM IMPLEMENTATION

The present questionnaire aims at collecting the points of view of students and teachers who participated to the pilot of the BUGI curriculum.

The key evaluation domains are:

1. Curriculum description and entrance requirements

2. Curriculum Content

3. Resources

4. Evaluation methods

5. Other

Your feedback will be treated confidentially. The key outcomes of this evaluation exercise will be used for improving the curriculum.

Your in-depth feedback is critical to the continued success of BUGI.

Participant’s name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Organisation: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Using the following five-point scale please rate the quality of selected key aspects.

1 = insufficient; 2 = hardly sufficient; 3 = reasonable; 4 = good; 5 = excellent;

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1. Curriculum Description and Entrance Requirements** | | |
| **Dimensions** | A) Overall Rating | B) Comments |
| **Clarity and completeness of the programme/curriculum description** | ➀-➁-➂-➃-➄  insufficient - excellent |  |
| **Clarity and completeness of the program entrance/admission requirements in terms of basic knowledge, skills and/or abilities required to be successful in the program** | ➀-➁-➂-➃-➄  insufficient - excellent |  |
| **Are there any entrance/admission requirements which you would recommend as necessary?** | B) Comments | |

Please, use this space if you wish to add further remarks (free text):

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2. Curriculum Content and Structure** | | | | |
| **Dimensions** | A) Overall Rating | B) Problems Encountered | C) Positive Aspects | D) Additional Comments |
| **Accuracy and completeness of the learning objectives and pertinence of the related competences** | ➀-➁-➂-➃-➄  insufficient - excellent |  |  |  |
| **Adequacy of the timeline and duration of the program** | ➀-➁-➂-➃-➄  insufficient - excellent |  |  |  |
| **Relevance of learning outcomes (learning activities are consistent with UA practices?)** | ➀-➁-➂-➃-➄  insufficient - excellent |  |  |  |
| **Quality of the training methodology** | ➀-➁-➂-➃-➄  insufficient - excellent |  |  |  |
| **Balance between theory and practice** | ➀-➁-➂-➃-➄  insufficient - excellent |  |  |  |
| **Compliance with policy requirements in curriculum development** | ➀-➁-➂-➃-➄  insufficient - excellent |  |  |  |
| **Compliance with the legal requirements of the course in subject (if existing)** | ➀-➁-➂-➃-➄  insufficient - excellent |  |  |  |

Please, use this space if you wish to add further remarks (free text):

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **3. Resources** | | | | |
| **Dimensions** | A) Overall Rating | B) Problems Encountered | C) Positive Aspects | D) Additional Comments |
| **Adequacy of learning resources (e.g. print media, audio - visual materials etc..) provided for program delivery and active student engagement** | ➀-➁-➂-➃-➄  insufficient - excellent |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4. Evaluation methods** | | | | |
| **Dimensions** | A) Overall Rating | B) Problems Encountered | C) Positive Aspects | D) Additional Comments |
| **Adequacy of methods of evaluation and monitoring** | ➀-➁-➂-➃-➄  insufficient - excellent |  |  |  |
| **Requirements for successful completion** | ➀-➁-➂-➃-➄  insufficient - excellent |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **5. Other** | | | | |
| **Dimensions** | A) Overall Rating | B) Problems Encountered | C) Positive Aspects | D) Additional Comments |
| **How did your experience of undertaking the BUGI course align with your expectations?** | ➀-➁-➂-➃-➄  not at all – a little bit – quite a bit – a lot |  |  |  |
| **What impact has this course had on your UA knowledge, skills or practice?** | ➀-➁-➂-➃-➄  no chance – not much – a little bit – a lot |  |  |  |

1. ➀-➁-➂-➃-➄ insufficient - excellent [↑](#footnote-ref-1)