





# Internal Quality Assurance report Period from November 14<sup>th</sup>, 2021- May14<sup>th</sup>, 2022





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

After those trainings partners from Serbia begun to work intensively on preparation of the material for PPM training courses, as well as guidelines for the technological enhancement of teaching and learning.

In order to optimize publishing process, at online CMT held on 22nd March 2021, coordinators agreed to form Editorial board for training material related to activity 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4.

# **REPORT - UNI**

From December, the series of training courses has begun organized with the goal of preparation of training materials and strengthening teaching competences. Training were held by EU institutions. Some trainings were held online, some blended and some in-person, depending on the current circumstances with Covid.

At UNI, the blended training for usage of modern pedagogical and methodological principles in teaching and learning was organized. Thanks to LifeSize video-conferencing equipment, the training was held blended, so it was followed by teachers from all Serbian and Albanian partner universities.

The training with UNIOVI begun online, but, thankfully, situation has improved and latter part of the training was held in-person with interactive workshops being heavily implemented.

Participants of all trainings had their knowledge tested and most trainings then gave certificates.

Training with Ostrava took place in Nis parallel to the one with Oviedo. All partner institutions were participating and Irina Perfilieva (professor fom Ostrava) and Irene Diaz (professor from Oviedo), who are engaged on the master studies on computer science department, Faculty of sciences and mathematics, UNI as teachers from abroad had given presentations to students, which received great praises from students of the faculty.

Professor Tatjana Andjelkovic and Ivana Kokic from UNI have unveiled the remote laboratory and ways of following experiments from distant locations. The training was held in person, as a complement to the blended training held by UNIKG.

Professors from Nis have also participated in the in-person training held in Novi Sad, but have (due to timely obligations back in Nis) had to return a bit before the end.

The experience-rich (in organizing English competences training) teachers from UNI have held an online English competences training, with around 116 teachers from all partner institutions having improved their English proficiencies. Exam-taking for certificates was don in-person at each of the partner institutions. Professor Biljana Misic, who has prepared the content and training materials in collaboration with the coordinator, Jelena Ignjatovic, was the leader of the renowned TEMPUS project FUSE. Her knowledge was successfully shared to all participants in





this training. Prepared training materials are actually inspired by materials from the course EMI (English as a Medium of Instruction), which are traditionally, since the end of the FUSE project, held every year at UNI to professors from all faculties. The materials have been adapted to suit professors of natural and mathematical sciences at academic writing has been added as a new topic.





## UNI

#### Quality Assurance Check List for Review of Deliverable: Activities 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 7.2, 7.3 QAMB reviewer(s): Zorana Jančić

Assurance point	Issues to be addressed	Assessmen t	Comments	Recommendations
		L		
1.Complience with	Does the deliverable	xyes	/	/
the objective of	comply with the overall	□ no		
TeComp	objectives of the project?	partially		
2. Compliance with	Does the deliverables	Xyes	/	/
the specific	comply with the WP	🗆 no		
objectives of the	Objectives as specified in	partially		
workpackage	the WP description?			
3. Correspondence	Does the deliverable	Xyes	/	/
with the description	correspond with the	🗆 no		
of work of the	activity description as	partially		
relevant activity	specified in the			
	Application Form?			
4. Compliance with	Is the deliverable	X yes	/	/
the deliverables	presented using the	□ no		
format	Project's deliverable			
	format			
5. Adequacy of	Examples of	Xyes	/	/
complementary	complementary info:	_		
information	External sources used	□ no		
	Bibliography			
	List of contacts			
	Methodology used (i.e. for			
	surveys)			
6. Adequacy of	Level of written English	□excellent	/	/
written language		X		
		adequate		
		🗆 poor		
Overall assessment			To be more rigorous in	
and suggestions for			communication	
improvement				
Date of Quality Assura	nce performed by QAMB revi	ewers: June 1	5 <sup>th</sup> , 2022	1
Deadline for submissio	on of amended version of the	deliverables:	May 31 <sup>st</sup> , 2022	
			·,·-·,	





#### UNI

Quality Assurance Check List for Review of Deliverable: : Activities 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 7.2, 7.3

#### 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	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				
Date of Quality Assura	ance performed by QAMB revi	ewers: June 15 <sup>th</sup>	, 2022	1
Deadline for submission	on of amended version of the	deliverables: Ma	y 31 <sup>st</sup> , 2022	

Allout





## **REPORT - UB**

From December, the series of training courses has begun organized with the goal of preparation of training materials and strengthening teaching competences. Training were held by EU institutions. Some trainings were held online, some blended and some in-person, depending on the current circumstances with Covid. Teachers from Faculty of Biology, Physics and Mathematics at UB have participated in these trainings. They have attended the in-person trainings held by UNIOVI and UO in Nis and training with UMB in Novi Sad, as well. They have also shown interest in the English competences training (TAWE).





#### UB

Quality Assurance Check List for Review of Deliverable: : Activities 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 7.2, 7.3

#### 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?	x 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?	⊠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	Xi 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				

Deadline for submission of amended version of the deliverables: May 31<sup>st</sup>, 2022

Jacunt Hesginsa





# **REPORT - UNS**

From December, the series of training courses has begun organized with the goal of preparation of training materials and strengthening teaching competences. Training were held by EU institutions. Some trainings were held online, some blended and some in-person, depending on the current circumstances with Covid. Teachers from UNS have participated in all these trainings. They have attended the in-person trainings held by UNIOVI and UO in Nis and organized a training with UMB, as well. They have also shown great interest in the English competences training (TAWE), with many of their professors having attended the training.





Quality Assurance Check List for Review of Deliverable: : Activities 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 7.2, 7.3

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?	x 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?	⊠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	The deliverables are specify for TeComp project with no sourced indicated.	/
6. Adequacy of written language	Level of written English	□excellent □ adequate X poor	/	/
Overall assessment and suggestions for improvement				
Date of Quality Assura	nce performed by QAMB revi	ewers: June 15 <sup>th</sup>	, 2022	
Deadline for submission	on of amended version of the	deliverables: Ma	ıy 31 <sup>st</sup> , 2022	

lybatut





## **REPORT - UNIKG**

From December, the series of training courses has begun organized with the goal of preparation of training materials and strengthening teaching competences. Training were held by EU institutions. Some trainings were held online, some blended and some in-person, depending on the current circumstances with Covid. Teachers from UNIKG have participated in all these trainings. They have attended the in-person trainings held by UNIOVI and UO in Nis and training with UMB, as well. They have also shown great interest in the English competences training (TAWE), with many of their professors having attended the training.





### **UNIKG**

Quality Assurance Check List for Review of Deliverable: : Activities 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 7.2, 7.3

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?	x 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?	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	IXÌ yes □ no	/	/
5. Adequacy of complementary information	Examples of complementary info: External sources used Bibliography List of contacts Methodology used (i.e. for surveys)	<b>⊠</b> yes □ no	/	/
6. Adequacy of written language	Level of written English	• excellent □ adequate □ poor	/	/
Overall assessment and suggestions for improvement			/	
Date of Quality Assura	ance performed by QAMB revi	ewers: June 15 <sup>th</sup>	, 2022	1
Deadline for submission	on of amended version of the	deliverables: May	y 31 <sup>st</sup> , 2022	

Crafassa Burningsijebut





# **REPORT - ECUG**

From December, the series of training courses has begun organized with the goal of preparation of training materials and strengthening teaching competences. Training were held by EU institutions. Some trainings were held online, some blended and some in-person, depending on the current circumstances with Covid. Teachers from ECUG have participated in all these trainings. They have attended the in-person trainings held by UNIOVI and UO in Nis and training with UMB, as well. They have also shown great interest in the English competences training (TAWE), with many of their professors having attended the training.





#### **ECUG**

Quality Assurance Check List for Review of Deliverable: : Activities 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 7.2, 7.3

QAMB reviewer(s): Romeo Mano

	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?	x 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	IXÌ 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	<ul><li>excellent</li><li>adequate</li><li>poor</li></ul>	/	/
Overall assessment and suggestions for			/	/





## **REPORT - UNIKO**

From December, the series of training courses has begun organized with the goal of preparation of training materials and strengthening teaching competences. Training were held by EU institutions. Some trainings were held online, some blended and some in-person, depending on the current circumstances with Covid. Teachers from UNIKO have participated in all these trainings. They have attended the in-person trainings held by UNIOVI and UO in Nis and training with UMB, as well. They have also shown great interest in the English competences training (TAWE), with many of their professors having attended the training.





### **UNIKO**

#### Quality Assurance Check List for Review of Deliverable: : Activities 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 7.2, 7.3

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	1	/
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	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 図 adequate □ poor	/	/
Overall assessment and suggestions for improvement				
Date of Quality Assura	nce performed by QAMB revie	ewers: June 15 <sup>th</sup>	, 2022	1
Deadline for submissio	on of amended version of the	deliverables: Ma	y 31 <sup>st</sup> , 2022	

era







# 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