ERASMUS+ project reference number: 617490-EPP-1-2020-1-MD-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP

COOPERA

Integrating Dual Higher Education In Moldova and Ukraine

Monitoring and Evaluation Manual

Deliverable 5.1

DUAL HIGHER EDUCATION

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

COOPERA
DUAL HIGHER EDUCATION IN MOLDOVA AND UKRAINE

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

COOPERA
DUAL HIGHER EDUCATION IN MOLDOVA AND UKRAINE

COOPERA

INTEGRATING DUAL HIGHER EDUCATION IN MOLDOVA AND UKRAINE

MONITORING AND EVALUATION MANUAL

Project Acronym:	**COOPERA**
Project full title:	INTEGRATING DUAL HIGHER EDUCATION IN MOLDOVA AND UKRAINE
Project No:	617490-EPP-1-2020-1-MD-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP
Funding Scheme:	ERASMUS+
Coordinator:	ASEM-Academy of Economic Studies of Moldova
Project start date:	January 15, 2021
Project duration:	43 months

Monitoring and Evaluation Manual is a deliverable within COOPERA project "Integrating Dual Higher Education in Moldova and Ukraine", reference number 617490-EPP-1-2020-1-MD-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP, funded by the European Union through the Erasmus + Programme 2014-2020, KA2 – Cooperation for innovation and the exchange, Key action 2 - Capacity Building in Higher Education.

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

COOPERA
DUAL HIGHER EDUCATION IN MOLDOVA AND UKRAINE

DOCUMENT CONTROL SHEET

Title of Document:	**Monitoring and Evaluation Manual**
Work Package:	WP5 Quality Plan
Last version date:	15/04/2021
Status:	Draft
Document Version:	v.01
File Name	COOPERA_Monitoring and Evaluation Manual_v.01
Number of Pages	51
Dissemination Level	Internal (project`s consortium) - RESTRICTED

VERSIONING AND CONTRIBUTION HISTORY

Version	Date	Revision Description	Responsible Partner
v.01	15/04/2021	The first version of the document structure, done by the WP5 team	P14-EPDRI/SI
v.02	15/07/2021	Final draft version of the document elaborated	P14-EPDRI/SI
v.03	28/09.2021	Final version of the document published	P14-EPDRI/SI
v.04	25/12/2022	Final rectified version of the document published	P14-EPDRI/SI
v.05	15/10/2023	Final rectified version of the document published	P14-EPDRI/SI

TABLE OF CONTENT

1. INTRODUCTION

The COOPERA project's main objective is integrate DHE in the Partner countries in general, and to improve individual employability and development, increase suitability and continuity between the demands of the professional world and the initial training of university students, and achieve of greater economic efficiency and social integration, in particular.

In order to ensure high project implementation and results' quality, the consortium will continuously collect, collate, analyse and react to data and feedback from target users, consortium members and internal and external stakeholders. Quality Control and Monitoring will aim at identifying quality issues at a stage early enough to allow the partnership to take timely measures for improvement.

The role of the current Monitoring and Evaluation manual is to help set appropriate quality standards and targets and to ensure that all activities and deliverables in the COOPERA project are in compliance with the predefined requirements. The Quality Plan could be described as a guide for the quality control activities to be implemented throughout the project lifetime. The document establishes, inter alia, a set of criteria for measuring the quality of different types of activities and products defined and applied in line with the project Logical Framework Matrix (LFM) and the approved project activity timeline. The document also determines which structures are responsible for the different quality control activities and lays out a communication plan for all involved project participants and stakeholders.

As specified in the approved application form, quality assurance and quality control will we carried out on internal and external levels.

The Monitoring and Evaluation manual content covers:

- Internal monitoring, quality and risk management;
- External monitoring;
- Evaluation of the technical and financial reporting.

Chapter 2 clearly defines monitoring and evaluation of quality of key project outputs and events. In the process of project evaluation, both quantitative and

qualitative indicators will be used to assess progress and quality of key project outputs and events including WP1's DHE questionnaires; DHE report; WP2's Study Visits to EU partners; COOPERA Country Workshops on DHE development; WP3's White Paper on DHE; Recommendations for amendments to the Law on Higher Education; Guidelines on DHE implementation; WP4's Dual Study Programs; Training materials for DHE programs; Stakeholder's feedback report; WP6's Organisation and realisation of the dissemination events on institutional level, Final conference, TG satisfaction survey. Feedback from target users will be collected, collated and analysed throughout the project life through questionnaires (upon finalisation of project outputs, trainings and events, and during the introductions of new services and the implementation of new practices), as well as via interviews and focus groups during partner meetings.

In addition, all key intellectual outputs including, report on companies needs for DHE; flexible and generic Dual Higher Education Models for Moldova and Ukraine developed; white Paper on DHE elaborated; recommendations for amendments to the Law on Higher Education secured; guidelines on DHE implementation elaborated; dual Study Programs identified; training materials for specific Dual Study Programs developed; analysis of the results of pilot testing of each of specific DHEM realized, report published; will be reviewed by evaluators appointed by the project's coordinator and WP5 leader. The evaluators will be persons with relevant expertise who have not participated in the development of the output that they are evaluating. The purpose of the internal evaluation will be to monitor specifically the quality of the intellectual outputs in order to ensure applicability of the project results to the needs and expectations of the target groups.

Chapter 3 defines the internal monitoring strategy and outlines the responsibilities of the project partners as well as the core principles of the risk management strategy.

Chapter 4 describes the external monitoring strategy. Chapter 5 focuses on the financial and technical reporting duties of the partners and finally, the Annexes to the document provide templates (which are also available separately) to be used by the project partners.

2. QUALITY EXPECTATIONS

The present chapter presents the expectations of the project consortium with reference to the COOPERA deliverables and activities as well as the expectations relevant to the project management.

2.1. Quality of the project implementation

COOPERA is following the overarching aim **integrate DHE in the Partner countries in general, and to improve individual employability and development, increase suitability and continuity between the demands of the professional world and the initial training of university students, and achieve of greater economic efficiency and social integration, in particular.** The partners agree that this overall objective shall always be in the forefront of all decisions to be taken. The partners therefore might decide to prioritise certain activities over others which have a higher impact in relation to the achievement of the objectives. Quality in the project means that the achievement of the objectives might be more important even if it means e.g. postponing a deadline or changing some aspects of an activity.

To remind all partners, the four specific objectives of the project are:

OB1: To identify needs and specific requirements of companies in different industrial sectors and businesses for DHE and to find companies willing to participate in pilot implementations of DHE during the project;.

OB2: To develop a flexible and generic DHEM to support different needs and interests of employers, HEIs and students in different industrial and business sectors and to provide recommendations to HEIs for implementation of DHE;

OB3: To test the specific DHE models generated from the developed generic DHEM, by realizing their pilot implementations during the project and to analyse achieved results;

OB4: To propose changes to legislation/regulations to adapt DHE in the Partner countries.

2.2. Quality of project deliverables

The deliverables of the COOPERA project may be classified into reports, events (such as study visits, trainings, workshops and conferences), methodologies which include for example the strategies, guidelines, white paper and recommendations, and "other products".

A common quality expectation for all deliverables is their relevance to reach the overall objective and the specific objectives, with a further focus on their development in an efficient and effective manner. Timely delivery following the project work plan as identified in the COOPERA project`s timeline (modified and agreed by the Project Strategic Steering Committee (SSC) on six-month basis) is expected.

In the process of quality control and monitoring, activities, outputs and outcomes will be benchmarked against the project timeline and the quantitative and qualitative indicators defined in the LFM. Depending on the deliverable, indicators may refer to reports, teaching and learning materials produced, website content and data, online platforms and forums, number of events organized, number and level of satisfaction of event participants, number of online registrations, downloads and visits, evaluation from target users of project results' impact and sustainability. Table 1 below presents the indicators and criteria for measuring their success and feedback tools needed to be developed per type of output/ outcome (Table 1). Annex A of the Monitoring and Evaluation manual provides detailed presentation of the indicators, criteria and assessment tools for each of the 7 WPs and their outputs and outcomes.

Table 1: Indicators and criteria for measuring project outputs and outcomes' success (for more details, please refer to Annex A)

Output/ outcome	Indicators	Success criteria	Feedback tools and templates
Events	Number of participants; Feedback from participants;	The number is different for each kind of event Positive feedback from participants (>=75% positive feedback is considered success)	Events' agenda, attendance list, materials, minutes, photos, videos and other relevant evidence incl. participants' venue and traveling information form;

			Events evaluation forms; Feedback surveys' results;
Reports	Document's content and length; Number of pages; Feedback from target users and relevant stakeholders; Feedback from QAT and SSC; Feedback from the External Evaluator;	Document's content and length differs depending on the report type (for more details see Annex A); QAT and SSC approval Positive feedback from target users and relevant target users (>=75% positive feedback is considered success); Positive feedback from the External Advisory Board;	Report templates; QAT and SSC meeting minutes; Target users and stakeholders' evaluation forms; External Advisory Board communications incl. the External Evaluation Report;
Learning Materials	Topics covered in the content; Audio-visual materials' length and quality; Feedback from target users and relevant stakeholders;	Min. requirements concerning content and audio-visual materials length and quality; Positive feedback from target users and relevant stakeholders (>=75% positive feedback is considered success);	Evaluation forms; Feedback survey results; External Evaluator's assessment;
Product/ services	Depending on the product/ service there are a number of indicators incl. number of target users, documents' content and length, number of newly established structural units etc.; Feedback from target users and relevant stakeholders;	Depending on the product/ service, the proposed indicators differ (for more details see Annex A) Positive feedback from target users and relevant stakeholders (>=75% positive feedback is considered success);	Depending on the product/ service, there are a number of feedback tools to be used incl.: Evidence of newly established units incl. proof of embedding of these in the universities' organizational charts; Evaluation forms of target users and relevant stakeholders; Feedback survey results;

2.2.1. Visual identity requirements

All reports and documents will respect the visual identity of the COOPERA project (e.g. logo, title and Erasmus+ project number).

A consistent and common format for all document deliverables is to be followed which includes a common front page and common styles (fonts, headers, tables of content, etc.). The template for document deliverables is provided in Annex B and separately for the project partners. In all documents, the partners will use references, page numbering, and figures as well as table numbering.

Additional guidelines on the usage of the project logo and rules of EACEA are available in dissemination strategy.

2.2.2. Quality of meetings/workshops, trainings, conferences and seminars

All events organized by the project will be implemented professionally. The organizers provide in due time a full information package to the participants including the draft agenda, letter of invitation and a note on the logistics (informing about travel arrangements, venue, suggested hotels, etc.). Time for preparation activities depends on the type of event e.g. several months for conferences and several weeks for trainings. This will be defined in separate action plans by WP leaders.

The meeting organizers ensure smooth registration processes (including list of attendees for signatures) and the implementation of the meetings respecting appropriate time for coffee and lunch breaks as well as the availability of all necessary materials (e.g. pens and paper, beamer, etc.). The organizers will also ensure the recording of minutes of the meetings in a concise style including a list of action points. Material associated with the meetings will reflect the visual project identity. Where appropriate (e.g. for trainings, seminars) also feedback forms will be distributed among participants (Annex F) and event reports related to feedback forms will be prepared by organisers (Annex H).

Each event will be documented by various materials as described in the table below.

Table 2. Documentation of COOPERA event:

**Name and affiliation will be visible; all personal data will be hidden.*
*** Upon the approval of the presenter.*

Type of event	Materials	Available at	
		COOPERA web-site	Partners web page
Country Workshops/ Seminars/ Training sessions	News	x	x
	Agenda	x	x
	List of participants*	x	
	Minutes	x	
	Gallery	x	x
	Presentations**	x	
	Report on feedback forms		
Steering committee meetings and Conferences	News	x	x
	Agenda	x	x
	List of participants*	x	
	Minutes	x	
	Gallery	x	x
	Presentations**	x	
Study visits	News	x	x
	List of trainees*	x	
	Training materials	x	×
	Report on feedback forms		
	Minutes	x	x
	Gallery	x	x
TG Information sessions/ Career development sessions	News	x	x
	List of participants*	x	
	Gallery	x	
	Minutes	x	
	Report on feedback forms		
Mass-media appearance	News	x	x
	List of participants*	x	
	Gallery/link URL	x	x
	Minutes	x	

2.2.3. Quality of promotional materials

Communication and dissemination activities of the project will adhere to the Communication and Dissemination strategy of the COOPERA project (WP6). All promotional materials will reflect the visual identity of the project and Erasmus+ programme. The project coordinator (P1-ASEM) is responsible for design of all promotional material. The draft version will be sent to all partners for comments and suggestions, before printing, publishing and distribution. The promo materials will be disseminated by all project partners at events which are relevant to reach the project's target group (i.e. not only events organized by the project itself, but also general events with a focus on university lifelong learning).

2.2.4. Quality of websites and other electronic tools

The project envisages setting up the public COOPERA web-site, COOPERA Facebook page. All representation tools will be continuously updated by the project`s partners and are intended to effectively communicate the results of the project.

P1- ASEM will be responsible for setting up and maintaining the COOPERA web-site, and each partner will be responsible for their own web-site and HTML catalogues. All partners are asked to include a short description of the COOPERA project with a link to the official website on the institutional webpage.

The COOPERA webpage can be accessed by all partners depending on their assigned tasks and roles. All tools will be implemented with high performance, good functionality and stability.

2.2.5. Quality of methodologies

The methodologies (e.g report on companies needs for DHE; flexible and generic Dual Higher Education Models for Moldova and Ukraine; white Paper on DHE; recommendations for amendments to the Law on Higher Education; guidelines on DHE implementation; dual Study Programs; training materials; report on the results of pilot testing of each of specific DHEM) developed within COOPERA project will always be tailored to the defined target groups, they will be tested and refined and particular emphasis will be put on their usability. The

methodologies will always be well understandable, readable and developed with a strong focus on the future practical and sustainable implementation in order to reach the desired project impact.

2.3. Quality of Project Management

The project management structure has been established at the beginning of the project phase to ensure effectiveness, decisiveness, flexibility and quality of work. It involves the Contractor, the Grant Coordinator (GC), Executive Board (EB), Project's Strategic Steering Committee (SSC), a Project Support Team (PST) and Quality Assurance Team (QAT). The SSC will review the activities and decide on any necessary contingency measures in reorganisation tasks and resources – as usual with a strong focus on the project impact. The project management will be transparent and flexible but also strict enough to ensure the implementation of the project activities in order to achieve the project's objectives.

The COOPERA`s management structure is based on vast managerial experience of all partners and is established to ensure effectiveness, decisiveness, flexibility and quality of work.

All partners will be involved in each WP. In accordance with the defined plans (Coordination Plan, Risk Management, Communication, Dissemination & Sustainability) with respect to the equality of all project partners, leaders of the WPs will have a greater responsibility for implementation of WP & cooperation with all project's partners, together with the GC. The assignments are evenly distributed among the all project partners.

Each partner is equally and independently responsible for assigned activities, money use and reporting. Site Managers (contact persons) have the responsibility for the local management.

2.4. General Project Guidelines

COOPERA project will follow different project guidelines and respects the requirements of the programme. Apart from the Monitoring and Evaluation Manual at hand, the reference documents include:

EACEA – COOPERA project Grant Agreement
COOPERA project Partnership Agreements
COOPERA Communication and Dissemination Strategy
COOPERA Handbook
EACEA - Guidelines for the Use of Grants
EACEA - Frequently Asked Questions

2.5. Amendments to the guidelines

The procedures in this manual can be amended by agreement of all partners or by a decision taken by the Project Strategic Steering Committee (SSC). Any new version is communicated to all the partners and takes effect 15 calendar days after this communication.

3. INTERNAL MONITORING

Internal monitoring will be carried out by all partners, including self-evaluation by using the LFM, Timeline, budget and cash flow tables, SSC meetings, monitoring visits of the QAT and questionnaires / satisfaction surveys of target groups (e.g. participants of dissemination and training events; see also Annex F and Annex H). The COOPERA project and partners` webpage will also be used for monitoring of project activities.

For the harmonization of legislative framework on quality assurance in HEIs, enhance QA management and building institutional capacities will be applied: from team member to WP leader, then to the coordinator and after that to the SSC for final approval.

3.1. Project Quality Assurance Strategy

The Quality Assurance in COOPERA project includes four levels of quality control: (1) Deliverable authors, Task and WP leaders; (2) Deliverable reviewers; (3) Coordinator level; and (4) Strategic Steering Committee level and final approval.

1. **Deliverable authors, task and WP leaders:**

The 1st level corresponds to the activity level. The presentation of deliverables and activities of the project are a joint responsibility of the associated Task Leader and his/her team, further partners involved in the activity and of the corresponding WP leader. It shall guarantee the quality and timeliness of the deliverable as identified in Application Form and WP action plans (modified and agreed by the SSC on six-month basis). They present a “final draft deliverable” to the QAT (i.e. the deliverable reviewers).

2. **Deliverable reviewers (QAT and Advisory Team):**

The 2nd level of control is elaborated by at least two assigned reviewers of the QAT who are not leaders of Task/WP within which the deliverable is produced. The reviewers have 5 working days to respond by sending comments using the template for the quality assurance check list (Annex A). The deliverable authors have 5 more working days to conform to the reviewer comments or send their

written objections. In this case the reviewers will have another 5 days to send back their final comments.

In case profound disagreements between reviewers and Task leaders arise, the 3rd level control of the deliverables will allow the coordinator to have a final say – while he/she may also involve the rest of the consortium if deemed necessary.

3. **Coordinator level:**

The 3rd level control is carried out by the Grant Coordinator. If a draft deliverable has not passed the 2nd level control and there are disagreements between the deliverable authors and the reviewers, the Coordinator will take the necessary corrective actions in order to come up with acceptable deliverables. If necessary, the Coordinator may involve the rest of the consortium. A draft deliverable that has passed the 2nd level of control will still be checked by the Coordinator for final comments and when accepted it will be forwarded to the Project Strategic Steering Committee for formal approval.

4. **Project Strategic Steering Committee level and final approval:**

The 4th level control is elaborated at the Project Strategic Steering Committee level. The Project Strategic Steering Committee is the highest decision making body of the partnership that takes the final decision for the approval of major deliverables. It shall be possible to include a deliverable in the project reports even if its formal approval is still pending, if it has passed the 2nd and 3rd level of control without profound disagreements as then no major alterations are to be expected.

It is expected that the partners will also establish internal quality control mechanisms, i.e. the site manager will always check the output of his co-workers before sending documents to the COOPERA team or before uploading them on the project communication tools.

3.2. Quality responsibilities

4 structures/ bodies will be mainly involved in the processes of monitoring and evaluation of the quality of the project achievements, each one operating at a different level, in order to avoid miscommunications and overlaps.

3.2.1. Task Leader

- Is responsible for coordinating the development of the deliverable(s) according to the deliverable template.
- Is responsible for assigning parts of the work leading to the deliverable to the other partners involved in the activity.
- Is responsible for coordinating the work of the other partners involved in the task, providing guidance when necessary.
- Is responsible for aligning the contributions of the other partners involved in the task, in order to produce the deliverable.
- Is responsible for the submission of the draft deliverable via COOPERA to the WP leader (1st level control), the QAT (2nd level control) and the grant coordinator (3rd level control).
- Is responsible for implementing the suggestions of the QAT team, assigning certain amendments to the other partners contributing to the task as appropriate.
- Is responsible for sending the amended draft deliverable.
- Reports to the WP Leader for any problems occurring during the implementation of the activity.
- Cooperates with the WP Leader and the other partners in the same WP in order to ensure the activity's progress in conformity with other activities and that any cross-task inputs and outputs are being delivered as foreseen by the WP description (respecting any changes approved by the Project Strategic Steering Committee as recorded in the respective minutes).

3.2.2. WP Leader

- Is responsible for preparing and updating of WP Action plan, making sure that all activities are in the time frame defined
- Is responsible for coordinating the Work Package and ensuring that all the activities are contributing to the WP's objectives.
- Cooperates with the Task Leaders and the coordinator in ensuring that all of the contributing partners are smoothly cooperating with a view to accomplish the WP's objectives and that any cross-WP inputs and outputs are being delivered as foreseen by the project description.
- Sends alerts in time to remind about submission deadlines and the procedures to be followed and provides input and suggestions to the

Task Leaders of the WP during the development of the relevant deliverables.

- Provides to the Task Leaders comments and suggestions on the draft deliverables (1st level control).
- Cooperates with the Task Leaders in ensuring the implementation of the suggestions of the QAT team (2nd and 3rd level control).
- Verifies the satisfactory implementation of the recommendations.

3.2.3. Quality Assurance Team (QAT)

- Collect and verify the completion of deliverables submitted by the respective WP leaders.
- Sends the Quality Assurance Check List to the Task Leader and the Coordinator.
- Check and prevent any procedural non-conformity. Identify and record any relevant problems.
- Initiate, recommend and/or provide solutions through the reporting system in place.
- Verify that action has been taken to solve problems.
- Facilitate the communication with the External Evaluator.
- Supervise and report during the Quality Panels scheduled to take place at the partner meetings.
- Supervise the drafting, development and implementation of Interim and Final Internal Evaluation Reports.

3.2.4. Project Coordinator

- Cooperates with the QAT and the Task Leaders on all matters arising relevant to ensuring the quality of the project's deliverables.
- Accepts the deliverable or provides final comments to the Task Leaders and WP Leaders (3rd level control).
- Cooperates with the WP Leaders in order to ensure that all WPs are progressing in conformity with each other and that any cross-WP inputs and outputs are being delivered as foreseen by the WP description.
- Informs the QAT, the WP Leaders and the Task Leaders of any changes in the Partnership Agreement and the related Timeline or any implicit

changes in the implementation of the project that may affect the timing or the content of the relevant deliverables.
- Officially submits all approved deliverables after their approval (4th level control).

3.2.5. Project's Strategic Steering Committee (SSC)

SSC is a project management body, which as far as quality is concerned, is responsible for ensuring that the project achieves its objectives by verifying the quality of the delivered outcomes, and by providing data for the annual Project Progress Reports. The SSC ensures that the content of the deliverables is in accordance to the project specifications and predefined standards and that it is of appropriate academic quality. The consortium will introduce the principle of rotation in the SSC membership to guarantee that all project partners are equally involved and committed to the project management processes. Over the 36 project months, SSC will consist of representatives of both the project partner institutions in the EU and the PCs. In addition, in each of the PCs a local management facilitator will be selected by the PC HEIs themselves to support the project coordinator when dealing with country-specific management issues.

SSC plays a crucial role in the overall planning, monitoring and evaluation of the project activities and deliverables. More specifically - quality control wise - the SSC is charged with the tasks to:

- Check the quality of the project deliverables, and Interim and Final Quality Reports.
- Ensure that the produced content is of appropriate academic quality and in accordance with project requirements and specifications.
- Co-hosts the quality panels during the partner meetings.

3.3. Common templates and formats

All document based deliverables are being drafted based on a common MS Word format. This format is adopted by the SSC in order to ensure a common appearance of deliverables as well as ensuring that a minimum amount of information will appear consistently in all documents produced by the project.

This is not relevant to deliverables that by their nature need to have a different format (i.e. project brochures, newsletters).

The document template is given in Annex B of this manual as a separate document.

All presentations shall be based on a common MS PowerPoint template. The template is provided in Annex C as a separate document which will be also shared with the Project's partners.

For the professional execution of meetings also some other templates have been developed to record the attendance and minutes of the meeting (provided in Annex D und Annex E as separate documents for download).

3.4. Quality feedback by the target groups

The satisfaction of stakeholders, beneficiaries and end users will also be investigated. It will take into account a variety of information from different sources using visits, interviews, questionnaires to target groups and consultation with the project beneficiaries.

In order to allow the impact assessment of the project activities, a template for feedback for different meetings / events has been developed. It needs to be adapted to the specific needs but the main items shall not be deleted. This form is provided in Annex F as a separate document which will be shared with the project's partners. Furthermore, a specific event report template (minutes) has been developed which is to be filled by project partners (organisers) for all COOPERA events (open door events, workshops, info days etc. – except SSC meetings). Furthermore, this template can be used to inform colleagues and partners about other events attended (promoting COOPERA). In the second case just the first page of the template should be prepared. This form is provided in Annex H as a separate document.

3.5. Project Risk Management

As part of the internal quality management, a regular risk assessment will be carried and reviewed out during the Project's Strategic Steering Committee meetings (Risk brainstorming) which shall lead to corrective actions and potential adaptations of the Work Plan/ Timeline based on a sound process.

The risk management strategy addresses issues that could potentially endanger the achievement of the overall goal of the project and its objectives considering potential financial risks (overspending and under spending), timing (postponing and preponing of activities/deliverables), performance risks (project management), and sustainability of the project developments. The main aim will be to provide a sound assessment, to anticipate challenges in a systematic way and to minimize the potentially negative overall impact.

The identification and assessment of new risks is a joint responsibility of all project partners who have to communicate them to the Coordinator and the rest of the partnership, eventually suggesting also possible interventions and solutions, as soon as they get aware of those risks. In particular, partners may think of preventive actions (avoiding that the risk occurs) and corrective actions (decreasing the severity and impact), specifying also the resources that would be needed.

The SSC may react in several ways, ranging from the simple acceptance of the situation in the case of negligible risks, to the enforcement of a mitigation plan including alternatives, workarounds and the proposed corrective actions that will make the risk consequences acceptable for the consortium.

Also the external reviewer will be involved in the risk management, who will be tasked to assess if there is a risk that the project will fail to meet its key indicators and if there is a risk that project partners will not be able to spend all the money according to the Partner budget table.

The proper allocation of resources to the project by the individual project partners is of outmost importance. There are several possible risks connected: the delay of the project implementation as defined in the project work plan; the rushed implementation of the work plan with low quality; an under spending during the project implementation (also causing a shift in the headings' ratio), meaning that the project timetable is followed with reference to technical deliverables, yet the relevant expenditures are not timely invoiced or validated; etc.

The project partners all have to ensure that they allocate the needed resources to the project, both human and financial.

3.5.1. Practical approach of risk identification

The first step in project risk management is to identify the risks that are present in a project. The risks should furthermore be identified as early as possible in order to deal with them properly and to think about corrective and/or preventive actions.
In order to identify and monitor the risks within COOPERA project, a monitoring sheet for risks has been developed including the information on corrective and/or preventive actions (Annex I).

3.5.2. Risks / Uncertainties Monitoring procedure

- Executive Board identify possible risks/uncertainties in their WP and fill in the template (Annex I).
- The risks monitoring templates (Annex I) are communicated to QAT Team + WP5 Leader (EPDRI) + Project coordinator (ASEM).
- QAT Team + WP5 Leader (EPDRI) + Project Coordinator (ASEM) register, analyses and priorities risks/uncertainties.
- QAT Team + WP5 Leader (EPDRI) + Project Coordinator (ASEM) plans and implements risk responses.

4. EXTERNAL MONITORING

The purpose of the monitoring process is to provide support and guidance to individual site managers and project management teams. It is designed to assist them in areas where they require support. The QAT (Quality Assurance Team) will be able to offer an objective point of view and be „a fresh pair of eyes “in assessing progress to date.

For external monitoring purposes an experienced quality control expert from outside the consortium will be engaged.

The tasks related to the external evaluation of the project results and implementation during the whole project life will be subcontracted to an external evaluator. The latter is expected to complete the following tasks:

- Carry out/execute regular independent peer review of project results and implementation
- Produce, as a result of his/her continuous work, an External Evaluation Report at project’s final stage.

The external evaluator (an expert or organisation that is external to the consortium) will conduct online interviews with the WP leaders and various project team members and will review the complete project documentation as well as various project outputs and events evidence.

The External Evaluation Report will summarize the findings of the continuous peer review and will provide assessment of project impact and the quality of the results achieved. It will also make conclusions on the consortium efficiency. It will include an independent cost/benefit analysis of the project. The External Evaluation Report will also make recommendations for strengthening the sustainability of the project results sustainability and for ensuring long-term impact. The Report will be discussed at the final partner meeting and will be published e on the project’s website.

5. EVALUATION OF THE TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL REPORTING

The main guidelines for the reporting are laid out in the Manual for contractual and financial management, discussed during the 1st Steering Committee meeting. Project Support Team (PST) team and Coordinator will continuously monitor the partners' reporting and check the supporting documents.

As it is defined in Partnership Agreement and Manual for Contractual and Financial Management, there will be three annual reports of the partners. They will be reviewed by PCT team and approved by the Coordinator, taking into consideration following assessment criteria:

- Conformity of the expenditures with the budget of the project;
- Eligibility of the expenditures;
- Correct use of the procurement procedures, whenever required;
- Correctness and completeness of all supporting documents;
- Correctness of the calculations and applied exchange rates;
- That any changes which occurred between budget categories are eligible and justified;
- All copies of the annual reports must be signed in original by the appointed contact person of partner institution;
- Expenditures must be in conformity, including full eligibility, with the allocated Budget in the Partnership Agreement.

In case that information in Annual Report are not complete or justified, the PCT team will help and make recommendations on how this situation can be rectified prior to the final approval of the Annual report by the Coordinator. The Report approved in this way is the basis for the transfer of next instalment to the partner institution.

ANNEXES

Different supporting documents have been elaborated for the overall enhancement of the project Monitoring and Evaluation manual.

Annex A Indicators and success criteria for project outcomes and outputs

WP1 PREPARATION **Lead partner: P1-ASEM/MD; Co-leader: P11-UdL/ES;** **Participating partners: P1-P14**					
Deliverable/ Outcome Ref. N.	**Title**	**Type**	**Indicator**	**Success criteria**	**Assessment tool**
1.1.	Preparation of overall project`s implementation secured	Service /Product	Participation at the Grand Holder coordinators meeting; Elaboration of project handbook; Number of Partnership agreements elaborated and signed;	Participation at the Grand Holder coordinators meetings secured; One (1) project's handbook elaborated; (13) Partnership agreements signed;	Document published on website; Signed Partnership Agreements shared internally;
1.2.	Companies needs for DHE identified	Report	Elaborated surveys of company's needs for DHE; Number of surveys completed; Report elaborated;	(1) questionnaire on companies needs elaborated; (14) questionnaires completed (1) report published;	Questionnaires e-published on the project webpage; Report e-published on the project webpage;

WP2 FLEXIBLE AND GENERIC DUAL HIGHER EDUCATION MODEL (DHEM) **Lead partner: P13- AWSB/PL; Co-leader: P12-VUM/BG** **Participating partners: P1-P14**					
Deliverable/ Outcome Ref. N.	**Title**	**Type**	**Indicator**	**Success criteria**	**Assessment tool**
2.1.	Flexible and generic Dual Higher Education Model (DHEM) developed	Event /Report	Project Working Groups (PWG) established; Number of study visits to EU partners realised; Number of COOPERA Expert Workshop realised; Feedback from target users.	(7) PWGs created; (4) Study visits realised; Positive feedback from SV' attendees (>=75% positive feedback is considered success). (3) COOPERA Expert Workshop realised Positive feedback from expert workshop attendees (>=75% positive feedback is considered success).	PWGs acts of establishment; Study visits' agendas, attendance lists, minutes, photos and other relevant evidence; Expert Workshops' programme, attendance lists, minutes, photos and other relevant evidence;

WP3 CREATION OF LEGAL AND OTHER CONDITIONS FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF DHE **Lead partner: P11-Udl/ES; Co-leader: P10-DHBW/DE** **Participating partners: P1-P14**

Deliverable/ Outcome Ref. N.	Title	Type	Indicator	Success criteria	Assessment tool
3.1.	White Paper on DHE elaborated	Service/ Product	NPTF groups formed in Moldova and Ukraine; White Paper on DHE elaborated and published;	(2) NPTF groups formed; (2) White Paper on DHE elaborated and published;	NPTF acts of establishment; Document available on the project webpage;
3.2.	Recommendations for amendments to the Law on Higher Education secured	Report	Number of Recommendations for amendments to the Law on Higher Education elaborated and published;	(2) Recommendations for amendments to the Law on HE elaborated and published;	Documents published on the project webpage;
3.3.	Guidelines on DHE implementation elaborated;	Report	Number of Guidelines on DHE implementation elaborated;	(2) Guidelines on DHE implementation elaborated and published;	Documents published on the project webpage;

WP4 PILOT TESTING OF THE FLEXIBLE AND GENERIC DHEM
Lead partner: P10-DHBW/DE; Co-leader: P13- AWSB/PL
Participating partners: P1-P14

Deliverable/ Outcome Ref. N.	Title	Type	Indicator	Success criteria	Assessment tool
4.1.	Dual Study Programs elaborated	Service/Product	Number of Dual Study Programs elaborated /modernised; Number of Agreements elaborated and signed;	(7) Dual Study Programs elaborated/modernised; (7) Agreements elaborated and signed;	Documents available on the project and institutional webpage;
4.2.	Materials for specific DHEMs elaborated	Training material	Number of training materials elaborated;	(7) Training materials for specific DHEMs elaborated;	Training materials available on the project webpage;
4.3.	Equipment procured;	Service/Product	Number of equipment items purchased and installed;	Equipment items purchased and installed;	Equipment items installed at PCUs;
4.4.	Piloting of Dual Study Programs realised	Report	Number of Reports on piloting of DSE elaborated;	(7) Reports on piloting of DSE elaborated;	Documents available on the project webpage;
4.5.	Stakeholders feedback secured	Report	Number of questionnaires elaborated; Number of reports published;	(1) Questionnaires elaborated; (7) Reports on stakeholders feedback elaborated;	Documents available on the project webpage;

WP5 QUALITY ASSURANCE AND MONITORING **Lead partner: P13-EPDRI/SI** **Participating partners: P1-P14**					
Deliverable/ Outcome Ref. N.	**Title**	**Type**	**Indicator**	**Success criteria**	**Assessment tool**
5.1.	Internal evaluation reports prepared	Event/ Report	Number of pages in MEM; Indicative topics; Number of Monitoring Visits; Number of Internal evaluation reports;	(1) Monitoring & evaluation manual published; (3) Monitoring visits realised; (3) Intermediate reports prepared;	Monitoring & evaluation manual published on the website; Monitoring Visits' minutes; Intermediate reports prepared and shared internally.
5.2.	External evaluation reports prepared	Report	Number of pages; Indicative topics; Feedback from target users; Audit report;	(1) Advisory recommendations; (1) Audit report prepared;	Report published on the website; SSC meetings minutes; Audit report shared internally;
5.3.	Fine-tuning of procedures and regulations realised	Event	Number of NPTF and PWG meetings	(5) NPTF meetings; At least (4) PWG meetings;	NPTF and PWG meetings minutes;

WP6 DISSEMINATION, EXPLOITATION & SUSTAINABILITY **Lead partner: P12-VUM/BG; Co-leader: P1-ASEM/MD** **Participating partners: P1-P14**					
Deliverable/ Outcome Ref. N.	**Title**	**Type**	**Indicator**	**Success criteria**	**Assessment tool**
6.1.	International campaign released	Report/ Service/ Product	Number of pages in Dissemination, exploitation and sustainability plan; Number of pages in brand book; Project webpage elaborated and maintained;	(1) Dissemination, exploitation and sustainability plan elaborated; (1) Project's brand book elaborated; (1) Project webpage elaborated and maintained;	Dissemination, exploitation and sustainability plan published on the project webpage and shared internally; Project's brand book shared with partners; Project webpage available;
6.2.	National campaign realised	Event	COOPERA Facebook page for each PC created; Number of articles national mass-media published;	(2) Facebook pages created; At least (7) articles in national mass-media published;	Articles published in national mass media;
6.3.	University campaign realised	Event	Number of Institutional dissemination events realized;	At least (7) Institutional dissemination events realized;	Event's promotional and communication materials, agenda, attendance lists,

			Number of institutional articles published;	At least (7) institutional articles published;	photos, videos and other relevant evidence, Event participants' evaluation forms, Satisfaction survey results; Articles published on PCU's web page;
6.4.	Dissemination and Sustainability reports secured	Report	Number of dissemination and sustainability reports elaborated;	(2) Dissemination and sustainability reports elaborated;	Dissemination and Sustainability reports published on the project webpage;
6.5.	Exploitation reports secured	Report	Number of Exploitation reports elaborated;	(2) Exploitation reports submitted;	Reports published on the project webpage;
6.6.	Final Conference organized	Event	Final Conference organized;	(1) Final conference realised; Positive feedback from final conference attendees (>=75% positive feedback is considered success).	Event's promotional and communication materials, agenda, attendance lists, photos, videos and other relevant evidence, Event participants' evaluation forms, Satisfaction survey results;

WP7 PROJECT MANAGEMENT **Lead partner: P1-USM/MD** **Participating partners: P1-P14**					
Deliverable/ Outcome Ref. N.	**Title**	**Type**	**Indicator**	**Success criteria**	**Assessment tool**
7.1.	Efficient overall management secured	Report	Number of management working groups (MWG) established;	(7) Management working groups established;	MWGs Acts of establishment published;
7.2.	Steering Committee meetings organised	Event	Number of consortium meetings; Number of participants in the meeting;	At last (4) Steering Committee meetings realised;	Meeting agenda, attendance lists, minutes, materials, photos and other relevant evidence, Meeting participants' evaluation forms, Satisfaction survey results;
7.3.	Interim and Final report submitted	Report	Number of reports;	Trimestral reports (R1-R6), Interim and final report submitted;	Reports submitted and shared internally;

Annex B Word template for project document deliverables

TITLE OF DELIVERABLE: Subtitle

Project Acronym:	**COOPERA**
Project full title:	INTEGRATING DUAL HIGHER EDUCATION IN MOLDOVA AND UKRAINE
Project No:	617490-EPP-1-2020-1-MD-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP
Funding Scheme:	ERASMUS+
Coordinator:	ASEM-Academy of Economic Studies of Moldova
Project start date:	January 15, 2021
Project duration:	43 months

Annex C PowerPoint template for project presentations

Annex D Attendance sheet template for different meetings / events

STUDY VISIT TO THE_____

ATTENDANCE LIST

Project Acronym:	**COOPERA**
Project No:	617490-EPP-1-2020-1-MD-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP
WP / Deliverable/ Action:	
Project partner (s)	
Place/ Date	

Nr. Pers.	Surname, Name	Institution, Position	Signature
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			

Annex E Word template for minutes of different meetings / events

NAME OF THE EVENT

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

Project Acronym:	**COOPERA**
Project No:	617490-EPP-1-2020-1-MD-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP
WP / Deliverable/ Action:	
Project partner (s)	
Place/ Date	

Date:

1.
2.
3.

Annex F Participant feedback form template for different meetings /events

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

a) Event Date:

b) Event Venue:

c) Participant data (not compulsory) - First name:

d) Participant data (not compulsory) - Last name:

c) Participant data (not compulsory) - Organisation

d) Participant data (not compulsory) – Country:

2. OVERALL FEEDBACK

a) GENERAL ASPECT: Please indicate your agreement with the following statements by ticking the appropriate number:

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
The objectives of the Event were clear	○	○	○	○	○
The issues on the Agenda were consistent with the Event objectives	○	○	○	○	○
The Event was useful for helping our organisation to carry out the expected project activities	○	○	○	○	○
The materials produced before and during the Event are clear to develop the project activities	○	○	○	○	○
All the partners contributed to the success of the Event	○	○	○	○	○
The Event was useful for establishing good working relationships among the partners	○	○	○	○	○
The Event met my expectations	○	○	○	○	○
The content of the Event was adequate selected and well prepared	○	○	○	○	○
The Coordinator significantly contributed to achieve the Event objectives	○	○	○	○	○

b) LOGISTIC AND ORGANISATION: Please indicate your agreement with the following statements by ticking the appropriate number:

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
The Agenda (and related materials) were circulated to the partnership in advance	○	○	○	○	○
Sufficient time was allocated to each issue on the Agenda	○	○	○	○	○
The Organiser contributed to install a collaborative working environment	○	○	○	○	○
The infrastructure provided was satisfactory (IT, PC, Internet etc.)	○	○	○	○	○
The Event took place in a suitable room	○	○	○	○	○

c) CONTENTS: Please indicate your agreement with the following statements by ticking the appropriate number:

	Not at all	To a small extent	To some extent	To a great extent	To a very great extent
After the Event, to which extent are project expected activities and results clear to you.	○	○	○	○	○
After the Event, to which extent are work plan and deadlines clear to you?	○	○	○	○	○
After the Event, to which extent are partner's role and responsibility in the project activities clear to you.	○	○	○	○	○
After the Event, to which extent are the decisions taken clear to you?	○	○	○	○	○

3. STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE EVENT

a) Please illustrate any strengths of the event and contributions or activities you enjoyed:

b) Please indicate how you think the event could have been improved:

c) Any further comments?

Annex G External monitoring report

External Monitoring Report (no.; date)

Project Acronym:	**COOPERA**
Project full title:	INTEGRATING DUAL HIGHER EDUCATION IN MOLDOVA AND UKRAINE
Project No:	617490-EPP-1-2020-1-MD-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP
Funding Scheme:	ERASMUS+
Coordinator:	ASEM-Academy of Economic Studies of Moldova
Project start date:	January 15, 2021
Project duration:	43 months

Number of project		617490-EPP-1-2020-1-MD-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP	
Visit completed by		Signature	
1.Project partner information			
1.1. Name:			
2. Visit information			
2.1. Location of visit (country, street, number)			
2.2. Date of visit:			
2.3. Contact person:	Name:	Position:	
3. Summary of progress to date			
3.1. Summarize progress of activities against the implementation schedule			
3.2. Summarize progress against specific objective indicators from the logical framework matrix			
3.3. Is there a risk that the project will fail to meet its key indicators? (if yes, please describe what corrective actions can be taken)			
3.4. Is there a risk that the Project partner will not be able to spent the all the money according to the Partner budget table?			
4. Description and status of the activities within project work plan			
Generally, is the project proceeding in accordance with the work plan? Specifically, which activities have not taken place which should have according to the work plan? What is the level of risk of the project not being completed on time or to the intended standard?			

5. Progress against indicators			
Outputs/outcomes	**Indicator**	**Achieved to date**	**Plan to achieve indicator**
PREP1	1.		
	2.		
	3.		
DEV2	1.		
	2.		
	3.		
DEV3	1.		
	2.		
	3.		
DEV4	1.		
	2.		
	3.		
QPLN	1.		
	2.		
	3.		
DISS & EXP	1.		
	2.		
	3.		
MNGT	1.		
	2.		
	3.		

6. Finance
6.1. Is the Project partner obtaining all necessary supporting documentation and storing this properly? If not, what action will the Project partner take to rectify the solution?
6.2. Is the Project partner experiencing any problems in terms of cash flow? This includes any problems caused by delays with payment from the ASEM?
6.3. Are any underspends or overspends anticipated? For overspends, what is the solution to keep within Partner budget table? For underspends, are there proposals for how this can be used?

6.4. Other		
7. Main problems encountered and recommendations		
Related to	Description of problem	Project partner Solution/s and/or recommendation/s
Procurement/installation		
Development of strategic documents		
Implementation of strategies		
Delivery of trainings and services		
Marketing/public relations		
Technical and financial reporting		
Relations with Project coordinator, PST and QAPT team		
Other		
Report received by the Project partner		
I confirm that I have received and read the monitoring report		
Name		Date:
Scheduled date of next visit		
Personnel to be present from the Project partner		
1.		
2.		

Annex H Event report template for organisation of meetings / events

Author:	
Event Title:	
Event Date:	
Event Venue:	
Type of event: (National, international, press conference, promotional event etc.)	
Short description:	
Organiser(s):	
Agenda:	Link to the agenda
Total number of participants:	
Links to further information:	ex. COOPERA website
Other personal remarks:	
Here you can include the information such: ▪ Presentation of COOPERA at the event? ▪ What was the subject of your presentation? ▪ Were you invited to present COOPERA or you have registered for the event by yourself? ▪ Were COOPERA promotional materials presented at this conference/event/meeting etc. ▪ COOPERA Stand? ▪ Etc.	

1. Event Organisation Details

Invitation was sent off to participants on:	
Information Material was sent off to participants on:	
Date of Initial Participant List Compilation:	
Date of Final Participant List Compilation:	
Total Number of Participants Invited	
Date of Agenda Finalisation:	
???	
???	

2. Problems encountered during the event preparation phase

(To be filled by organisers)

Organisers: *Please complete (if you have not met with any problems in that phase, please fill in "N/A". Please also include any feedback by the participants* ***before*** *the workshop)*

1.
2.

3. Event Rollout

Some general information (to be filled by organisers

3.1. Final Event Agenda + Participant list

(Please attach the final event agenda and the list of participants)

3.2. Event Implementation – Commentary by Organising Partners

WP-leader

Please add your comments, if any
Task leader
Please add your comments, if any

4. Event Evaluation by Participants

4.1. Summary of the Participant Feedback Form

Results to be filled by organisers based on the questionnaire results. Please note: insert only the overall percentage of all feedback forms received (e.g. participants total number=30; 15 of them were most satisfied and 15 of them satisfied, please include 50% in the column most satisfied and 50% in the column satisfied.)

	Most satisfied	Satisfied	Moderately satisfied	Rather dissatisfied	Not at all satisfied
The event administration					
The structure of the programme					
The venue and facilities					
The presentations					
The discussions					
The event dinner and subsistence					
The overall organisation was professional.					
The time management was always to my fullest satisfaction.					
The style and level of communication between organisers and participants was professional.					
I would recommend this kind of event to my colleagues.					

Prior Experience of Similar Events – Overall %	Please fill in the overall percentage of participants with prior experience of similar events

Strengths and limitations of the event: please include comments received

Strengths of the event and contributions or activities enjoyed by participants:	• XX • XX
Suggestions for the improvement:	• XX • XX
Any further comments	• XX • XX

4.2. Additional comments

to be filled by local partner

Please add the following additional information here

- *Charts of the statistical figures from the tables above (pie or bar charts);*
- *Any further comments concerning the feedback you received by the workshop participants*

5. Additional comments

May be filled by any of the organising partners

Please add in any other comments concerning the preparation and organisation of this event:

Annex I PROBLEM REPORT/CORRECTIVE - PREVENTIVE MEASURES FORM

Problem reported by:	
Date:	
Problem description:	
Possible causes of the problem:	

Actions undertaken to solve the problem	
Timeline	
Responsible institution and person(s)	

Actions undertaken to solve the problem	
Timeline	
Responsible institution and person(s)	