

## Deliverable 5.1: Quality Assurance Plan

WP5: Quality Assurance & Monitoring

Prepared by



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

## Project information

Project Acronym: SDGsJR

Project Title: Sustainable Development Goals in Journalism Reporting

Project Reference: 609897-EPP-1-2019-1-ES-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP (2019–1963/001– 001)

Project Website: [www.journalism-reporting.eu](http://www.journalism-reporting.eu)

Authoring Partner: Novel Group

Document Version: 0.1

Date of Preparation: 12/04/2021

| Document History |         |             |                                        |
|------------------|---------|-------------|----------------------------------------|
| Date             | Version | Author      | Description                            |
| 12/04/2021       | 0.1     | Novel Group | 1 <sup>st</sup> version of the QA Plan |



The European Commission's support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents, which reflect the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

## Table of Contents

|                                                                    |    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Table of Contents .....                                            | 2  |
| Executive Summary .....                                            | 3  |
| Purpose of this Document .....                                     | 4  |
| Project Objective and Main Focus .....                             | 5  |
| Actors Involved .....                                              | 6  |
| Quality Assurance to Project Management .....                      | 7  |
| Process for Meetings & Study visits Organisation .....             | 10 |
| Internal Communication Strategy .....                              | 11 |
| Risk Assessment and Management .....                               | 11 |
| Quality Assurance of Project Results and Activities .....          | 14 |
| Documents' Quality .....                                           | 15 |
| Deliverables Layout .....                                          | 19 |
| Indicators for Project's Activities .....                          | 19 |
| Short and long-term impact indicators of the Project .....         | 22 |
| Conclusion .....                                                   | 24 |
| Annexes .....                                                      | 25 |
| Quality and Monitoring Rubric for WP Progress and Completion ..... | 25 |
| Quality and Monitoring Rubric .....                                | 25 |
| Project Meetings' Evaluation Form .....                            | 34 |
| Study Visits' Evaluation Form .....                                | 36 |



## Executive Summary

The Quality Assurance Plan (Outcome 5.1) is being produced under Work Package 5 (Quality Plan) to provide a single point of reference regarding the quality that will govern the SDGsJR - Sustainable Development Goals in Journalism Reporting project.

The Quality Assurance of SDGSJR will be continuous and systematic, meaning that it will be implemented throughout the whole project's lifetime and monitored and adjusted through regular quality assurance reports. The produced Quality Assurance Process will be applied in every phase of the project to ensure:

- Control of data that are collected and analysed concerning each phase's requirements,
- Control of the required resources (materials, tools, software, human resources),
- Control of milestones of each phase in order to continually review and implement corrective actions, and
- Control of the results in order to know if the needs were met (feedback).

After presenting some information about the project in general, the Quality Assurance Plan indicates the quality assurance procedures to project management. Specifically, it provides information about the:

- ✓ process of meetings' evaluation,
- ✓ process of study visits' evaluation,
- ✓ internal communication strategy,
- ✓ Quality Assurance of Project Results and Activities,
- ✓ Roles of Quality Board,
- ✓ Indicators for the project's activities.

Quality assurance tools are annexed to the Plan.



## Purpose of this Document

The purpose of the Project Quality Plan is to define the quality expectations related to the SDGSJR project and detail how results' achievement will be monitored and thus how the quality of the project activities and results will be enhanced.

The main objectives of QA are to achieve the maximum standards of quality ensuring that the quality management obligations are fulfilled by all partners; that a high level of project performance is achieved by all partners; that a high level of satisfaction is evident among external stakeholders and participants to the trainings/study visits etc. These objectives will be achieved through the systematic monitoring and evaluation of the project to ensure that:

- Project procedures, products, outputs comply with objectives and purpose;
- Mistakes are kept to a minimum through the elimination of common errors;
- Increases in efficiency are achieved through the improvement of time and project management;
- Quality of project products/outputs is monitored helping to ensure that overall project and specific work package objectives are met;
- Feedback throughout the various project phases minimises chances of bad quality in outputs;
- Compliance to common standards with partners following the same guidelines in all phases to increase consistency and reliability.

Additionally, QA procedures will ensure that:

- a quality assurance framework for partner interaction within the consortium is outlined, agreed and adhered to;
- guidelines are set-out and adhered to for the engagement of and interaction with external stakeholders and end-users;



## Project Objective and Main Focus

The project's primary objective is to strengthen the capacity of academic staff working in the Partner Countries' higher education institutions. A group of academic staff will be trained in the new specialized course's teaching. This will assist them in developing a journalism curriculum that is current with climate change and sustainable development progress. They will be involved throughout the project's life cycle, including activities such as needs analysis, benefit of study visits, knowledge exchange, and development of the new course program. Second, a group of faculty members (academics, lecturers, and researchers) will receive online training in innovative ICT-based teaching methodologies and best practices from EU-HEIs.



The primary activity of the project is the development, testing, and adaptation of this six-month journalism reporting course, partially online and partially face-to-face, that will be a collection of programs and qualifications designed to assist journalists, analysts, and journalism students in preparing for work in a changing environment where domestic developmental challenges are paramount. The course will be built around an in-depth analysis of student needs and a real-world transnational approach based on the exchange of best practices.

As a result, the teaching/learning process will include academic personnel mobility to facilitate capacity building between the Programme and Partner HEIs. The course will be offered as a core component in the final year of a bachelor's degree program in journalism, as a module in a master's program in journalism, or as a 40-ECTS independent program.

## Actors Involved

SDGSJR project is set up by 9 partners, coming from three different European countries and three Asian countries:

✓ Coordinator of the project:

**P1** - Universidade de Santiago de Compostela (USC), Spain

✓ Co – applicants:

**P2** - Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu, Romania

**P3** - Novel Group Sarl, Luxembourg

**P4** - University of Battambang, Cambodia

**P5** - Royal University of Phnom Pen, Cambodia

**P6** - University of Nottingham Ningbo China, China

**P7** - Shenzhen Polytechnic, China

**P8** - University of Malaya, Malaysia

**P9** - Universiti Utara Malaysia, Malaysia



## Quality Assurance to Project Management



**Figure: The Quality Assurance Cycle 1**

Quality Assurance is the process of systematic project monitoring and evaluation that will ensure that standards of quality are being met. The SDGSJR QA follows a cycle of Monitoring, Assessment and Improvement. Quality monitoring allows for the planned, systematic and ongoing collection of information. Quality Assessment involves making a judgement on how the actual

performance compares to the standards set forth in the QA plan. Quality Improvement focuses on improving specific aspects of project delivery.

The Quality Control Process is about to ensure that all personnel in the project "does the right things in the right time". Thus, this approach will be helpful in avoiding misunderstandings of what to produce and how, which can result in productivity and quality losses, as well as schedule delays.

This is going to be achieved by:

- Early identification and reviews of all quality-impacting documents,
- Reviews of all quality-impacting documents,
- Using the well-defined and anchored quality standards and procedures of the project.

The Quality Control Process of the SDGSJR Project aims to ensure quality for the whole Project by implementing relevant actions when necessary, taking into account:

- The results from internal evaluation,
- The official project deliverables/activities/outputs,





- The preventive actions on all the above,
- The corrective action decided,
- Internal communication strategies,
- Control of quality records,
- Stakeholders' satisfaction,
- Project reporting and monitoring.

In addition, during the kick-off meeting, a **steering committee** was decided to be established. USC is responsible for the board appointment.

| P# | Partner                                      | Country    | Name of participant            |
|----|----------------------------------------------|------------|--------------------------------|
| 1  | Universidade de Santiago de Compostela (USC) | Spain      | Dr. Marcelo Martínez           |
| 2  | Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu             | Romania    | Dr. Roxana-Florenta<br>Savescu |
| 3  | Novel Group Sarl                             | Luxembourg | Mr. Athanasios Lakrintis       |
| 4  | University of Battambang                     | Cambodia   | Dr. Sovanna Seav               |
| 5  | Royal University of Phnom Pen                | Cambodia   | Dr. Ung Bun Y                  |
| 6  | University of Nottingham Ningbo<br>China     | China      | Dr. Shixin Zhang               |
| 7  | Shenzhen Polytechnic                         | China      | Dr. Zeng Xiuzhen               |
| 8  | University of Malaya                         | Malaysia   | Dr. Charity Lee                |
| 9  | Universiti Utara Malaysia                    | Malaysia   | Dr. Huda Bt Haji Ibrahim       |

The Steering Committee (SC) will be responsible for strategic decisions, progress follow-up, adjustments, conflict resolution and preparing the questionnaires that will be used for the evaluation of specific project outcomes. The functions of the board will be in accordance with the contractual obligations towards the EC.

In general, it will manage and perform significant quality work concerning:



- a) The initiation of actions to prevent a non – fulfilment of a specific requirement,
- b) The identification and recording of any relevant problem,
- c) The constant control of the scientific, technical and financial management of the project, to identify any possible difficulty that can create future misunderstandings, inefficiencies, or deviations from the project,
- d) The constant control of the dissemination activities of the project, to ensure that all targets are progressively achieved and that the impact of the project is the maximum possible,
- e) The initiation, recommendation and/or provision of solutions,
- f) The ensuring of those solutions' implementation,
- g) The assurance of the conformity of all project deliverables/activities/outputs with the defined criteria,
- h) The consultation of Work Package Leaders on the expected characteristics and level of quality of relevant deliverables.

The Steering Committee (SC) will focus on monitoring progress according to the specified indicators, in the following fields:

- general management progress and quality,
- overview of progress and results,
- management of dissemination activities,
- management of exploitation activities.

Monitoring of these activities will consider the reports from Quality Assurance and Evaluation and information provided from the WP Leaders, every semester.



## Process for Meetings & Study visits Organisation

During each meeting/study visit of the partners:

- a) the next meeting/study visit will be planned and, if possible, agreed.
- b) some tentative dates for telematic conferences will, also, be discussed and agreed. It is highly recommended that one telematic conference (Skype or similar) among all partners should be organized no later than every three months. Those meetings can be organized by the Coordinator, the Work Package Leaders, or the SC, when appropriate.

At least one month before every scheduled project meeting/study visit, the Coordinator will have to prepare a draft agenda and send it to partners. After a reasonable period of consultation during which all partners will be able to send their comments on the agenda, the Coordinator will update and finalize the agenda, and send to partners no later than ten working days before the meeting/study visit. During each meeting, the coordinator will be responsible for keeping minutes, which will be sent to all partners in a reasonable time after the meeting's end. Partners will then, can make comments on the minutes, before the coordinator produces the final revised meeting minutes.

For the evaluation of the project's physical meetings/study visits in order to identify their strong and weak points and provide feedback for the organisation of the next meetings/study visits, a project meeting's/study visit's evaluation form has been developed. All participating partners to the meetings/study visits will be asked to fill – in the evaluation questionnaire in time, so as for the evaluation process to start as soon as possible after the meeting/study visit (see Annex 8.3 & 8.4).



## Internal Communication Strategy

The Coordinator will be responsible for providing a shared, restricted platform (in this case Google Drive) that will be created to offer each partner independent access to important documents, rules meeting agendas and information, supporting material, to – do lists, and other project information.

Internal communication will be implemented through:

- E–mail messages,
- Skype (or similar) communication,
- Use of “cloud” tools,
- Telephone, in extremely urgent situations,
- Other channels that will be agreed by the consortium.

## Risk Assessment and Management

For the successful implementation of the project’s objectives, risk management and contingency planning is a crucial factor. Risk management in SDGSJR will be iterative, aiming at reducing uncertainty by identifying risks as soon as possible and periodically reassessing their importance:

- During the first months of the project, work package leaders and the project coordinator will identify and assess the main risks for each work package and for the project as a whole, and propose preventative and remedial actions.
- The identified risks will be reviewed before the start of each work package, and specific actions will be taken in order to ensure smooth implementation.
- Potential risks will be addressed during the project meetings, where all partners can reassess previous working packages and propose further actions.



The risk assessment and management procedure can be identified in the following figure:



**Figure: Procedure of risk assessment and management**

Project management risks can be broken down in the following parameters:

- Risk event: What can possible happen that will affect the implementation of the project?
- Risk timeframe: When is it most likely to happen?
- Probability: How probable is it for this event to happen?
- Impacts: Which will be the expected impacts?
- Factors: What events might warn or cause this risk event?

A list of possible risks and respective remedial actions has already been compiled:

| Internal risks                         |                                                                                               |
|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Potential risk                         | Proposed remedial action                                                                      |
| Low level of motivation among partners | Partners will be encouraged to express interests, suggestions and share the work accordingly. |
| Poor communication among partners      | A systematic communication plan will be discussed and agreed at the kick – off meeting.       |

|                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Not delivering tasks on time                                          | Online meetings and follow up communication will always help to monitor the current situation of specific tasks.                                                                                                                                                                             |
| Unclear roles                                                         | Detailed work plans will be specified and agreed at the kick – off meeting.                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| Failure to reach project aims                                         | A comprehensive quality management system will be in place.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| Project outputs do not meet requirements                              | Extensive research and analysis at project start, frequent feedback loops, project standards catalogue.                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| Low reach – out to target groups                                      | Use of large existing networks and multipliers, and relevant stakeholders who find the approach very useful.                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| Insufficient number of participants in the trainings/study visits etc | Broad information delivery on the training course from the initial stages of the project, involvement of possible participants in project activities, such as needs analysis, organization of events to inform on the purpose of the trainings/study visits etc and the respective benefits. |

| External risks                           |                                                                                                                             |
|------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Potential risk                           | Proposed remedial action                                                                                                    |
| SDGSJR products to not meet requirements | Extensive research and analysis at project start, frequent feedback loops including the SDGSJR quality standards catalogue. |
| Low reach – out to target groups         | Large existing networks and contacts use of viral marketing techniques.                                                     |
| Low visibility of the project            | Comprehensive media strategy, use of diverse channels and appropriate linking with (online) tools.                          |
| Partner withdrawal                       | Disposition and penalties specified in the partner's agreement.                                                             |

## Quality Assurance of Project Results and Activities

The SDGSJR project will implement multiple processes to assess and ensure the quality of its outputs. The project members working on a deliverable/outcome are expected to deliver the project outcomes in a timely fashion and complying with the established standards of quality.

General quality indicators for project deliverables and activities are related to:

- Relevance: Does the deliverable fulfil the requirements mentioned in the description of tasks and results?
- Due – time submission: Is the deliverable is produced in due time?
- Consistency: Does the deliverable have a uniform design and well organized in sections and follows the SDGSJR template, including the European Commission's visibility rules?
- Simplicity: Does the deliverable fulfil its objectives with the most non-complex and understandable way?
- Visualization: Does the deliverable fulfil its objectives by using, when appropriate, info-graphics, pictures, tables, schematic diagrams?

**Every six months**, in order to closely monitor the progress of the project, Quality and Monitoring Rubrics will be sent to WP leaders by UBB with the view to report the progress of their WPs as well as the general evaluation of the project until this time. Respectively, every six months UBB will send to the partners that are not WP leaders, an evaluation questionnaire to collect data on several aspects of the project. In total, **6 Periodic Quality and Evaluation Reports** will be developed by UBB and all monitoring data will feed into the **Final Impact and Evaluation report**.



## Documents' Quality

To ensure the quality of the project deliverables, an internal document review procedure will be undertaken. Deliverables must be in final draft at least 2 weeks before the deadline, to undergo an internal review procedure:

- The partner responsible for the deliverable will have to send out a draft to UBB, who is responsible to distribute the deliverables to the members of QB for review.
- After the end of the 2 weeks, if there is no comment/review by the side of partners, then it is assumed that they accept the deliverables. **A silence-assent rule applies.**

All feedback provided by the QB and the rest of partners will be forwarded to the author of the deliverable, who will update it accordingly. The partner responsible for the deliverable will submit it in its final form to the Coordinator and the Work Package Leader by the deadline.

General criteria for the evaluation of document – related deliverables will be, among others:

- The timely delivery for review;
- The timely delivery of the final output;
- The timely review by the QB;
- The content's conforming to the project's objectives;
- The clarity, structure, and length of presentation.

In addition, a **Quality Board (QB)** is established, consisting of the same number of members as the partners, **but with external experts.**

| P# | Partners                                     | Countries  | Name of participants |
|----|----------------------------------------------|------------|----------------------|
| 1  | Universidade de Santiago de Compostela (USC) | Spain      | +++                  |
| 2  | Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu             | Romania    | +++                  |
| 3  | Novel Group Sarl                             | Luxembourg | +++                  |
| 4  | University of Battambang                     | Cambodia   | +++                  |





|   |                                          |          |     |
|---|------------------------------------------|----------|-----|
| 5 | Royal University of Phnom Penh           | Cambodia | +++ |
| 6 | University of Nottingham<br>Ningbo China | China    | +++ |
| 7 | Shenzhen Polytechnic                     | China    | +++ |
| 8 | University of Malaya                     | Malaysia | +++ |
| 9 | Universiti Utara Malaysia                | Malaysia | +++ |

In order to assist in reaching the basic quality standards of deliverables, the project timetable, including other useful information of deliverables, is summarized in the following table:

| WP | Outcome ref. Nr | Outcome Title                                                   | Type                                                    | Language        | Due date   |
|----|-----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|------------|
| 1  | 1.1             | Report on SDGs Journalism Reporting Course Content              | Report                                                  | EN              | 15/04/2020 |
|    | 1.2             | Report on relevant capacity building courses and best practices | Report                                                  | EN              | 15/03/2020 |
|    | 1.3             | State-of-the-art report                                         | Report                                                  | EN              | 15/06/2020 |
| 2  | 2.1             | Outline and methodology of the Syllabus for course              | Teaching Material, Report, Event                        | EN, CH, KH, MAL | 15/07/2020 |
|    | 2.2             | Study material for course                                       | Teaching Material, Learning Material,                   | EN, CH, KH, MAL | 15/11/2020 |
|    | 2.3             | Capacity building Material                                      | Teaching Material, Learning Material, Training Material | EN, CH, KH, MAL | 15/11/2020 |

|   |     |                                                              |                                      |                 |              |
|---|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
|   | 2.4 | Specs for SDGs_Reporting Platform                            | Report                               | EN              | 15/01/2021   |
|   | 2.5 | E-tutor's guide                                              | Teaching Material, Report            | EN              | 15/03/2021   |
|   | 2.6 | Specs for development of Research Units                      | Report                               | EN              | 15/03/2021   |
| 3 | 3.1 | Delivery of SDGs_Reporting Platform                          | Service/Product                      | EN, CH, KH, MAL | 15/06/2021   |
|   | 3.2 | Study Visits                                                 | Teaching material, Learning material | EN, CH, KH, MAL | 15/11/2022   |
|   | 3.3 | Online training sessions                                     | Service/Product                      | EN, CH, KH, MAL | 15/09/2021   |
|   | 3.4 | Delivery of Research Units                                   | Service/Product                      | EN, CH, KH, MAL | 15/07/2021   |
| 4 | 4.1 | Delivery of the course Programme & capacity building program | Event, Service/Product               | EN, CH, KH, MAL | 15 /11 /2021 |
|   | 4.2 | Programme Delivery Interim Evaluation Report                 | Report                               | EN              | 15/05/2022   |
|   | 4.3 | Accreditation Report on developed Course of PC- HEIs         | Report                               | EN              | 15/11/2022   |

|   |     |                                                  |                                   |    |             |
|---|-----|--------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----|-------------|
|   | 4.4 | Programme Delivery<br>Final Evaluation<br>Report | Report                            | EN | 15/11/2022  |
| 5 | 5.1 | Quality Assurance<br>Plan                        | Report                            | EN | 15/11/2020  |
|   | 5.2 | Quality Board<br>Appointment                     | Event                             | EN | 15 /12/2019 |
|   | 5.3 | Periodic Quality and<br>Evaluation Report        | Report                            | EN | 15/08/2022  |
|   | 5.4 | Final Impact and<br>Evaluation Report            | Report                            | EN | 15/11/2022  |
| 6 | 6.1 | Dissemination Plan                               | Report                            | EN | 15/02/2020  |
|   | 6.2 | SDGs_Reporting<br>Website                        | Service/Product                   | EN | 15/03/2021  |
|   | 6.3 | Networking Events                                | Event                             | EN | 15/11/2022  |
|   | 6.4 | Exploitation and<br>Sustainability<br>Planning   | Report                            | EN | 15/08/2022  |
|   | 6.5 | Portfolio and<br>Dissemination<br>Material       | Service/Product                   | EN | 15/01/2020  |
| 7 | 7.1 | Consortium<br>Management and<br>Coordination     | Report,<br>Service/Product        | EN | 15/11/2022  |
|   | 7.2 | Project Meetings                                 | Event, Report,<br>Service/Product | EN | 15/11/2022  |

|  |     |                                               |                            |    |            |
|--|-----|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------------|----|------------|
|  | 7.3 | Funding Management                            | Report,<br>Service/Product | EN | 15/11/2022 |
|  | 7.4 | Risk Management                               | Report,<br>Service/Product | EN | 15/07/2022 |
|  | 7.5 | Consortium<br>Agreement                       | Report,<br>Service/Product | EN | 15/12/2020 |
|  | 7.6 | Coordination and<br>Communication<br>Platform | Service/Product            | EN | 15/01/2020 |

### Deliverables Layout

All SDGSJR deliverables should display the project's logo and follow a homogenous presentation and numbering, using the relevant templates. In addition, they should all abide by the European Commission's provisions for the visibility of Union funding.

The structure of the SDGSJR reports should include the following:

- First page as in the SDGSJR reports template;
- Project information page, including copyright information;
- Table of Contents;
- Executive Summary, that can be used for dissemination purposes;
- Main Part;
- Conclusion;
- References, if needed;
- Annexes, if needed.

### Indicators for Project's Activities

Specific qualitative and quantitative indicators that will be used for the evaluation of the reach and coverage of activities and results of actions for core Work Packages, include the following:



**Work Package 1: Needs Analysis**

- Questionnaires completed by journalism students & journalists: 180
- Questionnaires completed by academic staff (42 from PC-HEIs & 7 per EU-HEI)
- Questionnaires completed by 30 experts from academia
- Focus group per PC-HEI: 8-10
- relevance and rationale of state-of-the-art report
- consistency with aim and objectives
- elaboration of assessment tool to measure progress

**Work Package 2: Curricula & Vocational Course Development**

- Quality of course material
- Quality of e-tutor's e-guide

**Work Package 3: Capacity Building Activities**

- Number of trained academic professionals (at least 150)
- Number of capacity building courses developed (6 courses-12 modules)
- Number of courses developed (6)
- Number of study visits (7)
- Number of Academic Staff who will attend study visits (at least 40)

**Work package 4: Delivery of course programme and capacity building programme**

- Number of Academic professionals involved in delivery (at least 30)
- Number of students that will participate in the delivery (at least 180)
- Number of Labs established (one per PC-HEI)
- Number of Academic professionals & Administrative staff involved in delivery (at least 90)
- Number of students enrolled in the course program (target>80%)
- Number of trainings provided (target 100%)



- Evaluation of effectiveness of study visits by participants (based on feedback forms, filled in by participants in meetings, trainings and events) (target >80%)
- Feedback and satisfaction of students and university staff in D4.4
- Successful completion by students
- Level of satisfaction of students and businesses with internship programme
- Level of satisfaction by Platform users

#### **Work package 5: Quality assurance & Monitoring**

- Quality of training material
- Quality of new courses
- Quality of teaching material
- Evaluation of effectiveness (using questionnaires) of study visits by participants
- Feedback and satisfaction of students and university staff
- Successful completion by students
- Level of satisfaction of students and businesses with internship programme
- Level of satisfaction by Platform users
- Use of SSCs for the delivery of the programme
- Overall success of SDGSJR programme

#### **Work package 6: Dissemination and Exploitation**

- Number of networking events (6)
- Number of attendants (600-800)

#### **Work package 7: Management & Coordination**

- Number of meetings carried out (target 4 transnational meetings and 30 virtual ones)



## Short and long-term impact indicators of the Project

The following table includes the short and long-term impact indicators:

| Short term impact                                            | Target groups/potential beneficiaries                                           | Quantitative indicators                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Qualitative indicators                                                                                                                                                    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Needs Analysis Reports                                       | Academic/Teaching staff/Journalism students and Journalists/Experts/Focus group | Questionnaires completed by journalism students & journalists: 180<br>Questionnaires completed by academic staff (42 from PC-HEIs & 7 per EU-HEI)<br>Questionnaires completed by 30 experts from academia<br>Focus group per PC-HEI: 8-10 | Average qualitative feedback from the members of the focus group (target >80%)                                                                                            |
| Capacity building of academic professionals COURSE           | Academic/Teaching staff                                                         | Number of trained academic professionals (at least 150)<br>Number of capacity building courses developed (6 courses-12 modules)                                                                                                           | Suggestions made from the members of the target group (target < 10)<br>Average qualitative feedback from the members of the target group following training (target >80%) |
| New curriculum added in the HEIs                             | Students attending course                                                       | Number of courses developed (6)                                                                                                                                                                                                           | Suggestions made from the members of the target group (target < 10)<br>Average qualitative monthly feedback from the students (target >80%)                               |
| Exchange of good practices and know-how between EU & PC-HEIs | Academic staff/students attending course or other Programme in the Department   | Number of study visits (7)<br>Number of Academic Staff who will attend                                                                                                                                                                    | Average qualitative feedback from the members of the target group following study visits (target >80%)                                                                    |



|                                                 |                                                                          |                                                                                                                                                |                                                                                                                            |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                                 |                                                                          | study visits (at least 40)                                                                                                                     |                                                                                                                            |
| Delivery of Journalism Reporting Course in SDGs | Academic staff<br>Students attending course                              | Number of Academic professionals involved in delivery (at least 30)<br>Number of students that will participate in the delivery (at least 180) | interim quality evaluation report conclusions (target >80%);<br>final quality evaluation report conclusions (target >80%). |
| Research Units                                  | Academic staff<br>Students<br>Journalists                                | Number of Labs established (one per PC-HEI)                                                                                                    | Average qualitative feedback following visit of Units (target >80%).                                                       |
| Networking Events                               | Academic staff<br>Students<br>Field experts<br>All relevant stakeholders | Number of networking events (6)<br>Number of attendants (600-800)                                                                              | Number of members of the target group that attended public events (target >80%)                                            |

| Long term impact                                                             | Target groups/potential beneficiaries                                                                                | Quantitative indicators (in numbers please)                                                         | Qualitative indicators                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Research Units maintenance                                                   | Academic staff<br>Researchers, experts, associations or networks of HEIs, research institutes, students, Journalists | Number of visits to the Units (500 annually)<br>Number of research publications issued (5 annually) | Satisfaction indicators (based on feedback forms, filled in by the visitors of the units) (target >80%)<br>Increased number of qualified graduates compared to the past situation<br>Increased number of qualified and internationally recognized academics |
| Employability of students addressing labour needs of the media organizations | Students<br>Field-relevant institutions and organizations                                                            | Number of graduates working in relevant organizations after they complete their                     | High quality of journalism reporting on SDGs                                                                                                                                                                                                                |



|                                     |                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                      |                                                                                                         |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                     |                                                                       | Journalism Degree or Master (>80% of graduates)                                                                                                                                                      |                                                                                                         |
| Journalism Reporting Course in SDGs | Students<br>PC-HEIs                                                   | Number of students & journalists completing Programme every year (180)                                                                                                                               | Course results /accreditation of course                                                                 |
| SDGs_Reporting Platform             | Academic staff<br>Students<br>Field experts<br>Journalists & Analysts | Number of participants who completed vocational training (150 annually)<br>Number of reports uploaded by experts (50 annually)<br>Number of partnerships created between researchers and journalists | Satisfaction indicators (based on feedback forms, filled in by participants in trainings) (target >80%) |

## Conclusion

The SDGSJR project will ensure the Quality Assurance of its deliverables and processes through systematic and continuous activities that will implement, monitor and assess specific quality standards, according to the Quality Control Process.

The processes and tools that have been established in this Quality Assurance Plan, will be used to facilitate the monitoring of progress of the project's activities, deliverables, and procedures, to ensure the overall quality of the project's implementation.

The present Quality Assurance Plan will act as a reference point for all processes used to ensure the project's quality, and will be subject to adjustments and further enrichment, based on comments and recommendations from partners, as well as on emerging needs and requirements.

## Annexes

### Quality and Monitoring Rubric for WP Progress and Completion

(to be filled by every active WP's Leader, every semester)

#### Quality and Monitoring Rubric PROGRESS & WP COMPLETION

Dear partners of the **SDGSJR Project**,

Through the following questions we would like to collect your feedback on the quality of the management and collaboration in our project related to the WP you are leading. This is an internal quality and monitoring process, as foreseen in the proposal, and the aim is to find out, if the project is proceeding well, or if there is something that should be changed or optimized. Your answers will lead to a collection of statements about our common work which we will present in the semi-annual quality reports.

Monitoring and Quality Control is necessary to improve the quality of the project and its products - and it is an **integrated part of the project work plan**.

Regarding this questionnaire, please note that:

- To fill it in will take no longer than **15 minutes** It is recommended **to read the whole questionnaire at least once** before you start to fill it in, so you can get familiar with structure and content of the form, which helps to avoid misunderstandings, redundancies and extra work.
- Answer all questions by **ticking the appropriate score box** as well as by providing **some written text**; if a question is not relevant, please simply tick the box with **“NA” (not applicable)**.

Thank you for taking part!

Developed by Novel Group Sarl



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

|                               |  |            |  |
|-------------------------------|--|------------|--|
| Name of partner organisation: |  | Partner n. |  |
| Leader of Work-package n      |  |            |  |

| Please, provide a list of all deliverables included in your leading Work-package |                   |            |                                     |                 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Deliverable n.                                                                   | Deliverable title | % Achieved | Due date (according to application) | Actual due date |
|                                                                                  |                   |            |                                     |                 |
|                                                                                  |                   |            |                                     |                 |
|                                                                                  |                   |            |                                     |                 |
|                                                                                  |                   |            |                                     |                 |

\*Please, add as many rows as necessary.

| Please use the space below to identify any <b>deviations in outcomes</b> from the initial plans (the application form or subsequent amendment approved by the EC) as well as the reasons for the change |                          |                          |                          |                          |                                           |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                                         |                          |                          |                          |                          |                                           |
| PROGRESS & DIRECTION                                                                                                                                                                                    | Very good                | Good                     | Less good                | Bad                      | COMMENTS<br>(Please, explain your rating) |
| The work carried out by the project's team (i.e. defining objectives, choice of activities, definition of work procedures, division of roles etc.) has been:                                            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                                           |
| The calendar proposed for the carrying out of the project's activities was:                                                                                                                             | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                                           |



|                                                                                           |                          |                          |                          |                          |  |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| The actual implementation of the distribution of responsibilities among the partners was: | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |
| How would you evaluate the overall quality of the project results?                        | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |
| The progress met my expectations as WP leader.                                            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |
| What support would you have needed?                                                       |                          |                          |                          |                          |  |

| MANAGEMENT & COMMUNICATION                                                                    | Very good                | Good                     | Less good                | Bad                      | COMMENTS<br>(Please, explain your rating) |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| How efficient were the management and coordination arrangements?                              | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                                           |
| How did the co-ordination of the project impact your ability to deliver on your work package? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                                           |
| How would you evaluate the time management and the respect of deadlines?                      | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                                           |
| Are the partners' roles consistent with their skills?                                         | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                                           |
| Partners could suggest ideas and solutions to various problems.                               | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                                           |
| The circulation of the information within the partnership was:                                | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                                           |
| Communication with partners was:                                                              | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                                           |

|                                                                                                               |                          |                          |                          |                          |  |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| Were the financial resources adequate for the WP completion?                                                  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |
| The channels of communication (e-mails, Skype meetings, Google+, in-presence meeting, phone calls) used were: | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |  |
| What support would you have needed?                                                                           |                          |                          |                          |                          |  |

| TEAM & ROLES                                                                               | Very good                    | Good                     | Less good                   | Bad                      | COMMENTS<br>(Please, explain your rating) |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| Team work<br>[Cohesive and supportive with all roles being clearly defined and understood] | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>    | <input type="checkbox"/> |                                           |
| How would you evaluate the cooperative work of the partners                                | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>    | <input type="checkbox"/> |                                           |
| Partners were able to understand the instructions and the procedure.                       | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>    | <input type="checkbox"/> |                                           |
| Partners were able to work autonomously and independently.                                 | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>    | <input type="checkbox"/> |                                           |
| Did you encounter any difficulties in setting up the group work?                           | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> |                          | No <input type="checkbox"/> |                          |                                           |
| What worked well in the Partnership?                                                       |                              |                          |                             |                          |                                           |
| What didn't work well in the Partnership?                                                  |                              |                          |                             |                          |                                           |
| What support would you have needed?                                                        |                              |                          |                             |                          |                                           |



| LESSONS LEARNED                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | Yes                      | No                       | COMMENTS<br>(Please, explain your rating) |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| Have you personally learned something during this period thanks to this project?<br>Please give details                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                                           |
| What did your organization learn thanks to this project?<br>Please give details                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |                          |                          |                                           |
| <p><b>Transnationality</b> is a principle of carrying out an action across national borders, so as to have effects at a more general level. It is commonly referred to with reference to the actions of the European Union (EU), in distinction to 'international' (among national governments and controlled by them) or 'supranational' (suggesting powers delegated to a higher level of government). According to the principle of subsidiarity, actions ought to be taken at the lowest level of government possible, so as to maximize democratic accountability and responsiveness to people's needs. The actions of the EU are therefore often justified by reference to 'transnational added value'. This means that the lessons of the experience of one country may prove useful in another.</p> |                          |                          |                                           |
| How successful has SDGSJR been in demonstrating a trans-national approach?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |                          |                          |                                           |
| What actions could be taken to improve the trans-nationality of the project?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |                          |                          |                                           |

| OPPORTUNITIES & RISKS                   | COMMENTS |
|-----------------------------------------|----------|
| What challenges did you face?           |          |
| In your opinion what needs improvement? |          |
| ...and what did you like most?          |          |



|                                                                                |  |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| What opportunities/unexpected benefits did you discover thanks to the project? |  |
| What challenges do you expect in the next period?                              |  |
| Are there any changes you would suggest for the next part of the project?      |  |

| <b>DIFFICULTIES / CHALLENGES</b><br>you met are rooted in:                 | Not at all               | At some degree           | Likely yes               | Definitely yes           | <b>COMMENTS</b><br>(Please, explain your rating) |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| The administrative requirements of the project                             | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                                                  |
| Institutional differences of partners                                      | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                                                  |
| Cultural differences (different values, norms, working styles of partners) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                                                  |
| Personal differences (e.g. strong personalities)                           | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                                                  |
| The technical work (reaching the objectives)                               | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |                                                  |

|                                         |
|-----------------------------------------|
| Any other issue you would like to share |
|                                         |

The tables below breakdown the Working-packages on the expected outputs and the main indicators in line with the logical framework matrix of the project, the mid-evaluation form has been designed to gather information concerning the WP processes – so, please, **fill in the questionnaire as WP leader and only concerning your WP**, if a question is not

relevant yet, please simply tick the box with **“NA” (not applicable)**. Please consider that the numbers refer to the overall duration of the WP.

|                               |  |            |  |
|-------------------------------|--|------------|--|
| Name of partner organisation: |  | Partner n. |  |
| Leader of Work-package n.     |  |            |  |

| WP1 – Needs Analysis                                                |                        |            |                       |          |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|------------|-----------------------|----------|
| WP Deliverables                                                     | Performance Indicators | % Achieved | Number reached so far | COMMENTS |
| 1.1 Report on SDGs Journalism Reporting Course Content              |                        |            |                       |          |
| 1.2 Report on relevant capacity building courses and best practices |                        |            |                       |          |
| 1.3 State-of-the-art report                                         |                        |            |                       |          |

\*Please, add as many rows as necessary

| WP 2 – Curricula & Vocational Course Development       |                        |            |                       |          |
|--------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|------------|-----------------------|----------|
| WP Deliverables                                        | Performance Indicators | % Achieved | Number reached so far | COMMENTS |
| 2.1 Outline and methodology of the Syllabus for course |                        |            |                       |          |
| 2.2 Study material for course                          |                        |            |                       |          |
| 2.3 Capacity building Material                         |                        |            |                       |          |
| 2.4 Specs for SDGs_Reporting Platform                  |                        |            |                       |          |
| 2.5 E-tutor's guide                                    |                        |            |                       |          |





|                                             |  |  |  |  |
|---------------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| 2.6 Specs for development of Research Units |  |  |  |  |
|---------------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|

\*Please, add as many rows as necessary

| WP 3 – Academic staff training and preparation for delivery |                        |            |                       |          |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|------------|-----------------------|----------|
| WP Deliverables                                             | Performance Indicators | % Achieved | Number reached so far | COMMENTS |
| 3.1 Delivery of SDGs_Reporting Platform                     |                        |            |                       |          |
| 3.2 Study visits                                            |                        |            |                       |          |
| 3.3 Online training sessions                                |                        |            |                       |          |
| 3.4 Delivery of Research Units                              |                        |            |                       |          |

\*Please, add as many rows as necessary

| WP 4 – Accreditation and delivery of the courses                 |                        |            |                       |          |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|------------|-----------------------|----------|
| WP Deliverables                                                  | Performance Indicators | % Achieved | Number reached so far | COMMENTS |
| 4.1 Delivery of the course Programme & capacity building program |                        |            |                       |          |
| 4.2 Programme Delivery Interim Evaluation Report                 |                        |            |                       |          |
| 4.3 Accreditation Report on developed Course of PC-HEI           |                        |            |                       |          |
| 4.4 Programme Delivery Final Evaluation Report                   |                        |            |                       |          |

\*Please, add as many rows as necessary

| WP 5- Quality Assurance & Monitoring |
|--------------------------------------|
|--------------------------------------|



| WP Deliverables                            | Performance Indicators | % Achieved | Number reached so far | COMMENTS |
|--------------------------------------------|------------------------|------------|-----------------------|----------|
| 5.1 Quality Assurance Plan                 |                        |            |                       |          |
| 5.2 Quality Board Appointment              |                        |            |                       |          |
| 5.3 Periodic Quality and Evaluation Report |                        |            |                       |          |
| 5.4 Final Impact and Evaluation Report     |                        |            |                       |          |

\*Please, add as many rows as necessary

| WP 6- Dissemination and Exploitation         |                        |            |                       |          |
|----------------------------------------------|------------------------|------------|-----------------------|----------|
| WP Deliverables                              | Performance Indicators | % Achieved | Number reached so far | COMMENTS |
| 6.1 Dissemination plan                       |                        |            |                       |          |
| 6.2 SDGSJR website                           |                        |            |                       |          |
| 6.3 Networking Events                        |                        |            |                       |          |
| 6.4 Exploitation and Sustainability planning |                        |            |                       |          |
| 6.5 Portfolio of dissemination material      |                        |            |                       |          |

\*Please, add as many rows as necessary

| WP 7- Management & Coordination |                        |            |                       |          |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|------------|-----------------------|----------|
| WP Deliverables                 | Performance Indicators | % Achieved | Number reached so far | COMMENTS |
| 7.1 Technical Coordination      |                        |            |                       |          |
| 7.2 Administrative Coordination |                        |            |                       |          |
| 7.3 Contingency Planning        |                        |            |                       |          |



|                                                    |  |  |  |  |
|----------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| <b>7.4</b> Communication and Conflict Resolution   |  |  |  |  |
| <b>7.5</b> Consortium Agreement                    |  |  |  |  |
| <b>7.6</b> Coordination and Communication Platform |  |  |  |  |

\*Please, add as many rows as necessary

### Project Meetings' Evaluation Form

(to be filled by all participants of physical project meetings)

| QUESTIONS |                                                                                                                               | LEVEL OF THE AGREEMENT (scale 1-5)<br>(1=worst, 3= fair, 5=best) |
|-----------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Q1        | Name & Surname (optional)                                                                                                     | Short answer                                                     |
| Q2        | Organization's name *                                                                                                         | Short answer                                                     |
| Q3        | Overall, how would you rate the meeting? *                                                                                    | 1=poor, 5=excellent                                              |
| Q4        | The objectives of the meeting were clear to the partners. *                                                                   | 1=not at all, 5=very clear                                       |
| Q5        | The meeting was useful for helping our organization to carry out the expected project activities. *                           | 1= Not at all useful, 5=very useful                              |
| Q6        | The meeting was useful for establishing communication among partners. *                                                       | 1= Not at all useful, 5=very useful                              |
| Q7        | After the meeting, work plan and deadlines for each result were clear. *                                                      | 1=not at all, 5=very clear                                       |
| Q8        | After the meeting, my role and responsibility within the next project activities were clear. *                                | 1=not at all, 5=very clear                                       |
| Q9        | What is your opinion about the project meeting in terms of issues discussed, social interactions, problem resolution, etc.? * | 1= Not at all useful, 5=very useful                              |

|     |                                                                                                                                                                                         |                                                |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| Q10 | Are you satisfied with the presentations made by the partners in the meeting (timing, content, quality of content, connection with the project tasks, etc.)? *                          | 1= Not at all satisfied,<br>5=very satisfied   |
| Q11 | Were you satisfied with the meeting venue? *                                                                                                                                            | 1= Not at all satisfied,<br>5=very satisfied   |
| Q12 | How do you rate the duration, date and timing of the meeting? *                                                                                                                         | 1= very poor, 5=very good                      |
| Q13 | Was the information provided sufficient for this meeting (e.g. quantity and quality of information flow before the meeting; communication management from promoter and/or hotel etc.) * | 1= Not at all sufficient,<br>5=very sufficient |
| Q14 | Were meeting's activities organized in an efficient manner? *                                                                                                                           | 1= Not at all, 5=very efficient                |
| Q15 | What should be improved for the next meeting? Which difficulties detected must be solved?<br>How? Please explain. *                                                                     | Paragraph text                                 |
| Q16 | Any additional comments? (optional)                                                                                                                                                     | Paragraph text                                 |

(questions indicated with “\*” are compulsory)

## Study Visits' Evaluation Form

(to be filled by all participants of study visits)

| QUESTIONS |                                                                                                              | LEVEL OF THE AGREEMENT (scale 1-6)<br>(1=totally disagree, 6=totally agree) |
|-----------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Q1        | Name & Surname*                                                                                              | Short answer                                                                |
| Q2        | Profession and Institute *                                                                                   | Short answer                                                                |
| Q3        | The objectives of the study visit were clearly defined *                                                     | 1=totally disagree, 6=totally agree                                         |
| Q4        | The study visit improved my understanding of subject *                                                       | 1=totally disagree, 6=totally agree                                         |
| Q5        | I will be able to utilize the knowledge acquired, at some level. *                                           | 1=totally disagree, 6=totally agree                                         |
| Q6        | Participation and interaction were encouraged. *                                                             | 1=totally disagree, 6=totally agree                                         |
| Q7        | There was a correct balance between the theoretical part and discussion. *                                   | 1=totally disagree, 6=totally agree                                         |
| Q8        | The objectives of the study visit were met. *                                                                | 1=totally disagree, 6=totally agree                                         |
| Q9        | How do you rate the duration, date and timing of the study visit? *                                          | 1=very poor, 6=excellent                                                    |
| Q10       | Overall evaluation of the study visit. *                                                                     | 1=very poor, 6=excellent                                                    |
| Q11       | Which aspects do you think could be improved for the next study visit? Any additional comments? (optional) * | Long answer                                                                 |

(questions indicated with “\*” are compulsory)

