

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





Internal Quality Assurance report Period from May 14th - November 30th, 2019







Project acronym: Project full title:	TeComp Strengthening Teaching Competences in Higher Education in Natural and Mathematical Sciences
Project No:	598434-EPP-1-2018-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP
Number of grant contracts	2018-2467/001-001
Web address of project	www.tecomp.ni.ac.rs
Funding Scheme:	Erasmus+
Coordinator Institution:	University of Nis
Coordinator:	Prof. dr Jelena Ignjatović
Project duration:	15.11.2018. – 14.11.2022
Work package:	WP5 – Quality assurance and monitoring
Lead organization of	University of Korce
WP5:	Activity 5.3 Internal QA reports
Version of the document:	second
Status:	Final
Dissemination level:	Institutional, Internal



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



Introduction

This report is prepared based on the Internal quality reports provided by the coordinators and members of Quality Assurance and Monitoring Board (QAMB) from the eligible partner universities from Serbia and Albania.

During this period of time the preparation phase of the project is still in on-going. Two main activities were in preparation, one is finished until the end of the second mail stone. The analysis of the state of art of teaching and learning in both PC and EU HEIs is finished and reports based on collected data are completed.

Simultaneously, a survey of EU practice related to the forms and models of teaching and learning within the EU universities participating in the project is undertaken. The number of questions was fewer than in the surveys provided at the universities in Serbia and Albania, but with the same goals to make direct comparison of EU and PC outcomes possible. From the project management there was a significant desire, even though starting activities began late, to conduct the assessment/survey and try to catch up with the original project schedule in the first six months of the project.





Report - UNI

Coordination team from Nis has prepared the LCT meeting in Belgrade through the presentation about the project administration platform. They have also worked on the finishing activities for the tender for equipment purchase, analysis of the surveys taken by teachers and students, creation of the draft version of report on the situation analysis in higher education institutions. Two consortium members have attended the LCT meeting in Belgrade.

Shortly after the meeting, all regulative norms related to tender documentation have been completed and tender bids have been opened on the University of Nis, with representatives from all universities in Serbia being present. The best offer has been selected and agreements for equipment procurement have been signed without issues.

The project coordinator followed the survey distributed in EU countries and the report on that questionnaire has been made in order to make comparative analysis of the situation at PC and partner universities easier. During the summer, the notification from Brussels that Grant holder meeting in Durres will be held was received. Attendance of the coordinator from UNI, as well as from one WB institution, was necessary. Since partners from Albania could not be present, a representative from Banska Bystrica (which is partly a WB country) attended the meeting instead, as we deemed it better to have one more person present.

After that, CMT meeting was held in Granada, with the coordinator from UNI and one more member of the coordination team being present.



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



UNI

Quality Assurance Check List for Review of Deliverable: Activities 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 5.1, 7.2, 7.3

Author(s) responsible for the deliverable:

QAMB reviewer(s): Zorana Jančić

Assurance point	Issues to be addressed	Assessment	Comments	Recommendations
1.Complience with the objective of TeComp	Does the deliverable comply with the overall objectives of the project?	☑yes □ no □ partially	Completely fulfilled.	/
2. Compliance with the specific objectives of the workpackage	Does the deliverables comply with the WP Objectives as specified in the WP description?	Xiyes no partially	Full	/
3. Correspondence with the description of work of the relevant activity	Does the deliverable correspond with the activity description as specified in the Application Form?	⊠yes □ no □ partially	/	/
4. Compliance with the deliverables format	Is the deliverable presented using the Project's deliverable format	X yes □ no	/	/
5. Adequacy of complementary information	Examples of complementary info: External sources used Bibliography List of contacts Methodology used (i.e. for surveys)	Xiyes □ no	/	/
6. Adequacy of written language	Level of written English	□excellent I adequate □ poor	/	/
Overall assessment and suggestions for improvement			/	
	nce performed by QAMB revi		1 st , 2020	
Deadline for submission of amended version of the deliverables:				

Jul In



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



UNI

Quality Assurance Check List for Review of Deliverable: Activities 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 7.2, 7.3

Author(s) responsible for the deliverable:

QAMB reviewer(s): Aleksandar Nastić

Assurance point	Issues to be addressed	Assessment	Comments	Recommendations
1.Complience with the objective of TeComp	Does the deliverable comply with the overall objectives of the project?	xyes □ no □ partially	/	/
2. Compliance with the specific objectives of the workpackage	Does the deliverables comply with the WP Objectives as specified in the WP description?	Xiyes no partially	/	/
3. Correspondence with the description of work of the relevant activity	Does the deliverable correspond with the activity description as specified in the Application Form?	⊠yes □ no □ partially	/	/
4. Compliance with the deliverables format	Is the deliverable presented using the Project's deliverable format	XÌ yes □ no	/	/
5. Adequacy of complementary information	Examples of complementary info: External sources used Bibliography List of contacts Methodology used (i.e. for surveys)	Xiyes □ no	/	/
6. Adequacy of written language	Level of written English	□excellent X adequate □ poor	/	/
Overall assessment and suggestions for improvement Date of Quality Assura	nce performed by QAMB revi	ewers: January 2	21 st , 2020	

Deadline for submission of amended version of the deliverables: December 31st, 2019

Allocativet



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



Report - UB

University of Belgrade was the organizer of the LCT meeting, has participated in the preparation and signing of the tender documentation and attended the procedure of opening the bids.

The coordinator from Belgrade has attended the CMT meeting in Granada and has successfully finished all predicted assignments.





UB

Quality Assurance Check List for Review of Deliverable: Activities 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 7.2, 7.3

Author(s) responsible for the deliverable:

QAMB reviewer(s): Nebojša Jasnić

es to be addressed	Assessment	Comments	Recommendations
s the deliverable ply with the overall ectives of the project?	x γes □ no □ partially	/	/
s the deliverables ply with the WP ectives as specified in WP description?	Xyes □ no □ partially	/	/
s the deliverable espond with the vity description as cified in the lication Form?	⊠yes □ no □ partially	/	/
e deliverable ented using the ect's deliverable nat	Xi _{yes} □ no	/	/
nples of plementary info: mal sources used iography of contacts hodology used (i.e. for eys)	⊠ yes □ no	/	/
el of written English	□excellent	/	/
		14 2020	
	•	ormed by QAMB reviewers: January 2	•

Deadline for submission of amended version of the deliverables: December 31st, 2019

Jacunt Hespina



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



Report - UNS

University of Novi Sad has attended the LCT meeting, participated in the preparation and signing of the tender documentation and attended the procedure of opening the bids.

The coordinator from Novi Sad has attended the CMT meeting in Granada and has successfully finished all predicted assignments.



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



UNS

Quality Assurance Check List for Review of Deliverable: Activities 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 7.2, 7.3

Author(s) responsible for the deliverable:

QAMB reviewer(s): Zorana Lužanin

Assurance point	Issues to be addressed	Assessment	Comments	Recommendations
1.Complience with the objective of TeComp	Does the deliverable comply with the overall objectives of the project?	xyes □ no □ partially	/	/
2. Compliance with the specific objectives of the workpackage	Does the deliverables comply with the WP Objectives as specified in the WP description?	Xiyes □ no □ partially	/	/
3. Correspondence with the description of work of the relevant activity	Does the deliverable correspond with the activity description as specified in the Application Form?	⊠yes □ no □ partially	/	/
4. Compliance with the deliverables format	Is the deliverable presented using the Project's deliverable format	X yes □ no	/	/
5. Adequacy of complementary information	Examples of complementary info: External sources used Bibliography List of contacts Methodology used (i.e. for surveys)	Xiyes □ no	/	/
6. Adequacy of written language	Level of written English	□excellent □ adequate X poor	1	/
Overall assessment and suggestions for improvement				
	nce performed by QAMB revie			
Deadline for submission of amended version of the deliverables: December 31 st , 2019				

lymateut





Report - UNIKG

University of Kragujevac has attended the LCT meeting, participated in the preparation and signing of the tender documentation and attended the procedure of opening the bids.

The coordinator from Kragujevac has attended the CMT meeting in Granada and has successfully finished all predicted assignments.



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



UNIKG

Quality Assurance Check List for Review of Deliverable: Activities 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 7.2, 7.3

Author(s) responsible for the deliverable:

QAMB reviewer(s): Slađana Dimitrijević

Assurance point	Issues to be addressed	Assessment	Comments	Recommendations
1.Complience with the objective of TeComp	Does the deliverable comply with the overall objectives of the project?	xyes □ no □ partially	/	/
2. Compliance with the specific objectives of the workpackage	Does the deliverables comply with the WP Objectives as specified in the WP description?	Xiyes □ no □ partially	/	/
3. Correspondence with the description of work of the relevant activity	Does the deliverable correspond with the activity description as specified in the Application Form?	⊠yes □ no □ partially	/	/
4. Compliance with the deliverables format	Is the deliverable presented using the Project's deliverable format	X yes □ no	/	/
5. Adequacy of complementary information	Examples of complementary info: External sources used Bibliography List of contacts Methodology used (i.e. for surveys)	Xiyes □ no	/	/
6. Adequacy of written language	Level of written English	 excellent adequate poor 	/	/
Overall assessment and suggestions for improvement			This version should be approved as a final one.	
	nce performed by QAMB revie			
Deadline for submission	on of amended version of the	deliverables: Dec	emper 31°, 2019	

hotata Quantingingelant





Report - ECUG

The University of Gjirokaster is a leader of this work package, so their team members played a crucial role of collecting information and analysing the situations at all universities in Serbia and Albania.

On the LCT meeting in Belgrade, their coordinator presented the draft version of survey results, which will be used for comparative analysis and definition of action plan for project activities necessary for improvement of teaching in higher education.

On the CMT meeting in Granada, the final version of the surveys was adopted. Eu partners have presented the situations at their universities, which will be used by ECUG in order to make a comparative analysis.



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



ECUG

Quality Assurance Check List for Review of Deliverable: Activities 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 7.2, 7.3

Author(s) responsible for the deliverable:

QAMB reviewer(s): Romeo Mano

Assurance point	Issues to be addressed	Assessment	Comments	Recommendations
1.Complience with the objective of TeComp	Does the deliverable comply with the overall objectives of the project?	Xyes □ no □ partially	/	/
2. Compliance with the specific objectives of the workpackage	Does the deliverables comply with the WP Objectives as specified in the WP description?	Xiyes no partially	/	/
3. Correspondence with the description of work of the relevant activity	Does the deliverable correspond with the activity description as specified in the Application Form?	⊠yes □ no □ partially	/	/
4. Compliance with the deliverables format	Is the deliverable presented using the Project's deliverable format	X yes □ no	/	/
5. Adequacy of complementary information	Examples of complementary info: External sources used Bibliography List of contacts Methodology used (i.e. for surveys)	IXiyes □ no	/	/
6. Adequacy of written language	Level of written English	□excellent ⊠adequate □ poor	/	/
Overall assessment and suggestions for improvement			/	/
-	nce performed by QAMB revi	-		
Deadline for submission	on of amended version of the	deliverables: Dec	ember 31 st , 2019	



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



Report - UNIKO

University of Korce has attended the LCT meeting, participated in the preparation and signing of the tender documentation and attended the procedure of opening the bids.

The coordinator from Korce has attended the CMT meeting in Granada and has successfully finished all predicted assignments.





UNIKO

Quality Assurance Check List for Review of Deliverable: Activities 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 7.2, 7.3 Author(s) responsible for the deliverable:

QAMB reviewer(s): Ardian Cerava

Assurance point	Issues to be addressed	Assessment	Comments	Recommendations
1.Complience with the objective of TeComp	Does the deliverable comply with the overall objectives of the project?	xyes □ no □ partially	/	/
2. Compliance with the specific objectives of the workpackage	Does the deliverables comply with the WP Objectives as specified in the WP description?	Xiyes no partially	/	/
3. Correspondence with the description of work of the relevant activity	Does the deliverable correspond with the activity description as specified in the Application Form?	⊠yes □ no □ partially	/	/
4. Compliance with the deliverables format	Is the deliverable presented using the Project's deliverable format	X yes □ no	/	/
5. Adequacy of complementary information	Examples of complementary info: External sources used Bibliography List of contacts Methodology used (i.e. for surveys)	XÌγes □ no	/	/
6. Adequacy of written language	Level of written English	x excellent □ adequate □ poor	/	/
Overall assessment and suggestions for improvement Date of Quality Assura	nce performed by QAMB revi	ewers: January 2	11 st 2020	

Deadline for submission of amended version of the deliverables: December 31st, 2019

eran





SUMMARY OF THE DELIVERABLES OF THE ACTIVITY 1.1

Title	Universities equipped with technology-enhanced learning spaces		
	Teaching material	🗆 Event	
Туре	Learning material	🖾 Report	
	Training material	□Service/Product	
Achieved	The evaluation of students and professors at all Serbian and Albanian universities on		
	the state of the current state of teaching and learning was delivered and finished Reports on the performed analysis are in the preparation phase.		
goals			
Conclusion	Aim is completely achieved.		
	The quantitative analysis focused on the level of education of the young university		
Sustainability	teachers in pedagogy and methodology will be a basis for the improving teaching		
	competences of young university teacher	S.	

SUMMARY OF THE DELIVERABLES OF THE ACTIVITY 1.2

Title	Universities equipped with technology-enhanced learning spaces		
	Teaching material	🗆 Event	
Туре	Learning material	🖾 Report	
	Training material	□Service/Product	
	The evaluation of students and professor	s at all Serbian and Albanian universities on	
Achieved	the use of modern technologies in teach	ing and learning was undertaken and visits	
goals	to the PC universities gave the real picture of technical infrastructure and existing		
guais	laboratory equipment. Reports on the performed analysis are in the prep- phase.		
Conclusion	Aim is completely achieved.		
	Reports on the current state and trends of technology enhanced learning in partner		
Sustainability	countries will present the state of technology enhanced education based on collected data.		





SUMMARY OF THE DELIVERABLES OF THE ACTIVITY 1.3

Title	Universities equipped with technology-enhanced learning spaces		
	Teaching material	Event	
Туре	Learning material	⊠ Report	
	Training material	□Service/Product	
Achieved goals	The evaluation of students and professors at UNIOVI, UMB and OU related to the forms and models of teaching and learning within the EU universities is undertaken. Together with the EU partner reports these surveys will be collected in joint report which will be a reference point for improvement of teaching and learning at the PC HEIS.		
Conclusion	Aim is completely achieved.		
Sustainability	The joint report will be presented in the project web site and disseminated across all		
Sustainability	WB institutions.		

SUMMARY OF THE TASK 2.1

Title	Universities equipped with technology-enhanced learning spaces		
	Teaching material	Event	
Туре	Learning material	🖾 Report	
	Training material	Service/Product	
	The aim of activity 2.1 is to harness the potential of the developments in the service		
Achieved	of high-quality education at the WB HEIs by upgrading their educational		
goals	infrastructure. Equipment is purchased and tender procedures are finished in Serbia.		
	All the items are installed at all institutions in Serbia.		
Conclusion	Aims are partially achieved.		
Sustainability	Quality reports will be disseminated to ensure the sustainability of the project results.		

SUMMARY OF THE TASK 7.2





Title	Universities equipped with technology-enhanced learning spaces		
	Teaching material	Event	
Туре	Learning material	Report	
	Training material	Service/Product	
Achieved	During the project lifetime five CMT meetings are planned. The first one was held in		
goals	Granada work with three months latency in accordance to the original plan.		
Conclusion	Aims are partially achieved.		
Sustainability	The meeting will help in resolving technical, legal, financial, intellectual property and		
	other conflicts that eventually may occur.		

SUMMARY OF THE TASK 7.3

Title	Universities equipped with technology-enhanced learning spaces		
Туре	Teaching material	🖾 Event	
	Learning material	⊠ Report	
	Training material	□Service/Product	
Achieved goals	Meetings of LCT are planned in the middle of the intervals between two CMT meetings to ensure continuity of management of the project. The first one was held in UB with three months latency.		
Conclusion	Aims are partially achieved.		
Sustainability	Report on the state of teaching and learning are adopted as a basis for improvement		
	of teaching and learning. The Project administration platform that is adopted for the		
	project purposes is a sustainable project result.		



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





University of Niš The TeComp Consortium

www.tecomp.ni.ac.rs e-mail: tecomp@ni.ac.rs

tecomp.p2018@gmail.com



information contained therein

of the European Union This project has been co-funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the

Copyright©TeComp Consortium