

EACEA 586029-EPP-1-2017-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP



University of
Belgrade



**Implementation of Dual Education in Higher Education of
Serbia**

Kraljice Marije 16, 11120 Belgrade 35, Republic of Serbia

email: nzrnic@mas.bg.ac.rs



Faculty of Mechanical
Engineering



FH JOANNEUM
University of Applied Sciences



SPOŁECZNA AKADEMIA NAUK

Your IT solution.
POWMio GmbH



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union



Quality Control and Project Management Manual

contacts: DI Johannes Haas, , johannes.haas@fh-joanneum.at
Mag. Maja Dragan, maja.dragan@fh-joanneum.at

Project acronym:	DUALEDU
Project full title:	Implementation of Dual Education in Higher Education of Serbia
Project No:	586029-EPP-1-2017-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP (2017-2962/001-001)
Funding scheme:	ERASMUS+
Project start date:	October 15, 2017
Project duration:	36 months

Abstract	The manual outlines the main definitions related to quality management. It then defines processes for planning and executing the project activities in order to ensure the highest possible quality. The manual sets the minimum principles, requirements and processes needed to implement an effective quality assurance and control. It also provides templates to be used.
----------	--

Title of document:	Quality manual
Work package:	WP 5: Quality plan
Activity:	5.1 Creating quality and evaluation strategy and project quality monitoring
Last version date:	07.09.2019
File name:	DualEdu_Quality_Control_and_Monitoring_Manual v9.docx
Number of pages:	54
Dissemination level:	Consortium

VERSIONING AND CONTRIBUTION HISTORY

Version	Date	Revision description	Partner responsible
v.01	14.1.2018	Creation of document	FHJ - Christine Wöls
v.02	30.6.2018	Second draft	FHJ – Maja Dragan
v.03	02.7.2018.	Third draft	UB – Nenad Zrić, Radivoje Mitrović, Žarko Mišković
v.04	27.08.2019	Updated version based on EACEA recommendations from Interim report evaluation	UKG – Vesna Mandic, Nenad Stanisic
v.05	28.08.2019	Additional inputs	UKG – Vesna Mandic
v.06	05.09.2019	Additional inputs to the manual based on EACEA recommendations	UKG – Vesna Mandic
v.07	06.09.2019	Final inputs and annexes	UKG – Vesna Mandic

v.08	06.09.2019	Additional input to the manual based on EACEA recommendations	UKG – Nenad Stanisic
v.09	07.09.2019	Final inputs by UKG	UKG – Vesna Mandic / Žarko Mišković

DISCLAIMER

The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents which reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

TABLE OF CONTENT

Document control sheet	P.2
Versioning and contribution history	P.2
Table of content	P.4
Abbreviations	P.5
1. Introduction	P.6
2. Quality Expectations	P.7
2.1. Quality of the project implementation	P.7
2.2. Quality of the project deliverables	P.8
2.2.1. Quality of internal project communication and documentation	P.9
2.2.2. Project Publications and Results	P.9
2.2.3. Quality of DualEdu Dissemination, Training and Coordination Events	P.10
2.2.4. Quality of Promotional Materials	P.10
2.2.5. Quality of websites and other electronic tools	P.10
2.3. Quality of dual study programs	P.12
2.4. Quality of Project Management	P.13
2.5. General Project Guidelines	P.14
2.6. Amendments to the Manual	P.14
3. Internal monitoring	P.15
3.1. Project Quality Assurance Strategy	P.15
3.2. Quality responsibilities	P.16
3.2.1. Task Leader (main author of the deliverable)	P.16
3.2.2. Other partners involved in the activity, co-authors	P.16
3.2.3. WP Leader	P.17
3.2.4 Project Coordinator	P.17
3.2.5. Steering Committee (SC)	P.17
3.3. Quality feedback by the target groups	P.18
3.4. Project Risk Management	P.19
3.4.1. Practical approach to risk identification	P.19
4. External Monitoring	P.20
5. Partners' technical and financial reporting	P.23

ANNEXES	P.19
---------------	------

ABBREVIATIONS

UBG:	University of Belgrade
EACEA:	Education, Audio-visual and Culture Executive Agency EU: European Union
GA:	Grant Agreement
HEI:	Higher Education Institution
DualEdu:	Implementation of Dual Education in Higher Education of Serbia
LFM:	Logical Framework Matrix
NEO:	National Erasmus Office PA: Partnership Agreement PST: Project Support Team
QAPT:	Quality Assurance Project Team
SC:	Steering Committee
WP:	Work package
WPL:	Work package Leader

1. Introduction

The deliverable itself is produced based on clear responsibilities: the WPL (FHJ) drafts the manual, involves experienced partners on the project and obtains feedback from all project members.

Starting with the general strategy for quality control and monitoring, the manual defines the specific procedures, levels of control and the responsibilities of activity and WP leaders, , the Project Coordinator and the Steering Committee members.

The QCM Manual explicitly defines contractual and financial management procedures, to ensure efficient and effective project management. This includes the relevant templates and supporting documents, such us: PPT presentation, report, attendance form, minutes, participants' feedback, risk monitoring form, reviewers' form etc.

This manual defines procedures for:

- Internal monitoring,
- quality and risk management, and
- Partners' technical and financial reporting.

The structure of the deliverable is as follow:

- Chapter 2 defines the quality expectations of the consortium regarding the project as a whole, its deliverables, i.e. the documents, workshops, meetings and other activities and the project management as well as the general guidelines to be followed.
- Chapter 3 defines the internal monitoring strategy and outlines the responsibilities of the project partners as well as the core principles of the risk management strategy.
- Chapter 4 describes the external monitoring strategy.
- Chapter 5 focuses on the financial and technical reporting duties of the partners

The Annexes to the document provide templates (which are also available separately) to be used by the project partners.

2. Quality Expectations

The Quality Control and Management Manual formalizes the approach that will be followed by the partners of the DualEdu project to ensure the highest possible quality of the project activities, outputs, outcomes and project management.

2.1. Quality of the project implementation

DualEdu aims to provide the systemic and institutional conditions for the establishment of dual studies as an integral part of Serbia's higher education systems, which will serve to strengthen relations between the higher education systems and their wider economic and social environment. As such, the project aims to define legislative and policy frameworks at the system level, develop strategic, governance and operational policies, structures and mechanisms at the institutional level..

A further intention is to increase the competences and employability of graduates in the IT sector in the long term by means of needs-based higher education and thus to increase the attractiveness of IT studies, also from lower income families.

The partners agree that this overall objective shall always be in the forefront of all decisions to be taken. The partners therefore might decide to prioritize certain activities over others which have a higher impact in relation to the achievement of the objectives. Quality in the project means that the achievement of the objectives might be more important even if it means e.g. postponing a deadline or changing some aspects of an activity.

Five specifics objectives of the project are:

1. To develop a flexible generic dual education model for IT-studies in Serbia.
2. To develop strategic, governance and operational policies structures and mechanisms at the institutional level University – Company.
3. To develop governance structures, academic and administrative capabilities, learning platforms and other supporting mechanisms to implement and evaluate dual study programs in line with national regulatory requirements.
4. To establish a working prototype of a dual study program in the IT-sector and evaluate it.
5. To propose modifications of the legislative and policy frameworks at the system level to consolidate dual higher education in the Republic of Serbia.

2.2. Quality of project deliverables

The project deliverables are classified into tangible such as reports, publications, manuals, printed and electronically available promotional material as well as intangibles deliverables in form of organized events (conferences, trainings, info days etc...).

A common quality expectation for all deliverables is their relevance to reach the overall objective and the specific objectives, with a further focus on their development in an efficient and effective manner. Timely delivery following the project work-plan as identified in the Application Form as well as the Partner Agreement is expected.

2.2.1. Quality of internal project communication and documentation

A consistent and common format for all document based deliverables (word document, power point presentations) is to be followed by all partners using templates provided within this Manual. Those templates must be used in order to ensure a common visual identity as well as to ensure a good quality of information in documents produced by the project.

All templates can be found on:

<https://dualedu.ef.uns.ac.rs/index.php/download/category/5-visual-identity>

- Annex A – Report template
- Annex B – Attendance list
- Annex C – Participant feedback form
- Annex D – Study visit questionnaire
- Annex E – Risk monitoring sheet
- Annex F – PowerPoint document template
- Annex G – Event report template
- Annex H - Agenda template
- Annex I – Individual Travel Report template
- Annex J – Staff costs documentation templates (Joint Declaration and Timesheet)
- Annex K – Project progress indicators

2.2.2. Project Publications and Results

- Must display Erasmus+ Logo followed by the sentence " Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union" To be placed on the cover or the first page.
- Must include the following disclaimer on the inner pages:
"This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication [communication] reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein".

See following websites:

https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/about-eacea/visual-identity_en

http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/publ/graphics/beneficiaries_all.pdf

2.2.3. Quality of DualEdu Dissemination, Training and Coordination Events

All events within the project should be organized professionally.

- The organizers should provide in due time to the participants the draft agenda and a note on the logistics (informing about travel arrangements, venue, suggested hotels, etc.).
- The meeting organizers ensure smooth registration processes (including list of attendees – Annex B) and the implementation of the meetings respecting appropriate time for event sessions and breaks as well as the availability of all necessary materials (e.g. training and/or promotional material).
- The organizers will also ensure the recording of minutes of the meetings.
- Where appropriate (e.g. for trainings, seminars) also feedback forms will be distributed among participants (Annex C) and event reports related to feedback forms will be prepared by organizers.
- Power point presentation should be prepared using appropriate template (Annex H).
- Each event should be documented and presented on the project web site, when appropriate by presentations (upon the approval of the presenter), video materials (upon approval of authors), photos (upon approval of participants) etc.
- Based on obligations of the beneficiaries, the partners shall inform the public, press and media (internet included) of the event which must visibly indicate “with the support of the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union” as well as the graphic logos of the project and Erasmus+ Programme.
- Posters, roll-up and other promotional materials shall be displayed during the event.

2.2.4. Quality of Promotional Materials

Communication and dissemination activities of the project will adhere to the Dissemination and Exploitation Plan (WP8) of the project. All promotional materials will reflect the visual identity of the project and the Erasmus+ Programme.

2.2.5. Quality of websites and other electronic tools

The project envisages setting up its web-site and a trello-platform as intranet tool for project management:

<https://dualedu.ef.uns.ac.rs/>

<https://trello.com/b/joukCLcq/dualedu>

All partners are asked to promote DualEdu project on their websites and other electronic tools (such as Facebook; Twitter, LinkedIn, newsletter etc....) by providing short description of the project, logo and link to the DualEdu website etc.

The Workpackage Leader (UNS) is responsible for setting up and maintaining the DualEdu web-site with all information and materials received from project partners.

The DualEdu Trello platform can be accessed by all partners depending on their assigned tasks and roles. It will be the single point of reference for the project documentation and communication among partners. The project coordinator will set up and maintain the Trello DualEDU project platform.

2.3. Quality of dual study programs

Quality assurance and control of dual education study program should be performed both during the program approval stage, and in the program implementation phase. Quality control should be performed internally and externally. Due to the dual nature of such programs, internal control should be done by universities and companies, while external control should be done by national authorities in a field of higher education. Three main stakeholders in the quality assurance and control, thus, are: national authorities in the field of higher education, universities and companies.

At the national level, the basic principles of quality control of dual education programs are defined in the relevant laws: Law on higher education, and Law on Dual Study Model in Higher Education.

The core institutions relevant for the higher education study programs' quality control in the Republic of Serbia are:

- The National Council for Higher Education – NCHE, and
- National Entity for Accreditation and Quality Assurance in Higher Education of Serbia – NEAQA.

NCHE is formed to ensure the development and enhancement of the quality of higher education, while NEAQA performs activities of accreditation and quality assurance of higher education institutions and their units, evaluation of study programs and quality assurance in higher education in Serbia.

Dual education study program should be obliged by all rules and standards relevant for study programs in higher education. In accordance with this:

- Higher education institution that perform dual education programs should be accredited by NEAQA, based on standards set by NCHE,
- Dual education study programs should be accredited by NEAQA, based on standards set by NCHE.

Taking into account the specific characteristics of dual education study programs, NCHE should set additional specific standard for such programs, with specific requirements for dual model of higher education in Republic of Serbia.

Quality of dual education study program depends highly on the quality of learning at work part of the program, performed in the companies. Not any company should be involved in such programs, i.e. a set of requirements for the companies that would be involved in dual programs should be set. Minimum requirements for the companies should be defined in the Law on Dual Study Model in Higher Education.

In order to ensure competent learning at work, the company should have competent tutors. The tutor at the employer must have competences for realization of learning through work defined by the general act of the higher education institution. Such act should also regulate the procedure of checking the competencies of the company tutor. The higher education institution should provide guidance for conducting mentor's work and organize a training program in accordance with the plan of realization of the dual study program.

All aforementioned procedures and rules are relevant at the dual study program approval phase. In the realization phase, quality control of dual programs should be performed internally and externally.

NCHE sets standards for self-assessment and quality evaluation of higher education institutions, as well as standards for the external appraisal of the quality of higher education institutions. Dual education study programs should be obliged to standards and procedure for internal self-assessment and external quality control of higher education institutions. However, some specific standards should be developed in order to ensure the quality of specific aspects of dual programs.

In the piloting stage of the DualEDU project, proposed pilots will be evaluated on the peer review principle. Considering that the DualEDU project consortium involved three partners who were part of the Erasmus + CWIHE project “European Network of Cooperative and Work Integrated Higher Education” (<https://cwihe.com>), and have valuable experience in dual studies, namely FH Joanneum Gesellschaft MBH, Universitat de Lleida and Formasup (Nord-Pas de Calais), their experts could provide quality reviews of the proposed pilot study programs and dual learning elements in Serbia.

2.4. Quality of Project Management

The project management structure was established at the project's Kick-off meeting to ensure effectiveness, decisiveness, flexibility and quality of work. It involves the Coordinator, a Steering Committee (SC), a Project Team* of each partner. The Steering Committee will review the activities and decide on any necessary contingency measures in reorganization tasks and resources. The project management will be transparent and flexible but also strict enough to ensure the implementation of the project activities in order to achieve the project's objectives.

Each partner is equally and independently responsible for assigned activities, money use and reporting. Contact persons have the responsibility for the local management at their institution.

Contact persons:

1. University of Belgrade - Prof. Dr.-Ing. Nenad Zrnić, Project coordinator
2. FH Joanneum Gesellschaft M.B.H. Graz - Prof. Dipl. Ing. Joannes Haas
3. FORMASUP - Dr. Frederic Sauvage
4. Universidad de Lleida - Prof. Dr. Ferran Badia
5. Spoleczna Akademia Nauk - M. A. Emilie Szczygalska
6. PowMio GmbH - Dr. Dejan Ilic
7. Belgrade Metropolitan University - Prof. Dr. Dragan Domazet
8. University of Novi Sad - Prof. Dr. Aleksandar Grubor
9. University of Kragujevac Prof. Dr. - Nenad Stanisic
10. State University of Novi Pazar . Prof. Dr. Miladin Kostic
11. The School of Electrical and Computer Engineering of Applied Studies - Prof. Dr. Vera Petrovic
12. Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development - Prof. Dr. Gabrijela Grujic
13. National Council for Higher Education of the Republic of Serbia - Prof. Dr. Miodrag Popovic
14. Cluster Ni-CAT - M. Sc. Goran Mladenovic

2.5. General Project Guidelines

Apart from the Quality Control and Management Manual, the reference documents include:

- EACEA – DualEdu Grant Agreement*
- DualEdu project Partnership Agreement
- DualEdu detailed project description*
- DualEdu detailed project budget*
- DualEdu project dissemination and exploitation Plan*

*These documents are available on the project-platform on trello and/or the homepage.

2.6. Amendments to the Manual

The procedures in this Manual can be amended by agreement of all partners or by a decision taken by the project's Steering Committee (SC). Any new version is communicated to all the partners and takes effect 15 calendar days after this communication.

3. Internal monitoring

Internal monitoring will be carried out by all partners, mainly on SC meetings, but also including self-evaluation by using the Logical Framework Matrix, Work Package description in Application Form, budget, questionnaires/satisfaction surveys of target groups (e.g. participants of dissemination and training events). The DualEdu Trello platform and homepage will also be used for internal monitoring of project activities.

3.1. Project Quality Assurance Strategy

The quality assurance includes four levels of quality control (1) Deliverable authors (Task leaders and WP leaders), (2) Deliverable reviewers, (3) Coordinator level, and (4) Steering Committee level and final approval:

3.1.1. Deliverable authors, Task and WP leaders

The 1st level corresponds to the activity level. The presentation of deliverables and activities of the project are a joint responsibility of the associated Task Leader and his/her team, partners involved in the activity and corresponding WP leader. It shall guarantee the quality and timeliness of the deliverable as identified in detailed Project Description and action (may be modified and agreed by the SC). They present a “final draft deliverable” to the deliverable reviewers.

3.1.2. Deliverable reviewers

The 2nd level of control is elaborated by at least two reviewers who are not authors of the deliverable. The reviewers have 5 working days to respond by sending comments – if they have any. The deliverable authors have 5 more working days to conform to the reviewer comments or send their written objections. In this case the reviewers will have another 5 days to send back their final comments.

In case profound disagreements between reviewers and Task leaders arise, the 3rd level control of the deliverables will allow the project coordinator to have a final decision – with the possibility to involve the rest of the consortium if deemed necessary.

3.1.3. Coordinator level:

The 3rd level control is carried out by the Project Coordinator. If a draft deliverable has not passed the 2nd level the Coordinator will take the necessary corrective actions in order to come up with acceptable deliverables. If necessary, the Coordinator may involve the rest of the consortium. A draft deliverable that has passed the 2nd level of control will still be checked by the Coordinator for final comments and when accepted it will be forwarded to the Steering Committee for formal approval (if required).

3.1.4. Steering Committee level and final approval:

The 4th level control is done at the Steering Committee level. The Steering Committee is the highest decision making body of the partnership that takes the final decision for the approval of major deliverables.

3.2. Quality responsibilities

This project recognizes different bodies with different roles and responsibilities when it comes to the project activities and the project quality assurance procedure.

Each DualEdu activity has its Task leader; each deliverable has its author or co-authors. Each activity is part of a work package and each work package has its own Workpackage leader.

3.2.1. Task Leader is responsible for:

- coordinating the development of the deliverable(s) according to the deliverable template,
- assigning parts of the work to other partners involved in the activity,
- coordinating the work of other partners involved in the activity,
- aligning the contributions of the other partners involved in the activity, in order to produce the deliverable,
- the submission of the deliverable to the WP leader (1st level control), the QAPT (2nd level control) and the coordinator (3rd level control),
- implementing the suggestions of the reviewers,
- sending the amended draft deliverable,
- reporting to the WP Leader, especially when problems occur during the implementation of the activity,
- cooperating with the WP Leader and other partners in the same WP in order to ensure the activity's progress in line with the time table as foreseen by the WP description (respecting any changes approved by the Steering Committee as recorded in the respective minutes).

3.2.2. Other partners involved in the activity, co-authors are responsible for:

- the production of their part in the deliverable according to the Task Leader's instructions.
- providing contributions in compliance with the appropriated templates so that to ensure that the Task Leader will be able to put all contributions together in the desirable format.
- providing to the Task Leader all the complementary information regarding their work (references, bibliography, methodologies used, contact details of people)

- implementing amendments to their contribution as a result of the amendments requested by the reviewers.

3.2.3. WP Leader is responsible for:

- delivery of up-to-date information on the WP progress, making sure that all activities are in the time frame defined in the Action Plan,
- coordinating the Work Package and ensuring that all the activities are contributing to the WP's objectives,
- ensuring that all of the contributing partners are smoothly cooperating in order to accomplish the WP's objectives,
- sending alerts on time to remind about submission deadlines and the procedures to be followed and provides input and suggestions to the Task Leaders of the WP,
- providing to the Task Leaders comments and suggestions on the draft deliverables,
- verifying the satisfactory implementation of the recommendations.

3.2.4. Project Coordinator

- cooperates with the WP and the Task Leaders on all matters arising relevant to ensuring the quality of the project's deliverables,
- accepts the deliverable or provides final comments to the Task Leaders and WP Leaders (3rd level control),
- cooperates with the WP Leaders in order to ensure that all WPs are progressing in conformity;
- informs the the WP Leaders and the Task Leaders of any changes in the Partnership Agreement and the related Work Plan or any implicit changes in the implementation of the project that may affect the timing or the content of the relevant deliverables,
- officially submits all approved deliverables after their approval at 4th level control.

3.2.5. Steering Committee (SC)

Steering Committee is the major decision-making body of the project which consists of representatives from each EU and Serbian partner organization.

The responsibilities of the SC are:

- Review project progress and control the activities;
- Ensure that the project maintains its relevance;
- Be aware of relevant activities in other projects;
- Resolve any technical administrative or contractual issues, which have not been resolved by other means within the project;

- Be the overall quality manager of the project, controlling the overall quality of the Work Packages and check the quality of the deliverables.
- Decisions will be taken on a consensual basis. In case of disagreement, the Steering Committee will make the final decision.
- The internal communication will be conducted by emails, phone, Skype, Google pool,
- etc.

Members of the Steering Committee:

1. University of Belgrade - Prof. Dr.-Ing. Nenad Zrnić, Project coordinator
2. FH Joanneum Gesellschaft M.B.H. Graz - Prof. Dipl. Ing. Joannes Haas
3. FORMASUP - Dr. Frederic Sauvage
4. Universidad de Lleida - Prof. Dr. Ferran Badia
5. Spoleczna Akademia Nauk - M. A. Emilie Szczygielska
6. PowMio GmbH - Dr. Dejan Ilic
7. Belgrade Metropolitan University - Prof. Dr. Dragan Domazet
8. University of Novi Sad - Prof. Dr. Aleksandar Grubor
9. University of Kragujevac Prof. Dr. - Nenad Stanisic
10. State University of Novi Pazar . Prof. Dr. Miladin Kostic
11. The School of Electrical and Computer Engineering of Applied Studies - Prof. Dr. Vera Petrovic
12. Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development - Prof. Dr. Gabrijela Grujic
13. National Council for Higher Education of the Republic of Serbia - Prof. Dr. Miodrag Popovic
14. Cluster Ni-CAT - M. Sc. Goran Mladenovic

3.3. Quality feedback by the target groups

The satisfaction of stakeholders, beneficiaries and end users will also be investigated. It will take into account a variety of information from different sources using visits, interviews, questionnaires to target groups and consultation with the project beneficiaries. A study visit questionnaire template is also available within this manual as Annex D.

A template for feedback for different meetings/events is different and available as Annex C. It needs to be adapted to the specific needs but the main items shall not be deleted. Besides, a specific Event report template (Annex G) is to be filled by project partners (organisers) for all DualEdu events (workshops, info days, trainings, etc. – except SC meetings). Report will include summary review of statistical data and will help in a final reporting.

3.4. Project Risk Management

As part of the internal quality management, a regular risk assessment will be carried and reviewed out during the Steering Committee meetings which shall lead to corrective actions and potential adaptations of the Work-Plan.

The risk management strategy addresses issues that could potentially endanger the achievement of the overall goal of the project and its objectives considering potential financial risks (overspending and underspending), timing (postponing of activities/deliverables), performance risks (project management) and sustainability of the project results. The main aim will be to provide a sound assessment, to anticipate challenges in a systematic way and to minimize the potentially negative overall impact.

The identification and assessment of new risks is a joint responsibility of all project partners who have to communicate them to the Project Coordinator and the Steering Committee, eventually suggesting also possible interventions and solutions, as soon as they get aware of those risks. In particular, partners may think of preventive actions (avoiding that the risk occurs) and corrective actions (decreasing the severity and impact), specifying also the resources that would be needed.

Also the external reviewers) will be involved in the risk management. During their monitoring visits they will assess if there is a risk that the project will fail to meet its key indicators and if there is a risk that project partners will not be able to spend all the money according to the planned project budget.

All the partners should take care of the proper allocation of resources. There are several possible risks connected: the delay of the project implementation as defined in the project work plan; the rushed implementation of the work plan with low quality; an underspending during the project implementation (also causing a shift in the headings' ratio), meaning that the project timetable is followed with reference to technical deliverables, yet the relevant expenditures are not timely invoiced or validated etc.

The project partners all have to ensure that they allocate the needed resources to the project, both human and financial.

3.4.1. Practical approach to risk identification

The risks should furthermore be identified as early as possible in order to deal with them properly and to think about corrective and/or preventive actions.

In order to identify and monitor the risks within DualEdu project, a Risk monitoring sheet includes the information on corrective and/or preventive actions (Annex E).

4. External Monitoring

External monitoring of the project will be performed as peer review by a subcontracted external evaluator, experienced in dual higher education and similar projects as DualEDU.

As stated in the application form in the project proposal, the requirements for selecting an external evaluator may be prior participation and experience in the Erasmus + CWIHE project “European Network of Cooperative and Work Integrated Higher Education” (<https://cwihe.com>). The project was implemented in the period from 2014 to 2017.

CWIHE partners on the project were:

- Duale Hochschule Baden-Württemberg (DHBW)
- FH Joanneum Gesellschaft M.B.H.
- Formasup (Nord- Pas de Calais)
- Fundación para la formación técnica en máquina-herramienta (IMH)
- Höskolan Väst
- Libera Università di Bolzano
- Universitat de Lleida

Considering that the project consortium involved three partners who are also part of the DualEDU consortium, these partners and their experts should be excluded from the selection, since it is not possible to subcontract employees (experts) from partner institutions, namely from partner universities / institutions of FH Joanneum Gesellschaft MBH, Universitat de Lleida and Formasup (Nord-Pas de Calais).

For this purpose, a grant amount of EUR 5000 has been allocated in the project budget, and the responsible partner for the implementation of the tender is the University of Belgrade, as coordinator. For the call for tender and procurement of the External evaluator for DualEDU project, UBG will prepare ToR (Terms of Reference) and define conditions that the expert must satisfy. The structure of the ToR document is standard and contains:

1. **Background and rationale:** The opening section of the ToR typically provides an orientation about the overall programme, project, or another intervention to be evaluated.
2. **Specific Objectives of the Evaluation and Evaluation Questions:** The framing and presentation of the objectives of the evaluation is usually a brief but important section in any ToR. Common understanding of, and consensus around, the stated objectives and evaluation questions will be important throughout the negotiation and implementation of the assigned tasks. Evaluation objectives might relate to predetermined criteria, such as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact or sustainability or other – often more horizontal - features, such as gender issues.

3. **Scope of the Evaluation:** This section presents the scope and limits of the evaluation. The scope should be realistic given the time and resources available for implementing the evaluation study.
4. **Approach and Methodology:** Specifying the approach for the evaluation can be the most challenging part of developing the ToR. This section should outline how the evaluation will be conducted. However, many ToRs leave room for the evaluator(s) to define a more detailed methodology in line with the prescribed scope and objectives, which is recommended.
5. **Governance and Accountability:** This section of the ToR specifies the governance and management arrangements for carrying out the evaluation. Any decision-making arrangements (such as a steering committee or an advisory group) should be described here in terms of their organization and function(s). Participation of other stakeholders (for example, beneficiary representatives in validating the results) and the lines of accountability should also be noted with, at minimum, clear guidance on who will review and approve the evaluation plan and subsequent products of the evaluation (e.g. inception report, draft report and final report).
6. **Guiding Principles and Values:** ToR specifies research ethics or procedures that the evaluators should follow. These might include fundamental principles of the organisation commissioning the task(s), basic tenets that should guide the study (for example, transparency, cost-effectiveness, collaboration with beneficiaries, hiring of local consultants, involvement of local agencies, etc.) or practices expected to be taken into account by the evaluators (for example, confidentiality of data, anonymity of responses, making data publicly available in a usable format, and so on).
7. **Professional Qualifications:** The mix of requested knowledge, skills, and experience will depend on the scope and methodology of the evaluation. The ToR should specify as clearly as possible what the profile of the evaluator should be to attract the strongest candidates for conducting the study.
8. **Deliverables and Schedule:** The outputs and reporting requirements expected for the evaluation should be specified, along with the required or proposed timeline for the study. Clear guidance in this section will help ensuring that the outputs from the evaluation meet expectations.
9. **Budget and Payment:** The commissioner of an evaluation should consider what funds are available to support the tasks envisioned for the evaluators. In cases where a limited budget will likely constrain the scope and methodology of the study, an effective practice is to state the available budget and ask proposers to describe what they expect to achieve. This allows for value-for-money assessments.

-
10. **Structure of the Proposal and Submission Guidelines:** ToRs can be used to request proposals from potential evaluators as part of a competitive bidding process. If this is the case, the ToR should provide instructions regarding the proposal format, content, and submission process.
11. **Additional References or Resources:** A high-quality evaluation will draw on existing knowledge regarding relevant previous and ongoing studies and programme experiences. To the extent possible, the ToR should identify useful information sources for the evaluator to better ensure that this body of knowledge is taken up in planning and conducting the evaluation.

It is envisaged that the external expert will perform monitoring online (through WBCInno platform) and on-site (by participating at Steering Committee meetings). Monitoring results will be presented in the form of External Monitoring Report. This will include any corrective measures recommended.

5. Partners' technical and financial reporting

At the Kick-off meeting, project partners are introduced to the rules of technical and financial management of Erasmus projects. They are also aware that the EACEA has prepared Guidelines for Use of the Grant, detailing the rules for spending and justifying the grant. In addition, UBG, as the coordinator, prepared the Partnership Agreement model, and all partners signed PA agreements and accepted its provisions, which further define the rules for reporting and project implementation in the partnership.

This guide provides some details regarding reporting and proper completion of supporting documents on the DualEDU project.

Coordinating institution and its DualEDU team will check the supporting documents for financial reporting sent by project partners as hard copies twice a year. During their review, they will take into consideration following assessment criteria:

- conformity of the expenditures with the budget of the project;
- eligibility of the expenditures;
- correctness and completeness of all supporting documents and certified copies of invoices;
- correctness of the calculations and applied exchange rates;
- that any changes which occurred between budget categories are eligible and justified;
- financial biannual reports must be signed in original by the appointed contact person of partner institution;
- expenditures must be in conformity, including full eligibility, with the allocated budget

In case that information in Biannual Report are not complete or justified, the UBG team will help and make recommendations on how this situation can be rectified prior to the final approval of the Biannual report by the Coordinator. The Report approved in this way is the basis for the transfer of next instalment to the partner institution.

ANNEXES

**Different supporting documents have been elaborated
for the overall enhancement of the project quality
assurance plan.**

Annex A

Report template

 University of Belgrade	EACEA 586029-EPP-1-2017-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP  Implementation of Dual Education in Higher Education of Serbia Kraljice Marije 16, 11120 Belgrade 35, Republic of Serbia email: nzrnic@mas.bg.ac.rs	 Faculty of Mechanical Engineering
             		

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union



TITLE

SUBTITLE

contacts:

Prof. Dr.-Ing. Nenad Zrnić, tel: +381-63-287-193
Dr.-Ing. Žarko Mišković, +381-64-18-32-989

Project acronym:	DUALEDU
Project full title:	Implementation of Dual Education in Higher Education of Serbia
Project No:	586029-EPP-1-2017-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP (2017-2962/001-001)
Funding scheme:	ERASMUS+
Project start date:	October 15, 2017
Project duration:	36 months

Abstract	This document is the template for all project reports.
----------	--

Title of document:	Report template Report title
Work package:	WP 6: Dissemination & Exploitation
Activity:	7.2. Steering Committees Meetings
Last version date:	03/01/2018
File name:	Report Template v 2.0
Number of pages:	3
Dissemination level:	Consortium

VERSIONING AND CONTRIBUTION HISTORY

Version	Date	Revision description	Partner responsible
v.2.0	03/01/2018	Logos of all partners	UNS (Mirko Savic)

DISCLAIMER

The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents which reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Table of content

Document control sheet	P.
Versioning and contribution history	P.
Table of content - Text:	
Arial 12 Abbreviations	
Text:Arial12	
1. Arial 12 – Alignment Left – Bold	
1.1 Arial 12	
1.1.1 Arial 12	
2 Arial 12 – Alignment Left – Bold	
2.2 Arial 12	
2.2.2 Arial 12	



Annex B

Attendance List



University of
Belgrade

EACEA 586029-EPP-1-2017-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP



**Implementation of Dual Education in Higher Education of
Serbia**
Kraljice Marije 16, 11120 Belgrade 35, Republic of Serbia
email: nznric@mas.bg.ac.rs



Faculty of Mechanical
Engineering















Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union



ATTENDANCE LIST

TYPE OF THE EVENT
NAME OF THE EVENT

contacts:

Date and place of the event					
Time:					
No.	Name and Surname	E-mail adress	Phone	Institution	Signature
1.					
2.					
3.					
4.					

5.					
6.					
7.					
8.					
9.					
10.					
11.					
12.					
13.					
14.					
15.					
16.					
17.					
18.					
19.					
20.					
21.					
22.					
23.					
24.					
25.					
26.					
27.					
28.					
29.					

Annex C

Participant feedback form

Event Evaluation

Thank you for attending this event. In our effort to improve the organization and the impact of these events we invite you to complete the following questionnaire. In most of the questions you will be asked to rate your satisfaction on a scale by ticking the appropriate answer. In some of the questions you will be asked to describe your personal opinion in a few words and to give suggestions for future improvements of the content and overall organization of the event.

We thank you in advance!

Event Title	
--------------------	--

Participant from DualEdu consortium	YES ☐ NO ☐
--	---

Event Date	
Event Venue	

RANKING	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
	Not at all satisfied	Rather dissatisfied	Moderately satisfied	Satisfied	Most satisfied	
The programme (contents)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The agenda (schedules)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The venue and facilities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The presentations	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The discussions	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The event dinner and subsistence	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Relevance of the information	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Cooperation and interaction with the other participants.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
	Not at all satisfied	Rather dissatisfied	Moderately satisfied	Satisfied	Most satisfied	
The materials distributed are useful and informative.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The methods of working were suitable for the topics and for the participants.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The overall organization was professional	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Suggestions:

Any Further comments:

Annex D

Study visit questionnaire

Study visit questionnaire for quality control

Name:

Organization:

Did the overall organization (e.g. venue, hotel, meals, time management) of the visit meet your expectations?

Clearly Yes ☐ Clearly No ☐ Somewhat ☐

Comments

Did the company visits meet your expectations?

Clearly Yes ☐ Clearly No ☐ Somewhat ☐

Comments

Did the know-how transfer at /institution/ meet your expectations?

Clearly Yes ☐ Clearly No ☐ Somewhat ☐

Comments

Did you make any decisions regarding your own project participation because of your experiences in /location, city/?

Clearly Yes ☐ Clearly No ☐ Somewhat ☐

Comments / Examples

Annex E

Risk monitoring sheet



Risk monitoring sheet

+Erasmus



To be updated after each Steering Committee meeting



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

Risk title	Risk level*	Description of the risk	Cause of the risk	Corrective action(s) has/ve been /can be done to decrease the severity of the risk)	Decisions

*Risk levels
1 - Minimal 2 - Minor 3 - Moderate
4 - Significant 5 - Severe

Title of deliverable

Page

Annex F

PowerPoint document template

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union



EACEA 586029-EPP-1-2017-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP
IMPLEMENTATION OF DUAL EDUCATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION OF SERBIA



Presentation Title

Title (Ph.D. etc.) Name Surname



FH JOANNEUM
University of Applied Sciences



6/28/2018

1

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union



EACEA 586029-EPP-1-2017-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP
IMPLEMENTATION OF DUAL EDUCATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION OF SERBIA

Section title

■ Sample text

■ Sample text:

□ 12345

□ 12345

□ 12345



6/28/2018

2

News and documents template

NEWS and DOCUMENTS for DUALEDU web site
(Annex G to Quality Control and Monitoring Manual)

This template will be used by all project partners for publishing news and final deliverables at DUALEDU web site. It should be sent to UN(mijick@ef.uns.ac.rs) as Work package leader of WP6 who is responsible for dissemination and exploitation.

Partner:	
Author:	
News / Deliverable title:	
Text of news or short description of deliverable:	

Attachments (if any)	
Agenda	Title of document (PDF)
Attendance sheet:	Title of document (PDF)
Photos for gallery:	(ZIP, jpg)
Report:	Title of the book:
Deliverable:	Title of document (PDF)
Presentations	List of presentations (PDF)
Other personal remarks:	

Annex G

Agenda template



University of
Belgrade

EACEA 586029-EPP-1-2017-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP



**Implementation of Dual Education in Higher Education of
Serbia**

Kraljice Marije 16, 11120 Belgrade 35, Republic of Serbia

email: nznrc@mas.bg.ac.rs



Faculty of Mechanical
Engineering















Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union



AGENDA

TITLE

IMPLEMENTATION OF DUAL EDUCATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION OF SERBIA

contacts: Names, e-mails, phones

DAY I

Date, location		
10 ³⁰ – 11 ⁰⁰ h	Registration of participants	
Part I		
Opening and welcome speeches		
11 ⁰⁰ – 11 ³⁰ h	Welcome speeches	

12 ⁰⁰ – 12 ³⁰ h	<i>Coffee break</i>
Part II Short presentation of partner institutions	
13 ⁴⁵ – 15 ³⁰ h	<i>Lunch break</i>
Part III Work Package presentation session	
18 ²⁰ – 19 ⁰⁰ h	<i>Discussion</i>
19 ⁰⁰ – 20 ³⁰ h	<i>Dinner</i>

DAY II

Date, location	
09 ⁴⁵ – 10 ⁰⁰ h	Registration of participants
Part I Project tasks and activities	
11 ³⁰ – 12 ⁰⁰ h	<i>Coffee break</i>
13 ⁰⁰ – 13 ³⁰ h	<i>Discussion and closing of the kick off meeting</i>
13 ³⁰ – 15 ⁰⁰ h	<i>Lunch break</i>

Annex H

Event report template

Apply when applicable

EVENT REPORT TEMPLATE (Annex H to Quality Control and Monitoring Manual)

This template has to be filled by project partners (organisers) for all DUALEDU events (except SC meetings). Furthermore, this template can be used to inform colleagues and partners about other events attended (promotional activities). In the second case please just fill in the first page and delete the chapters thereafter.

Author:	
Event Title:	
Event Date:	
Event Venue:	
Type of event: (National, international, press conference, promotional event etc.)	
Short description:	
Organiser(s):	
Agenda of the event:	
Total number of participants:	
Links to further information:	
Other personal remarks:	
Here you can include the information about the DualEdu project: Presentation of DualEdu at the event? What was the subject of your presentation?	

EVENT ORGANISATION DETAILS

Invitation was sent off to participants on:	
Information Material was sent off to participants on:	
Date of Initial Participant List Compilation: Date of Final	
Participant List Compilation:	
Total Number of Participants Invited	
Date of Agenda Finalisation:	
???	
???	

Problems encountered during the event preparation phase

(To be filled by organisers)

Organisers: Please complete (if you have not met with any problems in that phase, please fill in "N/A". Please also include any feedback by the participants **before** the workshop)

- 1)
- 2)

Annex I

Individual Travel Report

In order to be consistent when using reference number for each Individual Travel Report ITR (file names), regarding the files that have to be stored in the cloud (DualEdu virtual drive established by UNS) all partners should use the following pattern:

XXX-YYY-DD.MM.YYYY-DD.MM.YYYY-ZZ



Home Institution Acronym - Host Institution Acronym - Travel start date - Travel end date – sequential number of participant (traveller)

Example:

For instance, the University of Belgrade (UB) had two participants (Nenad Zrnić and Žarko Mišković) at the study visit to the University of Lleida (UDL), in the period 17.04-20.04.2018.

Each of the participants from UB have to submit its own ITR with the following reference number and file name

UB-UDL-17.04-20.04.2018-1 (for Zrnić)

UB-UDL-17.04-20.04.2018-2 (for Mišković)

Annex J

Staff Cost documentation

The forming of the **JOINT DECLARATION** Reference Numbers:

XX-Y-ZZ-MM.YYYY

Institution Acronym – Researcher/Manager/Technician/Administrative – Sequential number of the document in the same month (different for each staff member who received the payment) – **Month.Year**

Example:

UB-R-01-11.2018

If different person from University of Belgrade (UB) received the payment as a Researcher in the same month his Joint Declaration Ref. No. would be: UB-R-02-11.2018

If different person University of Belgrade (UB) received the payment as a Technician in the same month his Joint Declaration Ref. No. would be: UB-T-01-11.2018

TIMESHEET Reference Number:

XX-Y-ZZ-MM.YYYY

Institution Acronym – Researcher/Manager/Technician/Administrative – Sequential number of the document in the same month (different for each staff member who received the payment) – **Month.Year**

Example: UB-R-01-11.2018

ANNEX II

JOINT DECLARATION

Ref. No. **UB-R-01-11.2019**

Project No. **586029-EPP-1-2017-1-RS-EPKKA2-CBHE-SP**

The reference number must correspond to the progressive numbering indicated in the financial statements of the final report

FROM **University of Belgrade**

Hereinafter "the Institution"*

AND

Name: **Žarko Mišković**

Address: Faculty of Mechanical Engineering, University of Belgrade
Kraljice Marije 16, 11120 Belgrade 35

Hereinafter "the Staff member"*

THE INSTITUTION AND THE STAFF MEMBER HEREBY CERTIFY THAT:

- The Institution is a member of the partnership for the above-mentioned project.
- The Staff member is either:
- employed by the Institution and is part of its payroll system YES
or
- a natural person ** assigned to the project on the basis of a contract against payment NO
- The Institution and Staff member agree that the Staff member has worked on this project and performed the following duties during the project's eligibility period.

dd/mm/yy		dd/mm/yy	
FROM	01/11/2018	TO	31/01/2019

Please describe the outputs produced (short overall indication since detailed information has to be given in the accompanying time-sheet):

.....Example: WP1 – Activity 1.3 – Name of the Activity from the Project Application. Output: name of the output (such as Questionnaire on XXXXXX, Report X.X on XXXXXX, Attendance list on XXXXXX, Teaching material XXXXXX, Power presentation XXXXXXXXXXXX etc.).....

- Please complete the following information.

Staff category (Manager / Researcher, Teacher, Trainer / Technician / Administrative staff)	Researcher
Country of the Institution	Serbia
Number of days worked and charged to the project (according to time-sheet)	15

- This declaration does not alter in any way the employment conditions/assignment already existing between the Institution and the Staff member and is established solely for the purpose of justifying the Staff costs that the Institution will charge to the Erasmus+ Capacity Building in Higher Education grant.

Done in Belgrade..... Date **03/04/2019**.....

Name **Ivanka Popović**.....

Function **Rector**.....

Institution **University of Belgrade**..... Staff member name **Žarko Mišković**.....

Signature and Stamp of the Institution

Signature of the Staff member

*The declaration must be signed by the person concerned, then signed and stamped by the person responsible in the Institution where this person worked for the project. The Institution must be a member of the partnership.

** A natural person (individual) can be assigned to the action also on the basis of e.g. a civil contract, a free-lance contract, an expert contract, a service contract with self-employed person ("in house consultant) or a secondment to the Institution against payment. The costs of such natural persons working under the action may be assimilated to the costs of personnel, if:
(i) the person works under conditions similar to those of an employee (in particular regarding the way the work is organised, the tasks that are performed and the premises where they are performed); and
(ii) the result of the work belongs to the Institution (unless exceptionally agreed otherwise); and

z **zare**
Ref. No. formed according to the instructions (start month of the period covered by the Joint Declaration)

z **zare**
Number of the DualEdu project

z **zare**
Start date of the time period covered by Joint Declaration – start date of the related Timesheet

z **zare**
End date of the time period covered by Joint Declaration – end date of the related Timesheet

z **zare**
The written outputs should correspond to the Timesheet related to Joint Declaration

z **zare**
TOTAL number of working days which corresponds to the Timesheet

z **zare**
Date when Joint Convention was filled-in

z **zare**
Name and surname of the person responsible for the signing in front of the Institution

z **zare**
Function of the person responsible for the signing in front of the Institution

PROJECT TIMESHEET				
Project number :		586029-EPP-1-2017-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP		
Surname :				
First Name :				
Institution :				
Country :				
Position :		Associate professor		
Staff Category :		Administrative		
Year	Month	Number of Days	Work Package	Description of tasks performed and outputs produced
			Management	Example: WP7 - Activity 7.2 - Steering Committee meetings. Transcription and writing of the minutes of the meetings - for meetings held during the all events included in the Kick off event. Output: Minutes of the meeting for Kick off event
			Quality	
			Development	
Total days:		0		

Signature of the staff member :

Signature of the person responsible in the institution (where the staff member is employed) :

Annex K

Project Progress Indicators

Outputs (tangible) and Outcomes (intangible):	Indicators of progress:
• (PREP)1.1. Review of EU and worldwide best practices and experiences in DHE • (PREP)1.2. Transfer of knowledge and skills from programme countries institutions to Serbian HEIs • (PREP)1.3. Report on review of needs and recommendations • (DEV) 2.1. Flexible and generic Dual Higher Education Model (DHEM) for Serbia • (DEV) 2.2. Conference on DualEdu added value on industrial sector • (DEV) 2.3. Discussion Forum on the proposed DHEM model with key stakeholders and policy makers • (DEV)3.1.Amendments to the Law on Higher Education and Law on Dual Education • (DEV)3.2. Amendments to the Labor Law • (DEV)3.3. Amendments to the Accreditation Standards • (DEV)3.4 Discussion forum on draft proposals of ammendments • (DEV) 3.5. Recommendations to HEIs in Serbia on how to implement DHE • (DEV) 4.1.Documents of description and concepts of the specific DHEMs of HEIs • (DEV)4.2. Presentation of specific DHMEs of HEIs to companies • (DEV)4.3.Agreements with companies interested to participate in the pilot testing of the specific DHEMs of HEI-partners from Serbia • (DEV)4.4.Plan for pilot testing of the spoecific DHEM of HEIs • (DEV)4.5. Material for specific DHEMs pilot testing • (DEV)4.6. Equipement	• Current practice of at least 10 DHE programmes in countries from EU and in the world analyzed. • 6 study visits to Programme country partners completed • Policies and practices from Programme country partners analysed and presented. • Survey of the needs for DHE for at least 10 companies from Serbia • Flexible and generic Dual Higher Education Model (DHEM) for Serbia developed • Conference on DualEdu added value on industrial sector realized • Discussion Forum realized • 3 working groups of 5 experts are established • Amendments to the Law on Higher Education and Law on Dual Education are created and subimtted to the authorities • Amendments to the Labour Law are created and submitted to the authorities • Amendments to Accreditation Standards are created and submitted to the authorities • Discussion Forum is realized • The document is developed published on project web site and distributed in hard copy to at least 25 HEIs • Each of Serbian HEI partner has specified its specific DHEM for pilot testing. • Concepts of specific DHEMs presented to at least 10 companies per HEI • At least 5 companies involved in pilot testings are known • Plan for pilot testing is accepted by HEIs authorities

• (DEV)4.7. Analysis of the results of pilot testing of each specific DHEMs of HEI partners from Serbia • (QPLN)5.1. Quality and Evaluation Strategy created • (QPLN)5.2. Interim Evaluation Report • (QPLN)5.3. Final Evaluation Report • (DIS)6.1. Dissemination and Exploitation Plan • (DIS)6.2. Dissemination products • (DISS)6.3. Interim dissemination and exploitation report (IDER) • (DISS) 6.4. Final dissemination and exploitation report (FDER) • (DISS)6.5. Final Conference Proceedings • (MNGT)7.1. Efficient overall project management • (MNGT)7.2. Steering Committee Meetings • (MNGT)7.3. Local Committee meetings • (MNGT)7.4. Monitoring and interim report • (MNGT)7.5. Final report	• 6 HEIs are ready for implementation of pilot testing • Learning and training material created and equipment purchased • Courses and coop of the pilots started • First groups of DHE students completed their coop programs. • Monitoring reports on internal quality assessments • All project activities are realizing the accepted Quality and Evaluation Strategy • Interim and Final reports submitted • Dissemination and Exploitation Plan accepted by the SC • Dissemination products are in distribution • IDER accepted by SC • FDER accepted by SC • Final Conference organized • Management teams are established • 5 SC meetings realized • 7 LC meetings realized • Project interim and financial reports generated • 1 Final and 1 Financial report accepted by EACEA
---	--

