

WP6 - QUALITY ASSURANCE & MONITORING

6.2 QUALITY CONTROL COMMITTEE SECOND EVALUATION REPORT

INNOVAT - INNOVATIVE TEACHING ACROSS CONTINENTS -
UNIVERSITIES FROM EUROPE, CHILE AND PERU ON AN EXPEDITION

Deliverable N.	6.2.3
1st Document version:	04/03/2021
Last Update:	19/09/2022
Created by:	Universidad de Piura – P4 Breda University of Applied Sciences – P3
Project Number:	598758-EPP-1-2018-1-AT-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP
Project duration:	15/1/2019 – 14/10/2022

CAPACITY BUILDING IN HIGHER EDUCATION – KA2 – ERASMUS+



TABLE OF CONTENT

1. Introduction.....	3
2. Third evaluation process.....	3
3. Results	5
3.1. WP4 - INNOVAT OFFICES ESTABLISHMENT.....	5
3.2. WP5: PILOT INNOVATIVE CLASSES REAL CASES	7
3.3. WP6 - QUALITY ASSURANCE & MONITORING	10
3.4. WP7 - DISSEMINATION & SUSTAINABILITY.....	13
3.5. WP8 - PROJECT MANAGEMENT.....	15
4. Conclusions.....	18



1. INTRODUCTION

The Quality Control Committee was set-up to safeguard and guarantee the effective accomplishment of InnovaT's objectives as well as exercise continue evaluation and provide recommendations so that all activities are implemented accordingly and to the agreed high standard. The main task of the Committee is to assure the quality of all products and minimize cultural differences. The committee evaluates each year's products according to the standards indicated in the Logical Framework Matrix (LFM).

This report presents the results of the evaluation of the advances of the InnovaT project, which were carried out by the QCC's members from June 27th 2022 to the July 21th 2022.

An assessment form consisting of 7 combined questions was developed (agreed upon amongst all Quality Control Committee members and the project leader) and used for the evaluation, including closed and open questions to give a space for improvement proposals or comments regarding any aspect that was assessed on the closed questions.

2. THIRD EVALUATION PROCESS

FH Joanneum University of Applied Sciences, on behalf of the InnovaT partnership and as project coordinator, requested a nine months' extension of the eligibility period for the project that has been accepted by the EACEA and the new proposed ending date is 14/10/2022.

In this sense, we proposed that the third QCC evaluation take place after the final conference and before the European summer vacations.

The evaluation process started with the planning phase. The leader and co-leader of WP6 elaborated the Quality Control Committee's Annual Evaluation Program, including the work packages to evaluate, the schedule and the evaluation team

The execution stage included a self-evaluation phase where leader and co-leader of the WPs filled the self-evaluation template. Then, each work package was evaluated through interviews by two or more members of the QCC. It is worth noting that in order to maintain impartiality in this process, during the elaboration of the program it was indicated that the institution's leaders or co-leaders of a WP could not be evaluated by a QCC's member belonging to the same institution.



The program of the third evaluation carried out by the QCC is presented below:

N°	WORKPACKAGES	Leader/Co-leader	Evaluators
1	IN DEPTH ASSESSMENT & KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER OUTSET	FHJ /Co leader: USCP	BUAS-ULIMA-USACH
2	CAPACITY BUILDING OF TEACHING STAFF INNOVATIVE T&L	BUAS / Co partner: UACH	UDEP-UVM
3	MOOC DEVELOPMENT & PILOT	UC3M / Co leader: ULIMA	FHJ-UACH
4	INNOVAT OFFICES ESTABLISHMENT	FHJ /Co leader: ULIMA	UC3M-UCSP
5	PILOT INNOVATIVE CLASSES REAL CASES	UVM / Co leader: UC3M	BUAS-ULIMA
6	QUALITY ASSURANCE & MONITORING	UDEP /Co leader: BUAS	FHJ-UACH
7	DISSEMINATION & SUSTAINABILITY	UCSP /Co leader: USACH	UDEP-UVM
8	PROJECT MANAGEMENT	FHJ /National CPs: UVM/UDEP	UC3M-UCSP-USACH

WP1, WP2 and WP3 have already ended.

During the implementation phase, the leader and co-leader of WP6 organized on May 31th 2022, an informative online meeting with the purpose of presenting and explaining to the QCC's members, the evaluation process, expose the schedule and solve any doubts.

The QCC members sent a report for each evaluated WP through an online form which had as a deadline July 21st 2022.

Schedule

Activity	Date
Self-evaluation form for WP leaders and co-leaders Starting date	13/06/2022
Self-evaluation form End date	17/06/2022 (5 days)
QCC evaluators will analyze and process the information of the WP's to be evaluated	1 week
QCC second evaluation Starting date of the interviews	27/06/2022
QCC evaluation End date of the interviews	15/07/2022 (15 days)
Deadline for sending the online finding reports	21/07/2022 (4 days)



3. RESULTS

Below are the results of the evaluations made by the QCC and reported through the online form (see link: <https://fd8.formdesk.com/buas/InnovaT-QualityControlCommittee>).

3.1. WP4 - INNOVAT OFFICES ESTABLISHMENT

Work Package	WP4	
Evaluators	Name and last name	Partner institution
Evaluator 1:	Iria Estevez	UC3M
Evaluator 2:	Vladimir Sucasaire	UCSP

3.1.1. What are the most relevant strengths or good practices in the development of the work package?

- Followed a structured plan for the establishment of INNOVAT offices.
- Very close guidance from the leaders and co-leaders of the package to meet goals. In many cases, the implemented offices of the leaders and co-leaders served as a model of good practice for other institutions to replicate in their offices (this was done through visits).
- Flexibility in readjusting planning to the increased timeframe of the project.
- Involvement, commitment and motivation of all partners to achieve the objectives, despite having a barrier generated by the pandemic. Thanks to all of the above, the delays and problems due to COVID, which jeopardized the achievement of the project objectives, were overcome.

3.1.2. Do you consider that the activities programmed of the work package (for the current evaluation period) are adequate for the purpose of the INNOVAT project?

From the point of view that all the expected results in this package have been met, the programmed activities were appropriate, logically sequenced and clear.

3.1.3. Regarding the expected outcomes of the activities, do you consider that the methodology and/or the mechanisms used are adequate?

Thanks to the work of the WP4 leader and co-leader, as well as to the constant work of the project partners, almost all the objectives have been achieved in their totality. The project partners followed a structured planning to achieve these objectives. Although some universities are lagging behind, often due to the effect of the pandemic and lockdown, InnovaT offices in all of them have been deployed and different activities have been carried out. At this point it is necessary to highlight the degree of commitment, adaptability and



response from the partners. All this indicates that the methodology followed has been the right one.

3.1.4. Do you consider that the results achieved and the deliverables content meet the expected requirements and quantitative/ qualitative indicators of the work package?

As of today, the WP has reached the proposed objectives, where all the universities have an InnovaT office functioning and only some of them have yet to carry out reports or counselling sessions. There are some universities that have not yet carried out 10 counselling sessions. This expected result is in process, but we believe that between now and the end of the project it will be fulfilled.

3.1.5. Do you consider that the main recommendations you provided in the previous evaluation have been incorporated into the work package?

Our main comment was to take into account in the planning the singularities of each university involved in order to meet the objectives. As the objectives have been met, we understand that they have been taken into account.

3.1.6. Do you consider that this work package is generating synergies with other work packages within the project? If so, please indicate which work packages and explain.

This WP4 generates synergies with the WP2 and WP3 packages: the teachers who have gone through the training courses (previous WPs) must then use the INNOVAT offices deployed in this WP4 package, as it provides the main resource to put into practice what they have learnt, allowing them to provide a response and continuity of the educational service in the pandemic. This has been evidenced in the hybrid congress held in June, where teachers have shared their experience and best practices, as well as how to use the INNOVAT offices. This also fulfils a future function of sustainability of these offices, as it is the teaching staff trained in the InnovaT courses and MOOCs who will act as ambassadors of the InnovaT offices in their respective universities.

3.1.7. Please, indicate aspects or improvement opportunities that you consider necessary for the work package.

Given that the package has been completed and has achieved the expected results, we believe that this section does not apply. However, for future projects, in order to share good practices, visits to implemented facilities can be formalized within the activities.



3.2. WP5: PILOT INNOVATIVE CLASSES REAL CASES

Work Package	WP6	
Evaluators	Name and last name	Partner institution
Evaluator 1:	Margo Rooijackers	BUas
Evaluator 2:	Merssy Quispe	ULima

3.2.1. What are the most relevant strengths or good practices in the development of the work package?

- Successful collaboration between educational partners (teachers & students) and external partners (entrepreneurs, other organizations, communities) established.
- The working relationship between the organizations and students. After the work that they had done with the external organization, the students felt that they had made a difference in their daily work. This experience empowered them and motivated them to continue working.
- Learnings from previous teacher training related to the use of digital and other innovative tools, techniques, and approaches were applied during the pilot classes. This is very important because this training came at a time when everybody needed to transition to online work and teaching due to COVID.
- The collaboration between educational partners and external stakeholders successfully impacted the organizations of the external partner(s).

3.2.2. Do you consider that the activities programmed of the work package (for the current evaluation period) are adequate for the purpose of the INNOVAT project?

The activities as programmed were of crucial importance because the purpose of the INNOVAT project is to implement innovative strategies for teaching and learning. In this WP, teachers implemented their newly acquired knowledge and skills into their professional practice and experimented with innovative teaching & learning tools, techniques and approaches. And the students applied those tools with the external organizations, like a snowball effect. It's a transfer of knowledge cycle that keeps going. Although the pandemic made teaching in general and especially collaborating with external partners, much more complex, participants successfully managed to implement the pilot innovative classes with the necessary adaptations. On the other hand, one can also state that exactly because of the pandemic digital tools & innovations were embraced quicker and more easily by teachers and students. As a suggestion, the lessons learned in this WP could be used in the continuous improvement process of a program's curriculum, to start small at first, and then it can be replicated in more programs. The implementation of the Innovat offices, with all the resources and technology, will be a good support to make this happen.



3.2.3. Regarding the expected outcomes of the activities, do you consider that the methodology and/or the mechanisms used are adequate?

The methodology used was adequate. Cases and students were selected, the pilot classes were executed, and finally, the events were organized. Perhaps the biggest hiccup that interrupted the methodology was the connectivity to the internet. Because the classes were online, for example, many students who live in rural areas don't have access to the internet or the connection is very poor, so the Universities did their utmost to improve this situation (amongst others provision of modems so that students had access to the internet and could connect to class). On the other hand, many documents are available that show proof of the activities undertaken during the different phases of the WP. Especially, the teacher reports demonstrate a richness of information. Regarding the events, as organized, in the last phase of the WP, less proof is available. For instance, it remains unclear whether virtual participation of teams of students from other Universities was possible and whether trainers from EU and/or project team members were invited to virtually participate and provide feedback. Furthermore, a final report which compiles the results and the lessons learned is (still) missing.

3.2.4. Do you consider that the results achieved and the deliverables content meet the expected requirements and quantitative/ qualitative indicators of the work package?

Yes, the results were achieved to meet the expected requirements. As previously mentioned, it took more time, but in general, they were met. Teachers were able to successfully implement their new knowledge and skills in their teaching, collaborations between education and external stakeholders were established and students were able to positively impact the organizations of their client(s). To be able to achieve these results amid a pandemic deserves a big compliment. However, due to the restrictions of the COVID-19 pandemic, it was not possible in some cases to include external organizations that meet the original criteria: integrate 1 female entrepreneur; 1 migrant entrepreneur, and 1 entrepreneur from an agricultural/rural area.

3.2.5. Do you consider that the main recommendations you provided in the previous evaluation have been incorporated into the work package?

Not applicable. Even though this WP doesn't have a previous evaluation, the following is a recommendation to continue working on this WP:

- The pilot class was designed to be face-to-face and was finally given online, so for future editions, they could be hybrid, so all the students can have a fair chance of being able to attend and participate, so they don't lose motivation. If they can't make it to class, they still can attend online. The pandemic has come to change the way we do things



3.2.6. Do you consider that this work package is generating synergies with other work packages within the project? If so, please indicate which work packages and explain.

WP5 is certainly generating synergies with other work packages within the Innovation Project. Especially this is the case for WP2 (innovative training), WP3 (the MOOC), WP4 (implementation of InnovaT Office), and WP7 (The H-conference). During WP2 & 3, knowledge and training regarding innovative teaching & learning approaches, tools & techniques were provided that could thereafter immediately be implemented in the Pilot Innovative classes. It also relates with WP4, because innovative classes need an innovative research center like InnovaT Office (each partner has one already working). Furthermore, synergy with WP4 is also evident although the pandemic caused some delays and equipment was installed later than originally planned. After the establishment of these offices professional knowledge clips etc. could be produced for online & hybrid educational purposes. Finally, in the H-conference teachers from the different partner institutions could show & share their experiences with a wider audience of professionals interested in innovative education.

3.2.7. Please, indicate aspects or improvement opportunities that you consider necessary for the work package.

Not applicable since this WP is already finalized. Points for improvement (for future editions):

- Invest time and effort to establish and intensify contact with external stakeholders when needed.
- During the execution of the pilot classes, organize moments of InterVision between teachers from partner institutions to learn with and from each other. Preferably, also include the EU partners in this InterVision process.
- Invest extra effort to bring students from multi-disciplinary backgrounds together in the pilot classes.
- Try to involve students (more) in the whole trajectory of preparing, executing, and evaluating the pilot classes.
- Rethink how to incorporate the student's voice more during a conference as the H-Conference.
- Have the support from the teacher who has been already trained in innovative classes in order to train the next group of teachers
- The trained teacher could also develop mechanisms to make sure the knowledge doesn't get lost, for example: to make manuals, guides, and informative videos about the innovative tools that can be used in other classes.



3.3. WP6 - QUALITY ASSURANCE & MONITORING

Work Package	WP6	
Evaluators	Name and last name	Partner institution
Evaluator 1:	Matthias Werner	FHJ
Evaluator 2:	Nadja Starocelsky	UACH

3.3.1. What are the most relevant strengths or good practices in the development of the work package?

The leader of this work package considers that one of the great strengths of the project is the good relationship that exists between leader and co-leader, with a highly organized work of both institutions. Likewise, there is good feedback from the partners, which allows both the contributions of partners and external evaluator to be a strength to monitor the project. According to the co-leader, WP 6 in general managed to establish of a “culture of quality and evaluation” throughout the whole project. Relevant factors for this success are seen in the very good communication and collaboration between WP lead and WP co-lead on the one hand, and the high commitment of the whole team on the other hand. Both aspects point to the relevance of communication and the “human factor” for successful cooperation.

3.3.2. Do you consider that the activities programmed of the work package (for the current evaluation period) are adequate for the purpose of the INNOVAT project?

The leader of the work package considers that in general, a good job has been done. However, previously, in the work package there was not much feedback between the leader and co-leader of WP6, but it has not been a problem since there is good communication. The work package leader considers that it would have been positive to involve the quality evaluators more from the beginning. Likewise, the interaction with the evaluators could have been improved, being the latter the role they have is not directly involved with all the work packages in a synchronous manner, but rather, they are involved only in quality evaluations. The WP applied a mix of qualitative and quantitative approaches. Good and productive balance between, on the hand, qualitative approaches, a high emphasis on communication and cooperation in quality management and, on the other hand, quantitative measurements have been realized. As documented in the reports the different practices and tools in quality management (e.g. surveys after activities; reflections at the end of meetings) have been accepted and adopted very good by the partners. In the evaluation interview, the co-leader stated that, compared to other projects, INNOVAT really stands out due to its “most elaborate structure” in respect of quality management.



3.3.3. Regarding the expected outcomes of the activities, do you consider that the methodology and/or the mechanisms used are adequate?

The internal reporting methodology and above all the external evaluation were an excellent methodology. Likewise, it is considered an adequate methodology since it has served to improve recurring activities, especially, considering that there are activities that are not continuous and are only evaluated once. On the other hand, the leader of the work package considers that the internal reports have served for the self-regulation of the work teams themselves, since it has allowed them to evaluate their progress according to the project. The high acceptance and implementation of quality management activities throughout the project can be regarded as a successful outcome of WP6 activities and approach. Concerning the overall project, the high effort related to quality management paid off, as the project activities could be conducted in high quality, and also additional activities have been conducted (e.g. 2nd run of the MOOC); also the strong quality perspective enabled the project to cope with the Covid-19 pandemic situation effectively.

3.3.4. Do you consider that the results achieved and the deliverables content meet the expected requirements and quantitative/ qualitative indicators of the work package?

The leader of this work package considers that the results are adequate and that the deliverables have been met. In addition, within WP6 there have been no problems in terms of deliverables. Likewise, in the case of the reports, follow-ups have been carried out since these reports are made between three and four months, which allows the leaders of other packages to be activated for continuous self-regulation. Survey results, evaluations and reports are very well documented and meet the indicators. The project's ability to adapt to the Covid-19 pandemic and to proceed successfully under the new conditions underlines that quality management worked very well and contributed to general project goals.

3.3.5. Do you consider that the main recommendations you provided in the previous evaluation have been incorporated into the work package?

The leader of this work package considers that the main recommendations have been incorporated into the project, an example of this is the improvements made within the recommendations provided by the evaluators. Likewise, it is evident that it is necessary to involve the evaluators more in a future project, through a request to each of the institutions. In addition, there was a lack of follow-up on the involvement of the evaluators in the project. According to the co-leader, the recommendations from the evaluations have been registered and discussed. On the other hand, project reality might bring about limitations, e.g. related to the recommendation of a closer involvement of QCC members and external evaluators.



Nevertheless, QCC meetings have been held, and communication with QCC members worked effectively (e.g.: re-scheduling of evaluation due to project prolongation; preparation of evaluation)

3.3.6. Do you consider that this work package is generating synergies with other work packages within the project? If so, please indicate which work packages and explain.

The leader of the work package considers that there is synergy with the other work packages since they are linked and intertwined, maintaining a permanent dialogue between activities. Quality control and management is a cross sectional activity and is meant to have impact on all the other WPs. The project's "quality culture" (cf. question 1) illustrates that WP6 has been successful in contributing to the "operational" WPs as well as to the other two "transversal" WPs (PM, dissemination). In this context, the co-leader explicitly stressed the very good exchange between quality management WP and project management WP.

3.3.7. Please, indicate aspects or improvement opportunities that you consider necessary for the work package.

The aspects to improve are the following:

- Involve evaluators.
- The quality issue was formed on the basis that the people who make it up know how this quality control is carried out (eg WP6 has support from the quality department of the university).
- It is important that there is communication and feedback, especially when there are delays.
- An opportunity for improvement may be the tools that were chosen since they were not dynamic.
- There is synergy in this type of project, and the objective of this package was not to be an auditor but to accompany the process.
- The delays emerge from other areas or indicators; in this sense the reports could have been more dynamic and personalized. Apart from these points – as stated above – the rather big effort made for quality management in the project obviously paid off.



3.4. WP7 - DISSEMINATION & SUSTAINABILITY

Work Package	WP6	
Evaluators	Name and last name	Partner institution
Evaluator 1:	Dante Guerrero	UDEP
Evaluator 2:	Nirkos Gutierrez	UVM

3.4.1. What are the most relevant strengths or good practices in the development of the work package?

The most relevant strengths and good practices are:

- Hire an external editor to produce the book (7.4. Participation in conferences and joint publication).
- Hire an external company to produce audio-visual content on social networks (7.5 InnovaT Electronics Conference)
- Work as a team to have a high convening power in conferences (7.5 InnovaT Electronics Conference)
- Promote active communication with partners to obtain relevant information (7.1 Dissemination and Sustainability Strategy)

3.4.2. Do you consider that the activities programmed of the work package (for the current evaluation period) are adequate for the purpose of the INNOVAT project?

The purpose of creating awareness among target groups, external experts, and society, in general, is fulfilled, thanks to the individual contribution of the partners. Therefore, "cooperative" work was obtained to achieve the stated goals. Although all the WP7 indicators have indeed been met, new material is still being worked on to take advantage of the content (YouTube, Facebook, and Newsletter) and develop more skills (7.1 Dissemination and Sustainability Strategy)

3.4.3. Regarding the expected outcomes of the activities, do you consider that the methodology and/or the mechanisms used are adequate?

The methods and mechanisms were adequate. However, it should be considered that:

- As a result of the hybrid conference, the main activity of WP7 was particularly good. However, the work exceeded the capacity of the leading institution and was reinforced by that of the host institution (7.5 InnovaT Electronics Conference).
- The newsletters supply valuable information for the consortium but could have a greater frequency and be smaller. (7.1 Dissemination and Sustainability Strategy).
- It is important to have the book in both languages, and although it would have been desirable to present it at the conference, the translation presents challenges to support



the literary style. This can be achieved with a single translator (7.4 Participation in conferences and joint publication).

3.4.4. Do you consider that the results achieved and the deliverables content meet the expected requirements and quantitative/ qualitative indicators of the work package?

All quantitative and qualitative indicators have been met, and new material has been developed, taking advantage of all the information obtained (7.1 Dissemination and Sustainability Strategy, 7.4. Participation in conferences and joint publication, 7.5 InnovaT Electronics Conference).

3.4.5. Do you consider that the main recommendations you provided in the previous evaluation have been incorporated into the work package?

Most of the recommendations were incorporated, which were sufficient to obtain the expected results, consultations were also conducted at specific moments of the project and doubts were clarified. Until now, cooperation has been achieved, but greater coordination between WP7 members has yet to be developed.

3.4.6. Do you consider that this work package is generating synergies with other work packages within the project? If so, please indicate which work packages and explain.

Compared to previous years, there has been greater synergy and cooperation between the work packages in general, given that everyone has taken part in the communication, especially progress and the result has been joined.

3.4.7. Please, indicate aspects or improvement opportunities that you consider necessary for the work package.

Among the improvement opportunities (recommendations) necessary for WP7, in addition to those proved in Annex 2, it is proposed:

- Propose greater instances (meetings, focus groups, brainstorming, and others.) that allow the collaboration of the partners to achieve the goals.
- Regarding the conference, there was no clarity about the responsibility of execution between leader and co-leader.

Regarding the project, the following information is collected:

- The execution model with a leader and co-leader for each work package requires a special maturity of the institutions and teams, this has worked very well in some work packages, however, it is convenient to evaluate if the model is valid for other projects.
- Propose more dynamic schedules that allow a better evaluation of the Latin American reality.



- Integrate the experience and lessons learned from individuals from Latin American institutions in the organization of MOOCs and combine them with the European proposal.
- Supply more flexibility in time and demand in the proposed courses so that users complete and learn

3.5. WP8 - PROJECT MANAGEMENT

Work Package	WP6	
Evaluators	Name and last name	Partner institution
Evaluator 1:	Roxana Aranda	USACH
Evaluator 2:	Iria Estevez	UC3M
Evaluator 3:	Vladimir Sucasaire	UCSP

3.5.1. What are the most relevant strengths or good practices in the development of the work package?

- The high degree of adaptation, responsiveness and commitment by the universities in order to effectively achieve the project tasks and activities, and consequently the objectives.
- The implementation of structured guidelines after the extension of the project for the achievement of the objectives.
- National coordination in each country has served to respond to the particular situation that each country has experienced as a result of the pandemic.
- This package is coordinated by Joanneum with good Project leadership: Towards the end of 2021 there was a transition of leadership with the departure of Ligia and Rita, but with the continuity of Clarissa.
- The departure of the people in charge was informed by mail and there was a virtual meeting where they said goodbye, plus another meeting where Ligia handed over to Doris. Doris took over the leadership, with a briefing and very good communication.
- Regarding the impact of this change: there was a gap in the more administrative financial part, with no clear answers regarding the use of the budget. For example, for the conference some partners didn't know beforehand if they had resources for certain expenses, as there was a delay in the response to these questions.
- There was always good will, but still some delays in the answers. At the last meeting in Peru they introduced a new person in this administrative area.
- Language, after a couple of years of the project, was no longer such an important constraint, even though both people who left spoke Spanish.
- All in all, the coordination has been quite good, despite the difficulties, prioritizing good communication with the partners, the leadership of the responsible institution is felt



3.5.2. Do you consider that the activities programmed of the work package (for the current evaluation period) are adequate for the purpose of the INNOVAT project?

The activities planned for the continuity of the project have been optimal and timely. It is worth noting the use of structured guides for this purpose. All the expected results have been achieved in this WP, so the planned activities were adequate. We have continued with the project progress meetings and have resumed 2 face-to-face meetings (in Breda and Lima). These meetings are vital for the continuity of the project and the minutes generated with the agreements and dates allow all those who have not been able to attend to be updated on the commitments. In addition, the use of the platform also helps.

3.5.3. Regarding the expected outcomes of the activities, do you consider that the methodology and/or the mechanisms used are adequate?

We believe that the methodology used has been the most appropriate, as can be seen in the fulfilment of the activities and of the objectives despite the pandemic. There is evidence of the flexibility adapting to the circumstances born as a result of the pandemic. This was shown in the last meeting that was held in a hybrid form (face-to-face-virtual). This meeting showed that the project was not only successful in keeping partners connected and motivated from the beginning and working effectively during the pandemic, but also in reconnecting in person and strengthening ties after the pandemic. Having resumed face-to-face meetings has been quite good, because seeing each other face to face improves communication and the building of mutual trust. There is one more meeting in Chile, in Valdivia (in October). The importance of this WP needs to be emphasised, as it is cross-cutting and becomes the backbone of the whole project.

3.5.4. Do you consider that the results achieved and the deliverables content meet the expected requirements and quantitative/ qualitative indicators of the work package?

The presentations and minutes of the meetings are the most relevant results of this WP. The presentation of progress made for each package is uploaded to the platform and this allows the status of each package to be reviewed quite easily. The platform is quite well structured and also allows the uploading of all financial information to identify purchases, expenses and payments. Although the platform was difficult to use at the beginning, it is now very well managed and is even considered user-friendly, as it allows all the information to be sorted. Unfortunately, there have been internal delays in the submission of financial reports caused by the particular situations (restrictions) of each country and institution. The national coordinators gave a lot of support in order to overcome these difficulties and to achieve the fulfilment of these indicators.



3.5.5. Do you consider that the main recommendations you provided in the previous evaluation have been incorporated into the work package?

The recommendations provided in the previous evaluation were:

- Evaluate the relevance of having an indicator that allows measuring the progress of the project by WP, for example, the fulfilment of indicators by WP, this will allow a general monitoring of progress and may allow the goals defined for future similar projects.
- In terms of management, it has been handled quite well, nothing to improve.
- Just see how the management and accountability of the expenses that have not been executed will be done, given the uncertain situation we are experiencing as a result of the pandemic.
- Regarding the first observation made in the previous evaluation, on the indicators of achievement of the project, some excel internal reports are completed every 4 months that allow to see the progress of the project, although there is neither an indicator per package nor a global one for the project.
- The third point had to do with using the budget that could not be spent on travel due to restrictions during the pandemic for more training for teachers. There was a desire to hold a face-to-face workshop in Chile and another in Peru (including a budget for internal national travel), since after the conference in Piura the teachers themselves requested it, but this required authorisation for a change in the original budget. Recently, the European Commission approved this budget reallocation for these workshops. To do this, it is necessary to fit in with the Latin American and European agendas, in order to avoid the northern hemisphere holidays, so it was set for the end of August and the beginning of September. There was also flexibility in the request for attendance at the conference in Piura, where more than two people were approved (between 5 and 7 teachers from each university that had participated in the project). The concern now, understanding that the project activities have been fulfilled, is how to give continuity to the actions after the closure of the project. The innovation offices have all been set up and are operational, which allows for continuity in their use. We want to create a community of practice with the teachers who were trained, where they can have a space for exchanging good practices.



3.5.6. Do you consider that this work package is generating synergies with other work packages within the project? If so, please indicate which work packages and explain.

This is a transversal and umbrella package of the others, because it supervises the fulfilment of all the others, so it has by definition synergy with all of them, being the backbone of the whole project

3.5.7. Please, indicate aspects or improvement opportunities that you consider necessary for the work package.

- Financial reporting is a complicated subject to understand as it is more specialized. So, it has needed more support from the leaders of the WP.
- It is recommended that the national coordinators (effective support) or partners who have experience in this type of project offer training or advice about financial reporting or administrative management.
- Managing such a large project is very complex and Joanneum has done it quite well. It has been a successful project, even if there have been some minor conflicts or delayed responses between partners or leaders and co-leaders regarding workload and distribution of tasks. These frictions generate a need for mediation which is very important from those who manage the project.
- Changes of people in a long-standing project also generate difficulties, however, the commitment of all the institutions and the leadership of the managing institution has been fundamental. The support of the project coordinator was felt throughout the project. This project not only taught us about innovation, but it was also a learning experience in terms of managing international cooperation projects; there are very good things to replicate in other projects. It requires persistence and being permanently attentive to the needs and feedback of each working group. Monitoring, constant reminding and timely feedback were essential.

4. CONCLUSIONS

- The QCC evaluators consider that the total of work packages demonstrated that their results reflect the accomplishment of the requirements and qualitative and quantitative indicators.
- The main project strengths or good practices identified by the QCC evaluators are:
 - Flexibility in readjusting planning.
 - Involvement, commitment and motivation of all partners.
 - Collaboration with external partners.
 - Good relationship between leaders and co-leaders.
 - Highly organized work.
 - Very good and active communication between partners.
 - Structured guidelines to meet goals.



- The QCC evaluators consider that the activities programmed for the current evaluation period were appropriate, logically sequenced, clear, timely and of crucial importance for the project.
- The methodology and mechanisms were adequate and consistent with the project objectives. However, some issues have been recognized:
 - For the pilot classes, the virtual participation of teams of students from other Universities and the virtual participation of trainers from EU and/or project team members could have been an added value, as well as a report compiling the results and the lessons learned. This is something that can be developed in terms of project sustainability by the community of practice.
 - Despite all challenges related to the pandemic, the joint research teams, the different languages used and the whole process implemented digitally, the book was almost ready for the conference which took place in June. It still needs editing and verification so that it would reach the desirable quality the project consortium is aiming at.
- The results achieved and the content of the deliverables in general are very good and met the expected requirements. The quantitative and qualitative indicators observed in reports and in user satisfaction surveys are very satisfactory. However, some issues have been recognized:
 - For some universities, the 10 counselling sessions at the InnovaT offices is in process and expected to be fulfilled before the end of the project.
 - Due to the restrictions of the COVID-19 pandemic, for the pilot classes it was not possible in some cases to include external organizations that meet the original criteria: integrate 1 female entrepreneur; 1 migrant entrepreneur and 1 entrepreneur from an agricultural/rural area. Nevertheless, the original target in number of students and external organizations was surpassed. From 72 to 600 students and from 18 to 49 external organizations.
 - There have been some internal delays in the submission of financial reports. Despite the particular situations (restrictions) of each country and institution caused by the pandemic, the national coordination gave a lot of support in order to overcome these difficulties and to achieve the fulfilment of these indicators.
- All recommendation of direct value and impact of the second QCC report were incorporated into the work packages evaluated.
- Although this is the final QCC report, still all recommendations provided shall be taken into consideration in the final steps of the conduction of all work packages and for future projects.