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# Objectives

The present Quality Assurance Plan (QAP) describes the approach that will be used to ensure that all the project activities, outputs and results meet a set of quality standards and comply with the objectives of the project.

It will establish a quality framework, defining the quantitative and qualitative indicators to be monitored as well as the mechanisms and instruments for quality control, with the final aim to improve the overall quality of the project.

The Quality Assurance process will be horizontal to the project duration and its main objectives are:

* Ensure consistency of the format of all the project materials.
* Ensure traceability of the actions and results.
* Identify potential problems or weaknesses with the purpose of correcting them.
* Improve the overall quality of the project results and outputs.
* Ensure long-term sustainability of the project results.

# Internal Quality Assurance

The Quality Assurance process will focus on establishing the appropriate processes, instruments and resources to ensure adherence to a set of quality standards that will be defined for task and output. In order to monitor the conformity of the project results with these standards and indicators, the Partners will conduct continuous monitoring. Based on this, periodical reports will be produced identifying potential shortfalls and proposing ways to address them.

## Project Management and implementation

The first and foremost quality assurance instrument of the project will be a streamlined project management. The quality of project results and outputs will greatly depend on the efficiency of the management of all aspects of the project. For this purpose, the Consortium has already set up a bundle of plans and resources. Namely, the Partners have approved an Internal Communication and Coordination Plan, an Implementation Plan ana a Financial Management Guide.

The Internal Communication and Coordination Plan defines the **regulatory framework** for the development of the project thus ensuring compliance with all four levels of regulations. It also establishes the **decision-making process**, essential for tackling potential problems and maintaining a common course of action, as well as **conflict resolution mechanisms**, setting a clear-cut framework to swiftly find solutions to potential disagreements or disputes. The plan also addresses possibly the most important aspect of a successful project, internal communication. It lays out the **internal communication tools and procedures** to be used in order to ensure fluent and regular communication, making sure all those involved on the project are thoroughly informed and updated on the project status and progress. This is critical to ensure the adequate development and quality of the project activities, outputs and deliverables.

The Implementation Planidentifies the **roles, responsibilities and obligations** of each partner. It breaks down the workload into **specific tasks**, defining the **expected results** for each of them and distributing the work among the partners. It also includes a calendarization of the tasks and activities using a dynamic Gantt chat. This plan aims to give the project teams a clear understanding of what needs to be achieved and how. It provides a reference to understand the workflow, to check the progress of the work, to track the various components, milestones and deadlines and to know what everyone needs to be doing at all times.

The Financial Management Guide sets out the principals, best practices and rules to be followed for **an efficient and transparent use of Grant**. In addition to ensuring compliance with the Erasmus+ Programme Guide and the Grant Agreement, it aims to achieve **timely and straightforward reporting**.

Moreover, during the initial stages of the project, dedicated management groups were set up to support the implementation of the project through a distributed management system:

* Management Board (MB)
* Academic Board (AB)
* Dissemination Board (DB)
* Entrepreneurship Centre Manager (ECM)
* Task Core Groups (TCG)

Their specific roles are defined in the Communication and Coordination Plan and all have an essential role to play in the QA process.

The Management Board, that is composed by one representative of each Partner organization and chaired by the Project Coordinator, constitutes the highest decision-making body of the project. MB members will act as dedicated **Quality Assurance Managers** (or will designate a person to do so on their behalf). The QAM will have a proactive role in overseeing the quality of the project implementation, eliminating project defects, helping balance conflicting priorities, making amendments where necessary and providing insight on long-term strategies.

The remaining bodies are made up of specialists with the relevant knowledge in the respective issues attributed to them. Having specific boards set up for academic issues, dissemination aspects and Entrepreneurship Centre management, will guarantee that the right expertise is applied to support the achievement of the quality standards defined in this Quality Assurance Plan.

## Quality Control and Monitoring

All the project task, activities and outputs will be subject to quality control procedures in order to ensure conformity with the predefined quality standards. TSUC will carry out this continuous monitoring, supported by the Quality Assurance Managers. All the project team members, through the respective task and WP leaders, will report on each task/activity on an ongoing basis, submitting all the necessary information.

The control and monitoring actions will check the fulfilment of the objectives and achievement of the indicators based on the criteria and using the tools defined in this Plan.

Drawing from this, TSUC will provide 3 quality reviews:

* The first one covering up to M12
* The second one covering up to M18
* The third one covering up to M30

In addition to providing a clear picture of the quality of the project implementation, these reviews will provide recommendations on how to improve the project processes and expected outputs aiming to progressively enhance the project work and eliminating project defects. They will also identify potential problems and weaknesses and propose ways to address them.

All the partners will support this work by providing regular information and taking the corrective actions necessary.

# External Quality Assurance

The project will be evaluated by a dedicated External Evaluator, who will be appointed after a comprehensive procedure (i.e. open call).

The external evaluator (a natural person, private entity or public law body) shall be selected on the basis of the professional and technical ability to perform the evaluation and according to the following criteria:

* Value for money.
* Expertise and knowledge in the subject matter of the project (industrial entrepreneurship, Master program development, university-business cooperation...)
* English language proficiency.
* Knowledge of Russian and/or Kazakh, Tajik and Turkmen will be an asset..
* Knowledge of the higher education system in Central Asia (specifically in KZ, TJ and TKM) and/or in the European Union.
* Experience in EU funded projects, in particular Erasmus+ KA2 projects.
* Experience in quality assurance, more specifically past experience conducting external evaluations or as reviewer in the context of internationally funded projects.

The External Evaluator will assess the project’s results and processes, as well as its exploitation and sustainability levels. All partners, led by the QA managers, will provide to the External Evaluator all necessary information/data related to the Evaluation exercise.

There will be one interim and one final evaluation exercises. These quality assessments will identify potential project shortfalls, methods to address them, possible process redesign needs and other project implementation changes.

# Quality Assurance Framework

|  |
| --- |
| **WP/Task** |
| 1.1. Kick-off meeting |
| **Tangible outputs** |
| * Performed Kick-off meeting * Meeting Agenda * Meeting Minutes * List of attendants * Meeting presentations |
| **Quantitative Indicators** |
| * Number of participants (target = 25) * Participants from all Partner institutions |
| **Qualitative Indicators** |
| |  | | --- | | * Fulfilment of objectives: | | * + Clarification of financial and operational requirements | | * + Presentation of strategies (Management, Dissemination, Sustainability, Entrepreneurship Centers, English training) | | * + Definition of an Action Plan | | * Agenda includes all the necessary information | | * The minutes are sufficiently clear about the issues discussed, decisions taken and follow-up actions | | * Use of project templates and compliance with EU visibility requirements | |
| **Quality Control action/mechanism** |
| * Participant evaluation form * Revision of the outputs by the MB |

|  |
| --- |
| **WP/Task** |
| 1.2. Financial management and administration |
| **Tangible outputs** |
| * Reporting templates * Financial Management Guide * Individual expenditure reports (every 6 months) * 1st year consolidated report * 2nd year consolidated report * 3rd year consolidated report |
| **Quantitative Indicators** |
| * 1 report per partner every 6 months = 84 * 3 consolidated reports |
| **Qualitative Indicators** |
| * Adherence to the reporting calendar * Compliance with the regulatory framework |
| **Quality Control action/mechanism** |
| * Revision of the outputs by the MB |

|  |
| --- |
| **WP/Task** |
| 1.3. Project internal communication and coordination |
| **Tangible outputs** |
| * Internal Communication and Coordination Plan * Communication channels set up * Project repository set up |
| **Quantitative Indicators** |
| * Number of meetings (target = 3 per year) |
| **Qualitative Indicators** |
| * Fulfilment of objectives:   + Definition of the regulatory framework   + Definition of the roles of the distributed management bodies   + Definition of the decision-making process   + Definition of a conflict resolution mechanism   + Definition of the communication tools and procedures |
| **Quality Control action/mechanism** |
| * Revision of the outputs by the MB |

|  |
| --- |
| **WP/Task** |
| 1.4. 2nd Management meeting |
| **Tangible outputs** |
| * Performed Management Meeting * Meeting Agenda * Meeting Minutes * List of attendants * Meeting presentations |
| **Quantitative Indicators** |
| * Number of participants (target = 25) * Participants from all Partner institutions |
| **Qualitative Indicators** |
| * Fulfilment of objectives:   + Finalization of the learning implementation process   + Discussion of Quality Assurance issues (quality improvement)   + Discussion of the project status   + Update of Action Plan * Agenda includes all the necessary information * The minutes are sufficiently clear about the issues discussed, decisions taken and follow-up actions * Use of project templates and compliance with EU visibility requirements |
| **Quality Control action/mechanism** |
| * Participant evaluation form * Revision of the outputs by the MB |

|  |
| --- |
| **WP/Task** |
| 1.5. 3rd Management meeting |
| **Tangible outputs** |
| * Performed Management Meeting * Meeting Agenda * Meeting Minutes * List of attendants * Meeting presentations |
| **Quantitative Indicators** |
| * Number of participants (target = 25) * Participants from all Partner institutions |
| **Qualitative Indicators** |
| * Fulfilment of objectives:   + Finalization of the exploitation and sustainability strategy   + Discussion of lessons learned and way forward   + Final report preparation   + Discussion of the project status * Update of Action Plan * Agenda includes all the necessary information * The minutes are sufficiently clear about the issues discussed, decisions taken and follow-up actions * Use of project templates and compliance with EU visibility requirements |
| **Quality Control action/mechanism** |
| * Participant evaluation form * Revision of the outputs by the MB |

|  |
| --- |
| **WP/Task** |
| 2.1. Development of guidelines for target group survey |
| **Tangible outputs** |
| * Survey guidelines * 1st round survey of the Delphi analysis * 2nd round survey of Delphi analysis * Survey for the identification of skill needs |
| **Quantitative Indicators** |
| * N/A |
| **Qualitative Indicators** |
| * Clear outline of the methodology and aims * Definition of the timeline * Consideration of the perspective of all the stakeholders (industry, HEIs, graduates, employees). * Use of project templates and compliance with EU visibility requirements |
| **Quality Control action/mechanism** |
| * Revision of the outputs by the AB |

|  |
| --- |
| **WP/Task** |
| 2.2. Implementation of Workshops/Survey with stakeholders (3 per HEI) |
| **Tangible outputs** |
| * Survey responses * Workshop programs * Workshop attendance lists & report * Workshop presentations * Workshop photos |
| **Quantitative Indicators** |
| * Number of companies participating in the surveys * Number of participants in the workshops |
| **Qualitative Indicators** |
| * Involvement of key players * Application of DELPHI methodology * Adherence to the guidelines for the market need analysis (2.1) * Use of project templates and compliance with EU visibility requirements |
| **Quality Control action/mechanism** |
| * Revision of the outputs by the AB |

|  |
| --- |
| **WP/Task** |
| 2.3. Analysis of needs and competences |
| **Tangible outputs** |
| * Market Needs Analysis Report * Competence Analysis Report |
| **Quantitative Indicators** |
| * N/A |
| **Qualitative Indicators** |
| * Fulfilment of objectives: * Definition of the skills lacking in the market * Analysis of macroeconomic and labour market indicators * Regional analysis of the labour market * Analysis of trends and forecasts of future skills demand * Use of project templates and compliance with EU visibility requirements |
| **Quality Control action/mechanism** |
| * Revision of the outputs by the AB |

|  |
| --- |
| **WP/Task** |
| 2.4. Analysis of international master programs |
| **Tangible outputs** |
| * Report on the analysis of international master programs |
| **Quantitative Indicators** |
| * N/A |
| **Qualitative Indicators** |
| * Analysis of the main types of programs and their structure * Definition of a proposal for the basic structure of the Mater program * Use of project templates and compliance with EU visibility requirements |
| **Quality Control action/mechanism** |
| * Revision of the outputs by the AB |

|  |
| --- |
| **WP/Task** |
| 2.5. Accounting and monitoring mechanisms |
| **Tangible outputs** |
| * Budget expenditure reports * Achievement indicators |
| **Quantitative Indicators** |
| * 1 expenditure report for each internal reporting period (total = 6) |
| **Qualitative Indicators** |
| * Timely reporting * Compliance of the expenditure with all levels of regulations |
| **Quality Control action/mechanism** |
| * Revision of the outputs by the MB |

|  |
| --- |
| **WP/Task** |
| 2.7. Defining MB, DB, AB, ECM and TCGs |
| **Tangible outputs** |
| * Distributed management bodies defined |
| **Quantitative Indicators** |
| * Representatives from all Partners |
| **Qualitative Indicators** |
| * Adequacy of the members of each board |
| **Quality Control action/mechanism** |
| * Revision of the outputs by the MB |

|  |
| --- |
| **WP/Task** |
| 3.1. Curriculum design and preparation |
| **Tangible outputs** |
| * Developed and approved Master Program Curriculum * Local meetings’ agenda, minutes, attendance lists and photos * Curriculum presented to stakeholders * Workshops agendas, minutes, attendance lists and photos * Developed and approved course materials (online and offline) * Academic staff’s English proficiency improved (list of trainees) * Report on the outcomes of the English training program * Trainings on the Master subjects (program, list of trainees and photos, presentations/training materials) * Certification and accreditation process reports * Official certification and accreditation documentation |
| **Quantitative Indicators** |
| * Number of participants/firms in local meetings. * Number of participants in the Stakeholder Workshops. * Number of teachers that received the English language training (target = 15 to 21 per HEI) * Degree of improvement of English language level. * Number of teachers trained on each Master subjects (target = 30+24+24+42). * Number of trainees that teach in the MA program. |
| **Qualitative Indicators** |
| * Fulfilment of objectives: * Developed curriculum and content materials * Presentation of the curriculum to stakeholders * Teachers trained in Master subjects and English language * Certification and accreditation of the new Master program * 3.1.1. The curriculum takes into account the conclusions of the market need analysis and analysis of the international master programs (2.3. and 2.4.) * 3.1.1. Involvement of stakeholders (HEIs, Research Institutes, Technoparks) in the co-design of the Curriculum. * 3.1.1. The curriculum has a multidisciplinary approach. * 3.1.1. The curriculum addresses the aspiration of the target-audiences. * 3.1.1. Well identified learning objectives. * 3.1.2. Involvement of the stakeholders in the workshops. * 3.1.2. The objectives, strategy, modules and teaching approach of the Master are presented. * 3.1.2. The practical case studies are relevant for the target groups. * 3.1.3. Relevance and completeness of the content developed. * 3.1.4. Adherence to the training plan and methodology. * 3.1.5. Adequacy of the training content. * 3.1.5. Satisfaction of the trainees. * 3.1.6. Full Master accreditation in all CA countries. * Use of project templates and compliance with EU visibility requirements |
| **Quality Control action/mechanism** |
| * Revision of outputs by the AB & the MB. * English training evaluation form. * Event evaluation forms (local meetings and stakeholder workshops) * Master subject trainings evaluation forms |

|  |
| --- |
| **WP/Task** |
| 3.2. Entrepeneurs Centres |
| **Tangible outputs** |
| * Training program, attendance list, presentations/materials and photos * Handbook on the establishment of Entrepreneur Centres * Report on the established Entrepreneur Centres * Seminar programs, attendance lists, presentations and photos |
| **Quantitative Indicators** |
| * Number of participants in the training on the establishment of EC (target = 12) * Number of participants in the seminars |
| **Qualitative Indicators** |
| * Fulfilment of objectives: * Established EC that have the capacity to improve the competence of university teachers, to offer business/economics training for industrial enterprises and to provide education for entrepreneurs. * Developed training programs and seminars for interested entrepreneurs. * Adequacy of the training program for the establishment of EC * Satisfaction of training attendees * The handbook sets clear guidelines for the creation of functional EC * The seminars cover the appropriate topics (marketing, tax consultancy, time management, business-plan preparation, etc.) * Use of project templates and compliance with EU visibility requirements |
| **Quality Control action/mechanism** |
| * Training evaluation forms * Revision of the outputs by the MB and ECM |

|  |
| --- |
| **WP/Task** |
| 3.3. Master program implementation |
| **Tangible outputs** |
| * Publication of marketing and educational materials * Report on the enrolment procedure * Feedback Analysis * Follow-up reports * Follow-up meeting agenda, attendance list, minutes, presentations and photos. * Report on Master content update |
| **Quantitative Indicators** |
| * Number of students enrolled (target = 25 per year) * Number of feedback forms * Number of participants in the follow-up meeting |
| **Qualitative Indicators** |
| * Fulfilment of objectives: * Student enrolment. * Full master implementation. * Assessment of the programme’s relevance, effectiveness and efficiency through feedback analysis, follow-up reports and meetings. * Master content update. * The marketing materials address all the potential student profiles and take into account local features. * The test roll-out stays in line with the defined methodology, modular structure and content strategy. * The feedback analysis and follow-up reports look at the overall structure, delivery methods, content, blended learning methods, peer-learning, etc. * The content update strives to keep up with the developments in the industrial and entrepreneurial sectors and meet the needs of the target groups. * Use of project templates and compliance with EU visibility requirements. |
| **Quality Control action/mechanism** |
| * Revision of the outputs by the MB * Feedback forms * Event evaluation form |

|  |
| --- |
| **WP/Task** |
| 3.4. Sustainability and Long-term recommendations |
| **Tangible outputs** |
| * Sustainability Strategy * Sustainability Strategy Implementation Plan * Sustainability Strategy: Report and recommendations |
| **Quantitative Indicators** |
| * To be defined |
| **Qualitative Indicators** |
| * Fulfilment of objectives: * Definition of the methodology and activities of the consortium towards establishing long-term sustainability. * Definition of the exploitation trajectories to be followed. * Establishing long-term cooperation with companies, policy makers, start-ups, etc. * Use of project templates and compliance with EU visibility requirements. |
| **Quality Control action/mechanism** |
| * Revision of outputs by the AB & the MB. |

|  |
| --- |
| **WP/Task** |
| 4.1. Quality Plan |
| **Tangible outputs** |
| * Quality Plan * External Evaluation interim and final evaluation reports |
| **Quantitative Indicators** |
| * N/A |
| **Qualitative Indicators** |
| * Fulfilment of objectives: * Definition of internal quality assurance procedures * Definition of Quality Control mechanisms * Definition of quality indicators for each WP and task * Definition of the criteria for the selection of the External Evaluator * Use of project templates and compliance with EU visibility requirements |
| **Quality Control action/mechanism** |
| * Revision of the outputs by the MB |

|  |
| --- |
| **WP/Task** |
| 4.2. Periodical reports |
| **Tangible outputs** |
| * Periodical reports |
| **Quantitative Indicators** |
| * 3 quality reviews |
| **Qualitative Indicators** |
| * Fulfilment of objectives: * Continuous monitoring * Review of the qualitative and quantitative indicators * Identification of potential weaknesses and suggestions for improvement * Use of project templates and compliance with EU visibility requirements |
| **Quality Control action/mechanism** |
| * Review by the QAM |

|  |
| --- |
| **WP/Task** |
| 5.1. Developing Dissemination Strategy |
| **Tangible outputs** |
| * Dissemination Strategy * Dissemination Reports |
| **Quantitative Indicators** |
| * Number of dissemination reports * Number of dissemination actions * Number of events |
| **Qualitative Indicators** |
| * Fulfilment of objectives: * Definition of the target audiences, dissemination methods and media * Timing of the dissemination activities * Guidance on positioning the project * Definition of the dissemination tools to be used * Definition of milestones and measurable indicators * Definition of a dissemination timeline and work plan * Description of the role of each partner * Definition of the specific actions to be taken by each partner * Set up of monitoring mechanisms * Use of project templates and compliance with EU visibility requirements |
| **Quality Control action/mechanism** |
| * Revision of the outputs by the DB and MB |

|  |
| --- |
| **WP/Task** |
| 5.2. Development of professional network |
| **Tangible outputs** |
| * Report on the development of the professional network |
| **Quantitative Indicators** |
| * Number of users |
| **Qualitative Indicators** |
| * Fulfilment of objectives: * Definition of the main stakeholders to be engaged, disaggregated by sector, location and scope of action. * Definition of means to reach target audience * Use of project templates and compliance with EU visibility requirements |
| **Quality Control action/mechanism** |
| * Revision of the outputs by the DB and MB |

|  |
| --- |
| **WP/Task** |
| 5.3. Promotion of the Master Program |
| **Tangible outputs** |
| * Promotional events’ agenda, attendance list, minutes, presentations and photos. |
| **Quantitative Indicators** |
| * Number of promotional events (target = 2) * Number of attendants to the promotional events |
| **Qualitative Indicators** |
| * Diversity of the attendants (students, staff, industrial companies, policy makers, etc.). * Use of project templates and compliance with EU visibility requirements. |
| **Quality Control action/mechanism** |
| * Revision of the outputs by the DB and the MB |

|  |
| --- |
| **WP/Task** |
| 5.4. Website and visual identity |
| **Tangible outputs** |
| * Project website * Project logo |
| **Quantitative Indicators** |
| * Number of entries on the website |
| **Qualitative Indicators** |
| * The main content of the website is available in English, Russian, Tajik, Kazakh and Turkmen. * Regularity of website updates. * Completeness of the information available. * Compliance with EU visibility requirements. |
| **Quality Control action/mechanism** |
| * Revision of the outputs by the DB |

|  |
| --- |
| **WP/Task** |
| 5.5. Social media and communication |
| **Tangible outputs** |
| * Set up social media channels |
| **Quantitative Indicators** |
| * Number of social media posts * Reach of each post |
| **Qualitative Indicators** |
| * Regularity of the posts and publications. * Compliance with EU visibility requirements. * Use of dedicated hashtags and engagement with other relevant social media accounts |
| **Quality Control action/mechanism** |
| * Revision of the outputs by the DB |

|  |
| --- |
| **WP/Task** |
| 5.6. Articles and publications |
| **Tangible outputs** |
| * Published articles |
| **Quantitative Indicators** |
| * Number of articles published (target = 2 per partner) |
| **Qualitative Indicators** |
| * Propagation of the articles through the existing channels (project website and SM) * Compliance with EU visibility requirements. |
| **Quality Control action/mechanism** |
| * Revision of the outputs by the DB |

|  |
| --- |
| **WP/Task** |
| 5.7. Dissemination , promotional campaigns, info and open days |
| **Tangible outputs** |
| * Dissemination and promotional materials for the campaigns. * Open Days’ agendas, attendance lists, presentations and photos. |
| **Quantitative Indicators** |
| * Number of events * Number of participants (target = 25) |
| **Qualitative Indicators** |
| * Ample promotion of the events * Participation of national stakeholders |
| **Quality Control action/mechanism** |
| * Revision of the outputs by the DB |

# Quality Assurance Tools

### Guidelines for online publication

All the publications must be respectful of copyright and data privacy regulations of the EU and of all the countries involved in the project.

All the content published in the frame of the project must be original. Where external sources or materials are used, these must be adequately referenced. The information taken from exiting sources or gathered through surveys/questionnaires/interviews must be clearly marked, correctly attributed and, if relevant, the source material must be referenced.

When using existing data or information, permission must be obtained from the original publisher, unless it is made available under a specific license, in which case the terms said license must be strictly respected.

It is essential that all data used is accurate and representative.

Explicit permission must be obtained for the publication of photos where people are identifiable. This is of particular importance when the people featured in a photo are external to the project.

### Formats and templates for deliverables and reports produced in the project.

A set of templates have been produced for deliverables, reports, presentations and other documents produced in the frame of the project. These templates are available in the project’s online repository. The use of these templates is mandatory.

### Accreditation and Certification

Information about the accreditation and certification process in each country will be collected through and structured questionnaire that will allow the consortium to have comparable information in order to develop a roadmap to achieve a timely accreditation of the new Master program. This questionnaire is available on the online project repository.

### Training evaluation forms

All the training events will be accompanied by evaluation exercises involving all learners and trainers evaluating the knowledge of the trainers, contents, materials, etc.

The following form will be used (it can be adapted to the specificity of each training):

**Please, rate your satisfaction with the training:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very unsatisfied | Unsatisfied | Neutral | Satisfied | Very Satisfied |
| Overall, how satisfied were you with this training? | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |

**How strongly do you agree with the following statements:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| The objectives of the training were clearly defined | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| The content of the training was relevant | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| The training was well organized and easy to follow | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| The trainers were knowledgeable about the training topics | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| The trainers were well prepared | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| The training objectives were met | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| The training materials were suitable | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| The venue/facilities were adequate | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |

What aspects of the training could be improved?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

What did you like most about this training?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

### Event evaluation form

All project’s implementation, dissemination and exploitation events will be followed by evaluation exercises addressing the satisfaction of the attendees.

The following form will be used (it can be adapted to the specificity of each event):

**Please, rate your satisfaction with the event:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very unsatisfied | Unsatisfied | Neutral | Satisfied | Very Satisfied |
| Overall, how satisfied were you with this event? | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |

**How strongly do you agree with the following statements:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| The information about the event was clear and sufficient | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| The content of the event was informative | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| The event was well organized and easy to follow | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| The speakers were well prepared | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| The event was useful to my interests | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |

**Rate the following:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Poor | Fair | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
| The event organization | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| The location of the venue | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| The venue (facilities) | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| Sound and presentations visibility | □ | □ | □ | □ | □ |

What aspects of the event could be improved?

|  |
| --- |
|  |