



QUALITY AND ASSURANCE PLAN

This project has been funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Curricula innovation in climate-smart urban development based on green and energy efficiency with the non-academic sector

Project: 101081724 — SmartWB — ERASMUS-EDU-2022-CBHE

PROJECT INFO

Project title	Curricula innovation in climate-smart urban development based on green and energy efficiency with the non-academic sector
Project acronym	SmartWB
Project reference number	101081724
Funding scheme	Lump sum grant - ERASMUS-EDU-2022-CBHE
Web address	www.smartwb.ucg.ac.me
Coordination institution	University of Montenegro
Project duration	36

DOCUMENT CONTROL SHEET

Work package	WP6 Quality assurance and monitoring
Ref. no and title of activity	T6.1 Development of the Quality and assurance plan
Title of deliverable	Quality and assurance plan
Lead institution	University of Nis
Author(s)	Milan Gocić, Marija Jevrić, Martin Oldenburg, Željko Bačić
Document status	Final
Document version and date	V2.0, 28 March 2023
Dissemination level	Confidential (Sensitive)

VERSIONING AND CONTRIBUTION HISTORY

Version	Date	Revision description	Partner responsible
v.01	15 February 2023	Document creation	UNI
v.02	28 March 2023	Document revision	UNI, UoM, THOWL, UNIZG

Contents

Executive summary	1
List of abbreviations	2
1. Introduction	3
1.1 Purpose and use	3
1.2 Management	3
1.3 Dissemination	4
2. Quality assessment and assurance	5
2.1 Quality Assurance Committee.....	5
2.1.1 Quality Assurance Committee meetings and reporting.....	6
3. Internal evaluation	7
3.1 SmartWB's deliverables management	7
3.1.1 Deliverable review process	9
3.2 Quality of SmartWB events	10
4. External evaluation	12
4.1 Criteria for selection of external evaluator	13
4.1.1 Description of the external evaluator task.....	13
4.1.2 Profile of the external evaluator	13
4.1.3 Responsibilities of the external evaluator.....	13
4.1.4 Evaluation budget	14
Annex AQ1 Event evaluation list	15
Annex AQ2 Event report	17
Annex AQ3 University course evaluation list	23
Annex AQ4 University course report	25
Annex AQ5 Deliverable evaluation list	29

Executive summary

This document represents deliverable D6.1 “Quality and assurance plan” of the SmartWB project funded by the European Commission's Erasmus+ Programme ERASMUS-EDU-2022-CBHE under grant agreement No 101081724. The main objective of this quality assurance plan is to act as the core reference point to ensure quality outcomes of the entire project and its deliverables. This quality assurance plan provides details of the SmartWB's quality standards describing the reporting quality standards and the communication quality standards requirements, highlighting a number of templates that are provided to all partners to ensure quality of achieved results. To ensure the deliverables' quality standards, in this plan there are details of the deliverables review process and their respective timeline, including a quality criteria list against which deliverables will be checked for quality. All beneficiaries, and when relevant associated partners, should abide to the plan stipulated in this document.

List of abbreviations

BOKU	University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences
CSUD	Climate-Smart Urban Development
EACEA	European Education and Culture Executive Agency
EU	European Union
HE	Higher Education
HEI	Higher Education Institution
NEO	National Erasmus+ Office
NMBU	Norwegian University of Life Sciences
QAC	Quality Assurance Committee
SC	Steering Committee
THOWL	Technische Hochschule Ostwestfalen-Lippe
UET	European University of Tirana
UNBI	University of Bihać
UNI	University of Nis
UNIZG	University of Zagreb UoM
UNMO	Dzemail Bijedic University of Mostar
UNSA	University of Sarajevo
UoM	University of Montenegro
UoM	University of Montenegro
UPT	Polytechnic University of Tirana
U-POLIS	Polis University
URJC	Universidad Rey Juan Carlos
WB	Western Balkan
WP	Work package

1. Introduction

The main objective of the SmartWB project is to improve the quality of higher education (HE) in the climate-smart urban development (CSUD) field by exchanging knowledge, experience, and good practices, modernising university courses in line with EU trends, and improving the level of competencies and skills of teaching staff. SmartWB's details are described in Table 1.

Table 1. SmartWB's details

Project number	101081724
Project name	Curricula innovation in climate-smart urban development based on green and energy efficiency with the non-academic sector
Project acronym	SmartWB
Call	ERASMUS-EDU-2022-CBHE
Type of action	ERASMUS+LS
Project start date	1 January 2023
Project end date	31 December 2025
Duration	36 months
Total European Union Eligible Project Cost	715,074.00 €

1.1 Purpose and use

The Quality and assurance plan (D6.1) for SmartWB, which is part of WP6 and is addressed directly in T6.1, aims to ensure the high quality of the project results, project deliverables, and key events. This Quality assurance plan denotes an essential document that should be used by every consortium beneficiary and associated partner when executing tasks or deliverables.

1.2 Management

The Project Coordinator in collaboration with the Quality Assurance Committee is responsible for the development and management of this Quality assurance plan. Requested deviations from the original deliverable should be made in writing, providing clear justifications, directly to the Project Coordinator. Approval for such deviations can only be granted by the Project Coordinator, who may consult with the project's Steering Committee. Upon approval of any modification to the original Quality and assurance plan, the Coordinator is responsible to issue a revised version, with new version numbering updated consecutively.

1.3 Dissemination

The Quality and assurance plan is confidential and will be made available only to SmartWB's beneficiaries and associated partners at the issue date. Copies of this Quality and assurance plan cannot be disseminated amongst third parties, unless with prior approval of the Project Coordinator.

2. Quality assessment and assurance

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

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

The quality assurance and monitoring will be performed by internal and external quality assessments. Internal quality assessment will be done by Quality Assurance Committee, while the external assessment will be performed by external quality evaluator.

2.1 Quality Assurance Committee

To ensure the quality of the SmartWB project, internal work quality standards and procedures will be agreed upon and established for the Consortium partners by the Quality Assurance Committee (QAC), which is established during the kick-off meeting to monitor project's performance and to achieve the quality the project results. The QAC consists of four members representing the partner HEIs (University of Nis - UNI, University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences - BOKU, Technische Hochschule Ostwestfalen-Lippe - THOWL, and University of Zagreb - UNIZG) (Table 2). The lead Partner for the Quality assurance and monitoring (WP6) is University of Nis (UNI).

Table 2 Quality Assurance Committee team

Organisation	Name and surname
UNI	Milan Gocić
BOKU	Doris Damyanovic
UNIZG	Željko Bačić
THOWL	Martin Oldenburg

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

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

The quality assurance tasks of the QAC are as follows:

- establishing the internal work quality standards and procedures,
- supporting the Project Coordinator in the establishment of independent monitoring evaluations by expert(s) (mid-term and at the end of the project),
- analysing of EACEA evaluation and NEO monitoring reports,
- evaluating the quality of the project deliverables, for its completion in due time as well as for its completeness, clarity and comprehensiveness.

2.1.1 Quality Assurance Committee meetings and reporting

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

The COVID-19 pandemic can negatively affect ongoing or planned activities under the SmartWB project. The WP6 leader will adequately react in order to organize further implementation of project activities by contacting project partners and suggesting necessary steps in order to prevent COVID-19 negative effects on project results.

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

3. Internal evaluation

The aim of internal evaluation is to steer the SmartWB project into the right direction through the definition of the effective methods for quality assessment, controlling and improving project implementation. Internal quality monitoring will be conducted using adequate procedures and tools such as evaluation forms, questionnaires and different evaluation reports.

All partners are responsible for regular internal evaluation of compliance with the defined work plan to achieve overall broader and specific objectives. They should respect defined procedures and tools for quality assurance, in fully respect to the signed partnership agreements. The Project Coordinator will inform on regular basis partners about evaluation results and agree remedial actions.

The QAC team is obligated to objectively judge project achievements and give recommendations for improving project quality standards.

3.1 SmartWB's deliverables management

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

Table 2 SmartWB project deliverables

Deliverable No.	Deliverable name	WP no.	Short name of the lead participant	Type	Dissemination level	Delivery date (in month)
1.1	Report on organized meetings	1	UoM	R	SEN	M36
1.2	Project management and reporting guide	1	UoM	DMP	SEN	M5
1.3	Progress and final reports	1	UoM	R	SEN	M18, M36
2.1	Report on WB regional issues related to urban development	2	UNMO	R	PU	M5
2.2	Report on EU initiatives and polices related to urban development and climate change	2	THOWL	R	PU	M5
2.3	Report on existing curricula related to CSUD in EU Member States and third countries non or associated to the Programme	2	UPT	R	PU	M5
2.4	Report on climate-friendly and innovative solutions	2	BOKU	R	PU	M6
3.1	Report on modernised university courses	3	URJC	R	PU	M16
3.2	Training programme for students' internships	3	U_POLIS	R	PU	M16

Deliverable No.	Deliverable name	WP no.	Short name of the lead participant	Type	Dissemination level	Delivery date (in month)
3.3	Report on theme-based trainings	3	UNIZG	R	PU	M16
3.4	Signed agreements for providing students' internships	3	UNBI	R	PU	M17
3.5	Report on purchased laboratory equipment	3	UoM	R	PU	M14
4.1	Report on innovative technological solutions in CSUD in EU Member States and third countries associated to the Programme	4	NMBU	R	PU	M5
4.2	Survey of industry sector needs for green jobs and climate-smart solutions in WB	4	UNSA	R	PU	M6
4.3	Technological platform for sharing experiences in CSUD	4	UET	DEC	PU	M17
5.1	Report on implemented university courses	5	UNSA	R	PU	M35
5.2	Report on students' internships	5	UNMO	R	PU	M36
5.3	Report on achieved business-academia collaboration and cooperation	5	UET	R	PU	M36
5.4	Quality report on implemented university courses	5	UNI	R	PU	M36
6.1	Quality and Assurance Plan	6	UNI	R	SEN	M5
6.2	Reports on organized meetings	6	UNI	R	PU	M36
6.3	Report on external evaluation of quality of project activities	6	UoM	R	SEN	M18, M30
6.4	Report on the inter-project coaching	6	THOWL	R	PU	M18
7.1	Dissemination and exploitation plan	7	UPT	R	SEN	M5
7.2	Project website and promotion material	7	UoM	DEC	PU	M36
7.3	Report on organized roundtables	7	UNBI	R	PU	M26
7.4	Report on promotion of using emission reduction	7	U_POLIS	R	PU	M36

Deliverable No.	Deliverable name	WP no.	Short name of the lead participant	Type	Dissemination level	Delivery date (in month)
	approaches and low-carbon technologies					
7.5	Report on green job opportunities in urban development	7	UPT	R	PU	M30
7.6	Report on organized final project conference	7	UNMO	R	PU	M36

3.1.1 Deliverable review process

The Project Coordinator is responsible for collecting, reviewing and submitting reports, other deliverables and specific requested documents to the European Commission.

Chain of responsibilities for internal evaluation of deliverables starts with the authors of deliverables, task leader and WP leader, followed by reviewers of the deliverables, Project Coordinator control and Steering Committee (SC) supervising and adoption of deliverables on SC meeting.

The Task Leader appointed by the responsible partner with the corresponding WP Leader should guarantee the quality and timeliness of the deliverables. The Task Leader is responsible for assigning parts of the work to other partners involved in the activity and their coordination and for the submission of the draft deliverable to the WP Leader, QAC and the Project Coordinator. It should report to the WP Leader for any problems occurring during the implementation of the activity.

WP Leaders have a role to take care about the monitoring success indicators, meaning to follow tasks progress – timeliness of execution and appearance of any risks since they have intensive contact with task leaders and deeper view in execution of tasks and at the same time reducing need for project coordinator to be deeply involved in every project activity. They should deliver a short info on tasks execution (in context of dynamic) and signalize risks if some appears.

The QAC assigns each realized deliverable to the appointed reviewer, who must not be an author of the deliverable. Within two weeks, the reviewer should prepare a review report with comments in accordance with the Deliverable evaluation form (Annex QA5) and send to the WP Leader.

The reviewers shall:

- Be internal individuals who have not directly worked on the specific deliverable but hold expertise and experience in the relevant field.
- Be separate from respective Work Package or Task Leaders.

The WP Leader in cooperation with authors has one more week to implement the reviewer comments, prepare a corrected draft delivery and send written objections to the reviewer. In this case, the reviewer will have another week to send back final comments to the WP Leader. If final reviewer's

comments are adequately included in the new version of the deliverable, the WP Leader sends it as a final deliverable version to the Project Coordinator and SC.

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

The Steering Committee, as the highest level of final decisions, accepts and officially approves the deliverables. When a deliverable has passed all previous controls without the need for major modifications and it is accepted by SC, it can be treated as the final deliverable and, accordingly, included in the project.

3.2 Quality of SmartWB events

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

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

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

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

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

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

Events should be evaluated based on a template (evaluation list and evaluation report – QA1 and QA2) filled by the participants of the event.

After the event, event report needs to be created by event organizer and made available during 10 working days after the event. Event report (Annex QA2) should include the collected statistical data from the event evaluation lists (Annex QA1), a summative narrative of the data and recommendations for the implementation of upcoming events within the SmartWB project. The results of the evaluation may be presented at the following event for further improvement of upcoming events.

4. External evaluation

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

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

- Relevance of the project in terms of its goals and achievements,
- Effectiveness in terms of how well the project specific objectives are met,
- Impact level in departments, faculty, university, and impact relates to wider project objective
- Sustainability instruments installed to ensure continuation of project activities after its completion.

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

- Preventive (in the first project year),
- Advisory (after the first project year), and
- Control (after the end of the project – sustainability check).

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

The external evaluation of the project aims to:

- Provide an outside critical view of the project approach and methodology and give suggestions for their improvement during and after the project implementation,
- Monitor the effectiveness of the project activities and the quality of the project results during and after the project implementation,
- Evaluate the project progress and overall satisfaction of all partners involved with project management and financial handling,
- Evaluate the single phases of the project,
- Evaluate the milestones of the project (e.g., creation of the Guidelines and Plans),
- Measure the impact of the project activities.

4.1 Criteria for selection of external evaluator

4.1.1 Description of the external evaluator task

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

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

4.1.2 Profile of the external evaluator

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

4.1.3 Responsibilities of the external evaluator

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

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

4.1.4 Evaluation budget

UoM will subcontract the external evaluator for the purpose of external review of the project. The SmartWB project allows for a maximum contract price of EUR 4.000 (incl. all related costs) for the external evaluation for quality. All the candidates are expected to specify at least the following items in their offer: planned working days for (1) interim external evaluation report, (2) final external evaluation report, (3) online meetings with coordination team, (4) per month in order to follow the projects progress. The candidates will be requested to specify his/her VAT status. The contract will be awarded to the bid offering best value for money (best price-quality ratio).

Annex AQ1 Event evaluation list



EVENT EVALUATION LIST

This project has been funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Curricula innovation in climate-smart urban development based on green and energy efficiency with the non-academic sector

Project: 101081724 — SmartWB — ERASMUS-EDU-2022-CBHE

Type of event	
Venue	
Date	
Organizer	

GENERAL ORGANIZATION OF THE EVENT

	Grading	Very poor	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Logistic preparation and organization of the event		1	2	3	4	5
Content of the agenda		1	2	3	4	5
Arrangements of the event		1	2	3	4	5
Comment:						

GENERAL WORKING COMMUNICATION

	Grading	Very poor	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Communication during the event		1	2	3	4	5
Duration and timetable of the event		1	2	3	4	5
Quality of materials provided during the event		1	2	3	4	5
Comment:						

OVERALL SUCCESS OF THE EVENT

	Grading	Very poor	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Mode of reaching the decisions at the event		1	2	3	4	5
Opportunities to express your opinion and influence decisions		1	2	3	4	5
Assessing the fulfilment of expectations regarding event		1	2	3	4	5
Comment:						

Annex AQ2 Event report



EVENT REPORT

This project has been funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Curricula innovation in climate-smart urban development based on green and energy efficiency with the non-academic sector

Project: 101081724 — SmartWB — ERASMUS-EDU-2022-CBHE

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

Event description
with special reference to goals and outcomes

Number of participants at the event	
Number of institutions	
Description:	

Attachment

Agenda (pdf)	
Attendance list (pdf)	
Presentations (pdf)	
Other personal remarks	

* Please note that a few media files (photo, video or audio) should be attached to this document as an integral part of this report and uploaded together with this .doc file.

Problems encountered during the event preparation phase

Please add your comments, if any:

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

Strengths of the event and contributions or activities by participants	
Suggestions for the improvement	
Comments	

Event details

Results of evaluation of the general organization of the event

Description
Figure

Results of evaluation of general working communication

Description
Figure

Results of evaluation of overall success of the event

Description
Figure

Please indicate your suggestions for further event's improvement:

Annex AQ3 University course evaluation list



UNIVERSITY COURSE EVALUATION LIST

This project has been funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Curricula innovation in climate-smart urban development based on green and energy efficiency with the non-academic sector

Project: 101081724 — SmartWB — ERASMUS-EDU-2022-CBHE

Institution	
Venue	
Date	

QUESTIONS RELATED TO THE COURSE

	Grading	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
How do you judge the ECTS of the course in comparison with the respective work load?	1	2	3	4	5	5
In this course, are students encouraged to participate actively in class (e.g., through group work, as well as self-regulated, problem-oriented learning)?	1	2	3	4	5	5
In this course, is the infrastructure (size and condition of the room, technical equipment) is very good?	1	2	3	4	5	5
Overall, this course fosters very strongly my interest in this subject	1	2	3	4	5	5
Time effort for pre- and post-preparation of the course content was adequate for me	1	2	3	4	5	5
Comment:						

QUESTIONS RELATED TO THE TEACHING STAFF

	Grading	No	Slightly	Moderate	Yes	Very much	I do not know/ I don't answer
Does the teacher make complex theory understandable?	1	2	3	4	5	6	6
Does the teaching staff properly organize the presentation of the course material?	1	2	3	4	5	6	6
Does the lecturer encourage the students to ask questions and comment in a critical way?	1	2	3	4	5	6	6
Is the teaching staff accessible to the students?	1	2	3	4	5	6	6
Comment:							

Annex AQ4 University course report



UNIVERSITY COURSE REPORT

This project has been funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Curricula innovation in climate-smart urban development based on green and energy efficiency with the non-academic sector

Project: 101081724 — SmartWB — ERASMUS-EDU-2022-CBHE

Institution	
Course name	
ECTS	
Reporting date	
Report author(s)	

Course description
with special reference to learning outcomes

Course description:

Problems encountered during the course implementation

Please add your comments, if any:

Evaluation details

Results of general evaluation of implemented course

Description
Figure

Results of evaluation of teaching staff

Description
Figure

Please indicate your suggestions for further improvement:

Annex AQ5 Deliverable evaluation list



DELIVERABLE EVALUATION LIST

This project has been funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Curricula innovation in climate-smart urban development based on green and energy efficiency with the non-academic sector

Project: 101081724 — SmartWB — ERASMUS-EDU-2022-CBHE

Work package	
Deliverable name	
Date of review	
Reviewer's name and institution	

FORMAT OF DELIVERABLE

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

CONTENTS OF DELIVERABLE

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

Comment:

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