

MAcroeconomics for Justice and Inclusive Growth

MAJIG

Deliverable 6.3

Quality Assurance Strategy

Project Coordinator: Professor Marco Missaglia, University of Pavia

Lead Beneficiary: University of Pavia

Date of publication: 31/01/2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction	3
2. The Project: 'MAJIG'	3
3. Quality Assurance (Strategy)	4
3.1 Internal Evaluation	4
3.2 External Evaluation	6
4. Quality Assurance Tools	7
5. Risk Management	7
6. Quality and Evaluation Plan	8
6.1 Indicators	9

ANNEXES

Annex 1 – Evaluation Form for Training Courses

Annex 2 – Evaluation Form for Project Meeting

Annex 3 – Quality Assurance Matrix for project Deliverables

1. Introduction

This document (Quality and Evaluation Plan) presents the Quality Assurance Strategy of the Erasmus + project "Macroeconomics for Justice and Inclusive Growth - MAJIG " (project ref. number 101083194 — MAJIG — ERASMUS-EDU-2022-CBHE).

It is developed within the scope of the Work Package 6 “Ensuring High Quality and the efficient management of the project” in compliance with the Project description and all applicable rules and guidelines; UNIPV is in charge of WP6.

The document outlines the strategy for how the quality control mechanisms will be applied so that the operational, management and working procedures are comprehensively monitored and improved throughout the project duration. It provides a set of guidelines and procedures, for internal use, to ensure the overall quality and progress of the MAJIG project activities and an efficient project management.

2. The Project: 'MAJIG'

The MAJIG Project (“MACroeconomics for Justice and Inclusive Growth”) addresses, for the Bolivian and Colombian context, critical issues such as, the urgent need indicated by ECLAC to re-think macroeconomic policies, and then macroeconomic tools and models, to overcome the combination of slow growth, mounting foreign debts and financial instability that characterized the very last years in South America. The social tensions that recently took place in the continent (Bolivia and Colombia are no exception) constitute an alarm bell and the need to move macroeconomic policies in the direction of justice and inclusive growth is increasingly recognized.

The central idea of MAJIG is to contribute to this task by using the already existing capacities in the Latin American universities belonging to the consortium, and strengthening them with the help of some world leading experts in the field of macroeconomic modeling working with the European universities of the consortium.

The MAJIG partnership includes different actors from different countries:

Università degli Studi di Pavia, Italy (Coordinator)
Università degli Studi di Cassino e del Lazio Meridionale, Italy
Universidad Mayor de San Andrés, Bolivia
Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Colombia
Universidad de La Salle, Colombia
Universidad de Cartagena, Colombia
Universidad Mayor de San Simón, Bolivia
Aalborg Universitet, Denmark

MAJIG is a 36 months project co-funded by the Erasmus+ programme of the European Union (project ref. number 101083194 — MAJIG — ERASMUS-EDU-2022-CBHE), running from 01/02/2023 to 31/01/2026.

3. Quality Assurance (Strategy)

Quality assurance aims to ensure that the Project objectives are met in the most effective way.

The overall quality management of the MAJIG project is a transversal activity as it regards the monitoring, evaluation and quality assurance of all Work Packages.

The Project partners, with the lead of UNIPV as WP6 Leader, will constantly monitor and assess the quality of the Project and its effective implementation. The document which outlines the methodology on implementation of reporting and reviewing procedures, fundamental to ensure the Project Quality Assurance, is the Quality Assurance Plan (QAP), developed in this deliverable (D6.3).

The QAP outlines the strategy to apply the quality control mechanisms, so that the operational, management and working procedures are monitored and improved throughout the Project duration.

The QAP defines not only the general approach to quality control, but also the internal and external evaluation as well as the established indicators and means of verification.

To ensure that the project implementation is of high quality and completed in time, the Project Quality Assurance is composed of an internal and an external component. Therefore, the quality control and monitoring process of MAJIG is to be carried from an internal quality perspective (from the partners directly benefiting from the project) and from an external quality perspective (external evaluation by the external evaluator).

3.1 Internal Evaluation

The Project internal monitoring and quality granting system is firstly related to the agreement requirements of the European Commission. The latter will be constantly monitored in order for them to be complied with and for the required reports to be sent within the due date.

WP6 Leader (UNIPV) leads the internal quality control and monitoring.

Together with the contractual agreements, the monitoring and quality granting systems also includes, for certain tracing activities as workshops, internships, training, etc. the use of quality instruments, such as questionnaires, with the aim of assessing goals and identifying strengths and weaknesses.

The internal component is not only related to the agreement requirements of the European Commission, which will be constantly monitored in order for them to be

complied with, but also to the use of quality instruments with the aim of assessing goals and identifying strengths and weaknesses.

In order to carry out these activities at best, harmonizing each partner's efforts and ensuring transparency, the internal component of quality assurance activities foresees, in the very first months of the project lifetime, the creation of a Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) and of a Quality Assurance Plan.

As mentioned, UNIPV (WP6 leader and coordinating institution), lead the internal control and monitoring, participating in the project's development activities, ensuring -along with the QAC- the proper and valid quality of project's results, collecting feedback, and reviews, from WP leaders and from the project participants.

The MAJIG Quality Assurance Strategy has foreseen, from the very first months of the project lifetime, the creation of a Quality Assurance Committee (QAC).

The former (QAC), indeed, has been set up during the Cartagena Kick-off meeting. It is composed of the Project Coordinator and the Project Managers from the University of Pavia, each WP Leader and the External Evaluator (as stated on Milestone MS3 'Governing Bodies document').

The QAC is the main strategic body which will guarantee the quality assurance of the project.

It will meet virtually on a regular basis to monitor and discuss the project activities' compliance with quality standards; besides the corresponding Minutes after each said meeting, effective follow up of the implementation of recommendations and improvement of actions, to be in place.

The role of the QAC is to guarantee the quality assurance of the project as well as to monitor that -project activities- are implemented in compliance with the quality standards and the identified indicators.

WP leaders ensure that the implemented activities are in accordance with the project's application and deadlines, and that all partners are aware of their role and responsibilities for each WP, and for WP6. They are responsible for keeping -partners- updated regarding all the progress in these tasks, starting from the planning and design to the completion and report of the activity/task/deliverable. As well, they provide WP6 leader (UNIPV), the QAC, and the external evaluator with all necessary information to perform the quality assurance and monitoring of the project. WP6 leader will organize qualitative interviews with each WP leader, to get their insight and feedback on the project's activities, deliverables and implementation.

As well, Task (activity/Deliverable) leaders have a critical role in what relates to the internal quality evaluation of MAJIG project.

All partners of the project contribute to the quality assurance activities at different stages; for instance, participants attending a project's activity and/or benefiting directly from the project's support, must complete an evaluation questionnaire presented by WP6 leader. Their feedback is essential to provide partners with insights on their appreciation of the activity/event, taking also into consideration potential recommendations or suggestions.

3.2 External Evaluation

The external evaluation is related to the appointment of an external expert who will provide his expertise and specific competences to ensure that the MAJIG quality results are reached. Indeed, the aim of the external monitoring and evaluation is to ensure that monitoring of the project is performed adequately and accurately, identifying relevant procedures, criteria and resources. It also deals with the evaluation of the results in comparison with the needs of the target group(s) and sector(s).

The External evaluation of the entire project will be conducted by an external evaluator who will be in charge of the quality review of the project's outcomes, in terms of: achievement of objectives and results, impact, coherence, involvement of external stakeholders.

He will analyze and interpret data about the project in order to identify strengths and weaknesses especially in relation to the quantifiable impact of the project activities on beneficiary institutions as well as the impact at local, national and international level.

Periodical reports will be released to check project progress and make recommendations.

The External Quality Expert will be responsible for:

- a) the finalization and official definition of quality indicators and of monitoring procedures;
- b) the elaboration of periodical Evaluation Reports.

The aim of the external monitoring and evaluation is to ensure that monitoring of the project is performed adequately and accurately, identifying relevant procedures, criteria and resources. It also deals with risk and issue management and with the evaluation of the results in comparison with the needs of the target group(s) and sector(s).

In the framework of MAJIG the External Quality Expert is expected to:

- define quantitative and qualitative indicators for the assessment of partnership performance (quality of the management and WP leaderships, effectiveness of communication, meeting deadlines, etc.);
- define quantitative and qualitative indicators to evaluate the impact of the outcomes produced inside the partnership and outside the organizations at local, regional, national and international level;
- define monitoring procedures to check the progress toward the contractual outcomes and respect of the work plan;
- support the consortium in the development of a sustainability strategy, identifying potential stakeholders for the exploitation of project results also after the funding period;
- analyze the data collected;
- participate in the periodical online meetings of the Quality Assurance Committee;
- elaborate one mid-term and one final evaluation report.

The results of the evaluation will be shared and discussed within the partnership. On the basis of recommendations from the Evaluator and feedback from partners, corrective actions will be taken if necessary.

The external evaluator leads the external quality control and monitoring of the project; he does not participate in MAJIG development activities and, his institution of origin (if any) is not a member of the MAJIG consortium -ensuring the impartiality of his remarks- with regards to the development of the project or its management.

4. Quality Assurance Tools

Key Quality Assurance Tools include:

- Project Proposal / Application
- Project Work Plan (updated)
- Feedback surveys for activities, events, meetings
- Quality Assurance Matrix for Deliverables
- External evaluation, reports
- Logical Framework Matrix
- Quality standards and indicators for the project outcomes
- Feedback/input from QAC

5. Risk Management

As part of the internal quality management, a regular risk assessment will be carried out and reviewed during the QAC meetings, which shall lead to corrective adaptations of the Work Plan. 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 underspending), timing (postponing of activities/Deliverables), performance risks (project management), and sustainability of the project results.

The identification and assessment of new risks is a joint responsibility of all project partners who have to communicate them to the QAC, and to UNIPV, thus suggesting possible interventions and solutions, as soon as they become 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 QAC and UNIPV 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.

The external evaluator will also be involved in the risk management.

The proper allocation of resources to the project by the individual project partners is of utmost 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; underspending, making sure that the project timetable is followed with reference to technical deliverables while avoiding that the relevant expenditures are not timely invoiced or validated. The project partners all have to ensure that they allocate the needed resources to the project, both human and financial.

The first step in project risk management is to clearly recognize and identify the risks. The risks should be identified as early as possible in order to manage them properly and devise corrective and/or preventive actions.

Current identified MAJIG risks, defined in project proposal (along with compiled proposed risk-mitigation measures), to be followed -and updated-, by the QAC are:

- Lack of teachers and professionals
- Economic and political risks
- COVID-19
- Lack of knowledge of the participants

- Difficult to create operational SFC models
- Change of governance in the partner universities
- Lack of information coming from the partner universities

6. Quality and Evaluation Plan

6.1 Indicators

The Project Quality and Evaluation Plan outlines (Tables, below) the elements of the MAJIG quality assurance, compiling the set of quality indicators, as well as the means of verification, for the General Objectives, the Specific Objectives and for the Deliverables and Milestones:

GENERAL OBJECTIVES	INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION
Fostering research capacities in the field of development macroeconomics in the LA universities belonging to the consortium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 5 maquette models created (one for each research unit) - 5 research units created, one in each partner LA University 	<p>5 models</p> <p>Evidence of research units</p> <p>Surveys distributed to the research centers scholars/participants</p> <p>Statistics of the university on publications.</p>
Strengthening the cooperation between LA HEIs and non-academic institutions (Ministries, research units, think-tank, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 6 collaborations between HEIs and non-academic actors, specifically via 3 levels' indicators logic (experts, institutions, students): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) 5 contributions in the Working Paper Series b) 6 agreements, affiliations, conventions between HEIs and non-academic actors to host traineeships, students, etc. c) 5 students undergoing traineeships and internships involving non academic actors 	<p>Documentation and reports on the installment of equipment and institution of the research centers, plus overall WP3 implementation report.</p> <p>a) database of the Working papers' series realized</p> <p>b) database for the collection of the agreements and opportunities</p> <p>c) certificates of completion of the internship period</p>
To strengthen the capacities of LA universities belonging to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of newly trained young professionals on 	<p>Enrollment/graduation rates (including Master and PhD level), and other</p>

<p>the consortium to support not only policymakers in their choices, but also local civil society organizations, think tanks, NGOs, entrepreneurial organizations, ...</p>	<p>SFC macroeconomic modeling (vs. existing ones)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - More Master/PhD students, making use of SFC macroeconomic models (ex ante vs. ex post) - Much stronger capacity to train researchers interested in SFC modeling - Higher opportunities to be part of international networks, with exchange of students and professors 	<p>education-related metrics, before and after the implementation of MAJIG (in the corresponding areas/fields/topics)</p> <p>Qualitative data/feedback (from within the LA partner HEIs and from external stakeholders), via interviews/surveys/focus groups, regarding the project's impact -and strengthened capacities in the topic-s-</p> <p><i>Note: some of these Indicators, to be assessed after the end of MAJIG project</i></p>
<p>Favoring the creation/expansion/of sustainable research units in this field through:</p> <p>a) The involvement of young researchers</p> <p>b) The preparation of «deliverable products» to be used after the completion of the project</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of Working Papers series circulating policy proposals/scenarios, based on SFC modeling - Higher opportunities to gain consultancy contracts, based on the preparation of databases, models and scenarios/predictions - Stronger connections with think tanks and policy-oriented research centers (inside/outside LA) - Design of a permanent network -on SFC Macroeconomics-, within Bolivia, Colombia at the international level 	<p>Outputs, services, results (including Working Papers Series) of the research units</p> <p>Metrics of the involved young researchers (age, gender, background, ...)</p> <p>Qualitative data/feedback (from within the LA partner HEIs and from external stakeholders), via interviews/surveys/focus groups, regarding the project's impact, specifically on the research units and its outcomes, services and the improved capacity of their staff and linked students and researchers</p> <p><i>Note: some of these Indicators, to be assessed after the end of MAJIG project</i></p>

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES	INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION
To realize a structured set of training activities.	- 4 training activities implemented	Report on the training activities realized (including number of participants, satisfaction questionnaires, etc.)
To build 5 SFC Maquette models aimed at designing and simulating macroeconomic policies for sustainable development (Building macroeconomic models to evaluate the potential impact of macroeconomic policies for justice, sustainable development and inclusive growth, in line with the Sustainable Development Goals adopted by the international community)	- 5 Maquette models designed and realized	5 Maquette models Records and reports on the activities of the research units.
To create in each LA university in the consortium a research unit on Macroeconomics for Development in charge of managing and using, for both research and pedagogical purposes, the above-mentioned models	- 5 Research units created, one in each LA partner university	Documents of the LA universities proving the installment of the equipment, the space allocation for the research units, staff list, etc.

DELIVERABLES / MILESTONES	INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION
<p>D1.1 - 4 training courses' programmes</p> <p>Due date: 31/05/2023</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 4 programmes, published on the website; specific syllabi, based on the previously identified local (teaching/research) needs, with relevant feedback provided by local partners 	<p>4 programmes</p> <p>Metrics of the project website (number of downloads of the programme and other relevant statistics e.g. countries, ...)</p>
<p>D 2.1 - Report on the training activities</p> <p>Due date: 31/12/2024</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1 report realized, uploaded on the website and disseminated (e.g. via newsletter) - Satisfaction rate of participants, 75% or higher; compiled suggestions towards future improvement (if feasible), taken into account for upcoming events 	<p>Analytics of the project website, analytics of the newsletter/dissemination impact of the report</p> <p>Feedback surveys to participants</p> <p>Evidence from the implementation of the training-s (programme, lists, agenda, photos/screenshots, ...)</p>
<p>D 2.2 - Training courses' virtual "packages"</p> <p>Due date: 31/12/2024</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 4 packages delivered (1/training, topic), uploaded, distributed, freely available - 25 students/staff completing the training (5/local project partner) - A minimum of 15 views of the contents on the platform - A minimum of 15 sharings 	<p>Proof of attendance (signed/virtual participants list-s) and certificates of completion, released</p> <p>Analytics of the project website (views, sharings, ...)</p>

<p>D 3.1 - Report on the stages in the EU and the setting of the unit</p> <p>Due date: 31/03/2025</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - report delivered; with list of participants (2/local partner) that underwent the stage and job shadowing, host institutions, specific training received, lessons learned (including the setup of research units and precise activities towards it); as well, which participants are actively involved in the research units' activities and their working plans 	<p>Tendering results' document and official proof for equipment (and software) installation -including pictures of all items, with EC stickers-</p> <p>Equipment, software recording in the institutions' inventory (Official Inventory List-s)</p> <p>Documents of the allocation of the space for research units -including organigram and list of staff-</p> <p>Working Plan of research units</p>
<p>D 4.1 - 5 Maquette models</p> <p>Due date: 31/05/2025</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 5 Maquette models (1/LA partner), created; including the equations of the model and Eviews file -with simulation results- 	<p>Documents (5 Maquette models)</p> <p>Above-mentioned models, uploaded on the project -and LA Partners'- websites; metrics/analytics of said websites</p>
<p>D 4.2 - Research Unit's Working Papers Series</p> <p>Due date: 30/09/2025</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 5 Working Papers Series (1/LA partner, one or two Papers 'representative'), published; also, including articles from the non-academic sectors - A minimum of 15 views/downloads on the project's website - A minimum of 6 distributions to relevant external stakeholders 	<p>Working Papers Series</p> <p>Analytics of the project's website</p> <p>Analytics of the newsletter/dissemination impact of the report</p> <p>Official communications and correspondence to external stakeholders sharing the papers</p>
<p>D 4.3 - Consultancy proposals</p> <p>Due date: 31/12/2025</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 5 consultancy proposals (1/LA partner) for a non-academic actor; 	<p>5 consultancy proposals</p> <p>Above-mentioned proposals, published on</p>

	showcasing applicability of the models to specific areas, serving as effective training towards (research units) offering external services	the project's website; analytics/metrics
D 5.1 – Website Due date: 31/07/2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1 project website, created, in English and Spanish; complete and updated information on all MAJIG results/activities, with a database/mapping of stakeholders and repository of resources (relevant outputs from the project) 	Complete metrics/analytics of the project's website (number of downloads of documents and other relevant statistics e.g. countries, institutions, length of visit, tabs/sections visited, ...)
D 5.2 - Webinar series Due date: 31/12/2025	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 5 webinars delivered, recorded and uploaded in project's website; in English and Spanish, approximately 60 minutes each. Content: sharing services of research units, project's outputs, ... - A minimum of 15 views and sharings - A minimum of 5 attendees -local stakeholders- (3/LA project partners) to in-streaming webinars - Satisfaction rate of participants, 75% or higher 	<p>5 Webinar series</p> <p>Analytics of the project's website, with number, and details, of downloads/sharings</p> <p>Evidence of the in-streaming webinars (list of participants, feedback surveys, agenda, presentations, ...)</p>

<p>D 5.3 - Communication and dissemination plan</p> <p>Due date: 30/09/2023</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1 document produced, published and freely accessible on the project's website; with definition of communication, dissemination, exploitation and outreach activities, addressing target groups, deadlines and responsible actors - 6 Newsletters (2/year), total - Annual International Web-Conference-s, 3 in total; with feedback survey - Final MAJIG Conference; with feedback survey - Inclusion of project's results into each partner HEIs' bulletins 	<p>Communication & Dissemination Plan</p> <p>Analytics of the project website</p> <p>Evidence and proceedings of Annual International Conferences, including feedback survey</p> <p>Evidence and proceedings of Final MAJIG Conference, including feedback survey</p>
<p>D 5.4 - Sustainability Strategy</p> <p>Due date: 30/04/2024</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A document defining the strategy (the set of actions) that the consortium intends to put in place to guarantee the sustainability of the project's results after the EU funding period. 	<p>Sustainability Plan/Strategy</p> <p>Analytics of the project website</p> <p>Analytics of the newsletter/dissemination impact of the report</p>
<p>D 6.1 - Quality reports</p> <p>Due date: 31/1/2026</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2 Quality Assurance Reports, produced and published in project's website (Intermediate Report, after the completion of the training programs; Final, after the end of the project, with focus 	<p>2 Quality Assurance Reports</p> <p>Analytics of the project website</p> <p>Official communications sharing the document</p>

	on research activities); addressing, among other aspects, the correct compliance of the project outputs in comparison to the set quality standards, the achievement of objectives and results, impact, coherence and involvement of external stakeholders	
D 6.2 - Partnership Agreements Due date: 31/07/2023	- Partnership agreements, officially signed	Partnership agreements Analytics of the project's website
D 6.3 - Quality assurance strategy Due date: 31/1/2024	- 1 document (Quality and Evaluation Plan) produced, published on the project's website; addressing the definition of indicators and activities related to the project's quality assurance, ensuring -MAJIG- reaches the highest quality standards, formalizing the tasks entrusted to the Consortium and those to the external evaluator	Quality and Evaluation Plan Analytics of the project's website Official communications sharing the document

ANNEXES

Annex 1 – Evaluation Form for Training Courses

Please complete the following module evaluation form corresponding to MAJIG XXXX module. To do this, use a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is "I completely disagree" and 5 is "I completely agree."

	1	2	3	4	5
Module objectives					
1 – The module's learning goals were clearly stated					
2 – The module covered the topics I expected					
3 – The time allocated to each topic was good					
4 – All the contents in the module were successfully covered					
5 – There was a good balance between theoretical and practical activities (if applicable)					
Module presentation					
1 – The course structure was easy to understand and follow					
2 – The topics were presented in logical order					
3 – I had enough time in class to practise the skills learned in the module					
4 – All the required material was available in due time					
5 – All the practical matters required for the course worked well (WiFi, IT, etc.)					
Instructor					
1 – The instructor was well prepared					
2 – The instructor communicated the contents clearly					
3 – The instructor was able to answer questions and clear my doubts					
4 – I received enough feedback on the practical activities of the module (if applicable)					
5 – Prior to the start of the module I received all the required material and information					
Overall impression					
1 – The module was worth the time I invested					
2 – With my prior knowledge I was well prepared to follow the contents of the module					
3 – I acquired a good understanding of the topics learned in the module					
4 – The contents and skills learned in the module will be useful in my future work-					
5 – I would recommend this course to other researchers working on my field					
Please, tell us about any aspects you appreciated of the module.					
Please, tell us what could be improved for the next time.					

Annex 2 – Evaluation Form for Project Meeting

Project meeting survey

PURPOSE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Analyse the activities/Deliverable carried out - Discuss about possible doubts for the next activities/Deliverables - Solve any possible problems that could interfere with the correct project deployment
TARGET	Consortium members
SUCCESS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To evaluate if the project keeps going as established - All possible incidences are detected and solved

1: I strongly disagree // 2: I disagree // 3: I neither agree nor disagree // 4: I agree // 5: I strongly agree

	1	2	3	4	5
BEFORE THE PROJECT MEETING					
The objectives of the meeting were clearly defined beforehand so that I could prepare better for the meeting					
The logistical information received was appropriate (transportation, accommodation, venue, etc.)					
The agenda was prepared by the project coordinator but I was asked for comments/suggestion for its improvement					
The agenda was appropriate for the purpose of the meeting and we clarified all the pending issues					
DURING THE PROJECT MEETING					
There was enough time for presentations, discussion and working groups					
The presentations made by the partners were of a high quality and with concrete issues and topics, important for clarifications of the project development					
All the topics foreseen in the agenda have been covered					
The meeting venue was appropriate					

AFTER THE PROJECT MEETING					
The meeting was effective (topics discussed, problems solved, next steps to be taken, etc.)					
Minutes of the meeting have been circulated within a reasonable time after the meeting and I was asked for comments for the consolidation of the final version					

Any recommendation-s for improving our next project meeting?

--

Annex 3 – Quality Assurance Matrix for project Deliverables

Quality Assurance Matrix for project Deliverables

QAC Reviewer:		
<i>Name</i>	<i>Institution</i>	<i>Review Date</i>

Overall Assessment

Please assess, if the following criteria are fulfilled, by ticking [X] “Yes” (fulfilled) or “No” (only partly or not fulfilled). Please make a short comment to highlight improvement potential. If a criterion is not applicable, you can write “n.a.” as comment. Detailed suggestions for improvement can be made in the table below

Make your final quality-review conclusion by ticking [X] here ☐

Accepted (No revisions required)	Accepted + (Changes required)	Not Accepted (for quality-review again)

Weak	1	2	3	4	5	Excellent
	☹☹	☹	☹☺	☺	☺☺	
					☺	

Criteria	Score (1-5)	Comments
1.The relevance level of the activity/Deliverable? This evaluation criteria is looking at: - Is the activity/Deliverable being carried out suitable to meet the specific need addressed in the project? - Is it suitable for the Bolivian and Colombian contexts? - Will it reach the target group that it is designed to impact?		
2.The impact level of the activity/Deliverable		

<p>This evaluation criteria is looking at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is there a need for this activity/Deliverable for the target group? - Is this activity/Deliverable filling a gap as proposed in the project? - Is it filling it in an efficient way? 		
<p>3. Dissemination, exploitation</p> <p>This evaluation criteria is looking at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is this activity/Deliverable widely disseminated? - Are the dissemination ways effective? - To what extent, the interested parties react to the project's activities? 		
<p>4.Sustainability</p> <p>This evaluation criteria is looking at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To what extent, the interested parties will take part in future activities/deliverables or support in the future for sustainability? 		
<p>5. Any observation/suggestion-s towards further improvement?</p>		