

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





Internal Quality Assurance report Period from November 30th, 2019 - May 14th, 2020







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		

Introduction





This report is prepared based on the Internal quality reports provided by the coordinators and members of Quality Assurance and Monitoring Board (QAMB) only from two project partners UNI and UNS. Action plan with many activities that would be realised during this period was made, but circumstances that no one could have planned happened and interrupted the implementation of the project before the visit to the university in Ghent, in order to prepare materials for pedagogical, psychological and methodological training courses.

All consortium members from partner institutions pearticipated in the LCT meeting in Novi Sad, where the action plan for the realization of upcoming trainings and activities has been accepted.

Comparative analysis has been done by the University of Gjirokaster and UNI and, thanks to the findings of this report, all partners participated in the realization of the action plan.

On the LCT meeting, the content of the technical interim report has been looked over and the way to validate delays of some activities was invented. Interim report was written by the main coordinator and was sent to Brussels for a review on time.





UNI

Quality Assurance Check List for Review of Deliverable: Activities 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	/	/	
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			1		
Date of Quality Assurance performed by QAMB reviewers: June 3rd, 2020					
Deadline for submission	Deadline for submission of amended version of the deliverables: May 30 th , 2020				

Jul In



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



UNI

Quality Assurance Check List for Review of Deliverable: Activities 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	1	/
5. Adequacy of complementary information	Examples of complementary info: External sources used Bibliography List of contacts Methodology used (i.e. for surveys)	⊠yes □ no	/	/
6. Adequacy of written language	Level of written English	□excellent I adequate □ poor	/	/
Overall assessment and suggestions for improvement				
Date of Quality Assura	nce performed by QAMB revie	ewers: June 3rd,	2020	
Deadline for submission	on of amended version of the	deliverables: Ma	y 30 th , 2020	

Allocativet





UB

Quality Assurance Check List for Review of Deliverable: Activities 7.3

Author(s) responsible for the deliverable:

QAMB reviewer(s): Nebojša Jasnić

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)	Xiγes □ 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: June 3rd,	2020	•
Deadline for submission	on of amended version of the	deliverables: Ma	y 30 th , 2020	

Jacunt Hedginsa



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



UNS

Quality Assurance Check List for Review of Deliverable: Activities 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?	Xyes □ 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	1	/
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 Date of Quality Assura	nce performed by QAMB revi	ewers: June 3rd	2020	
· •	on of amended version of the	-		

Deadline for submission of amended version of the deliverables: May 30th, 2020

lyberateut



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



UNIKG

Quality Assurance Check List for Review of Deliverable: Activities 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?	∑yes □ 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 revions of amended version of the other sectors and the sector of the sectors of the sect			

Deadline for submission of amended version of the deliverables: May 30th, 2020

hatata Inuitopanjelout



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



ECUG

Quality Assurance Check List for Review of Deliverable: Activities 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?	X ⁱ yes 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)	⊠yes □ no	/	/
6. Adequacy of written language	Level of written English	□excellent ☑adequate □ poor	/	/
Overall assessment and suggestions for improvement			1	1
Date of Quality Assurance performed by QAMB reviewers: June 3rd, 2020				
Deadline for submission	on of amended version of the	deliverables: Ma	y 30 th , 2020	





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



UNIKO

Quality Assurance Check List for Review of Deliverable: Activities 7.3

Author(s) responsible for the deliverable:

QAMB reviewer(s): Ardian Cerava

		Assessment	Comments	Recommendations	
the objective of co	oes the deliverable omply with the overall ojectives of the project?	xyes □ no □ partially	/	/	
the specific co objectives of the Ob	oes the deliverables omply with the WP bjectives as specified in ne WP description?	Xyes □ no □ partially	/	/	
with the description co of work of the ac relevant activity sp	oes the deliverable prrespond with the ctivity description as pecified in the pplication Form?	⊠yes □ no □ partially	/	/	
the deliverables pro format Pro for	the deliverable resented using the roject's deliverable ormat	X yes □ no	/	/	
complementary co information Ex Bil Lis Ma su	camples of omplementary info: cternal sources used bliography st of contacts lethodology used (i.e. for urveys)	Xyes □ no	/	/	
6. Adequacy of Lew written language	evel of written English	Xexcellent □ adequate □ poor	/	/	
Overall assessment and suggestions for improvement Date of Quality Assurance	performed by QAMB revie	wers: June 3rd, 2	2020		
	Deadline for submission of amended version of the deliverables: May 30 th , 2020				

ela



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

Copyright©TeComp Consortium

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme 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 information contained therein