

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





Internal Quality Assurance report Period from May 14th – November 14th, 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

This period was highlighted by the wrap-up of the project as a whole. There were problems around the last instalment of money due to the change of rules (resulted by Russia-Ukraine conflict). This resulted in a delayed arrival of all partner documentation, but we finished it all at the end and got a positive review from external audit. We believe that the results of the project far exceed all plans and expectations, keeping in mind that many subjects were innovated and the awareness of teachers about the necessity of usage of modern technologies and pedagogical methods has been greatly increased (partly due to the situation brought by Covid). The knowledge and friendships made during the project will surely last for years to come.

Report - UNI

During this period, multiple CMT meetings were organized. All of them were mostly aimed at finishing financial documentation, planning the final report and depicting project results. Final series of training courses has been realized in Granada and Oviedo, where teachers from Nis have also actively participated.

Visit to Oviedo was highlighted by the presence of the rector of University of Nis, who has, with the rector of University of Oviedo, created the agreement on future inter-university collaboration, as well as cooperation on mutual projects in the future.

Workshop from the beginning of WP3 was postponed for the end of that work package, so it could be held in-person for increased effectiveness. That proved to be a better solution, since many steps to sustainability of project results have been agreed on during this workshop. Advice on the best ways to sustain cooperation were given by the coordinators of 2 past Erasmus+ projects (NETCHEM and SWARM).

Draft version of the memorandum of future cooperation, recommended by the professors of UNI, was also accepted and modified according to recommendations of all present participants.

The final version of the strategy (guideline) for the improvement of the quality of T&L has also been accepted, with all consortium members agreeing to submit them to appropriate bodies on their institutions for approval.

Along with the workshop, the final training was held in Nis by teachers from Ghent, which represents a spinoff result. Namely, a short-cycle program was developed. The pilot version of it was tested in Nis, and will be offered to the Center of professional development of teaching staff at the Faculty of sciences and mathematics, UNI for accreditation. Courses from other EU universities are in the preparation phase, and will also be sent to the center for accreditation and offered to each interested teacher for professional development in the near future.

Financial manager from Nis had a lot of obligations, but all partners provided full documentation in the end.





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	Comments	Recommendations
		t		
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 X adequate □ poor	/	/
Overall assessment and suggestions for improvement			To be more rigorous in communication	
Date of Quality Assura	nce performed by QAMB revi	ewers: Nover	ber 14 th , 2021	1
Deadline for submissio	n of amended version of the o	deliverables: S	eptember 10 th , 2021	





UNI

Quality Assurance Check List for Review of Deliverable: Activities 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.7, 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?	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	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	/	/
Overall assessment and suggestions for improvement				
Date of Quality Assura	nce performed by QAMB revi	ewers: Novembe	er 14 th , 2021	I
Deadline for submission	on of amended version of the	deliverables: Sep	tember 10 th , 2021	

Allocater _





Report - UB

The final installment came late due to the problem of collecting documentation during lockdown. Nevertheless, the money was successfully divided among all staff members, who have finished their duties on the project even without payments.

Teachers from UB have participated in all trainings and the workshop and, with consultations with the coordinator, managed to solve all issues that would come up.





UB

Quality Assurance Check List for Review of Deliverable: Activities: 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.7, 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?	Xlyes □ 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 X adequate □ poor	/	/
Overall assessment and suggestions for improvement				
Date of Quality Assura	ince performed by QAMB revi	ewers: Novembe	er 14 th , 2021	1
Deadline for submission	on of amended version of the	deliverables: Sep	otember 10 th , 2021	

Jacunt Hesginsa





Report - UNS

The final installment came late due to the problem of collecting documentation during lockdown. Nevertheless, the money was successfully divided among all staff members, who have finished their duties on the project even without payments.

Teachers from UNS have participated in all trainings and the workshop and, with consultations with the coordinator, managed to solve all issues that would come up.





UNS

Quality Assurance Check List for Review of Deliverable: Activities:3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.7, 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)	Xiyes □ no	The deliverables are specify for TeComp project with no sourced indicated.	/
6. Adequacy of written language	Level of written English	□excellent X adequate □ poor	/	/
Overall assessment and suggestions for improvement	+			
	I ance performed by QAMB revie	<u> </u>	4 ath 2024	

lywater





Report - UNIKG

The final installment came late due to the problem of collecting documentation during lockdown. Nevertheless, the money was successfully divided among all staff members, who have finished their duties on the project even without payments.

Teachers from UNIKG have participated in all trainings and the workshop. They have worked hard on the dissemination of the project and got one project. They have also held courses on modern methods of teaching, which used the knowledge they acquired during the project activities.





UNIKG

Quality Assurance Check List for Review of Deliverable: Activities 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.7, 7.2, 7.3 QAMB reviewer(s): Slađana Dimitrijević

Issues to be addressed	Assessment	Comments	Recommendations
Does the deliverable comply with the overall objectives of the project?	x γes □ no □ partially	/	/
Does the deliverables comply with the WP Objectives as specified in the WP description?	⊠iyes □ no □ partially	/	/
Does the deliverable correspond with the activity description as specified in the Application Form?	⊠yes □ no □ partially	/	/
Is the deliverable presented using the Project's deliverable format	XÌ yes □ no	/	/
Examples of complementary info: External sources used Bibliography List of contacts Methodology used (i.e. for surveys)	⊠yes □ no	/	/
Level of written English	• excellent adequate poor	/	/
		/	
	 comply with the overall objectives of the project? Does the deliverables comply with the WP Objectives as specified in the WP description? Does the deliverable correspond with the activity description as specified in the Application Form? Is the deliverable presented using the Project's deliverable format Examples of complementary info: External sources used Bibliography List of contacts Methodology used (i.e. for surveys) 	comply with the overall objectives of the project?Ino I partiallyDoes the deliverables comply with the WP Objectives as specified in the WP description?Xiyes I no I partiallyDoes the deliverable correspond with the activity description as specified in the Application Form?Xiyes I no I partiallyIs the deliverable presented using the Project's deliverable formatXiyes I no I no Examples of complementary info: 	comply with the overall objectives of the project?no/Does the deliverables comply with the WP Objectives as specified in the WP description?Xiyes no/Does the deliverable correspond with the activity description as specified in the Application Form?Xiyes

hatava channy prijelent





Report - ECUG

The final installment came late due to the problem of collecting documentation during lockdown. Nevertheless, the money was successfully divided among all staff members, who have finished their duties on the project even without payments.

Teachers from ECUG have participated in all trainings and the workshop and, with consultations with the coordinator, managed to solve all issues that would come up.

ECUG was the organizer of a CMT meeting, on which many important questions were solved and dissemination material was printed. They worked hard on the dissemination of the project, as well. The duty of the CMT meeting organizer was held very well by them.

They did not visit Oviedo or Granada due to the budget constraints, but they were informed about everything done there by regular communication with other members.





ECUG

Quality Assurance Check List for Review of Deliverable: : Activities 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.7, 7.2, 7.3 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?	x ¥es □ 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	excellentadequatepoor	/	/
Overall assessment and suggestions for improvement			1	/
Date of Quality Assura	ance performed by QAMB revi	ewers: Novembe	er 14 th , 2021	1
Deadline for submission	on of amended version of the	deliverables: Sep	otember 10 th , 2021	





Report - UNIKO

The final installment came late due to the problem of collecting documentation during lockdown. Nevertheless, the money was successfully divided among all staff members, who have finished their duties on the project even without payments.

Teachers from UNIKO have participated in all trainings and the workshop and, with consultations with the coordinator, managed to solve all issues that would come up.





UNIKO

Quality Assurance Check List for Review of Deliverable: : Activities 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.7, 7.2, 7.3 QAMB reviewer(s): Ardian Cerava

			1
Does the deliverable comply with the overall objectives of the project?	x yes no partially	/	/
Does the deliverables comply with the WP Objectives as specified in the WP description?	Xiyes □ no □ partially	/	/
Does the deliverable correspond with the activity description as specified in the Application Form?	⊠yes □ no □ partially	/	/
Is the deliverable presented using the Project's deliverable format	X yes □ no	/	/
Examples of complementary info: External sources used Bibliography List of contacts Methodology used (i.e. for surveys)	Xiyes □ no	/	/
Level of written English	□excellent □ adequate X poor	/	/
nce performed by QAMB revie	ewers: Novemb	er 14 th , 2021	
	objectives of the project? Does the deliverables comply with the WP Objectives as specified in the WP description? Does the deliverable correspond with the activity description as specified in the Application Form? Is the deliverable presented using the Project's deliverable format Examples of complementary info: External sources used Bibliography List of contacts Methodology used (i.e. for surveys) Level of written English methodology action of the format of the fo	objectives of the project?□ partiallyDoes the deliverables comply with the WP Objectives as specified in the WP description?Image: System and any and any and any and any and any and any	objectives of the project?□ partiallyDoes the deliverables comply with the WP Objectives as specified in the WP description?Image: Signal Sig

era



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