



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



INOWASIA

WP4: Quality Control

M12 – Quality Report

**Project Title: Development of innovative multilevel
formation programs for the new water leading
professionals in South East Asia**

Project acronym: INOWASIA

Project Number:

619225-EPP-1-2020-1-ES-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

Funding scheme: Erasmus+ Programme (Capacity-Building projects in the field of
Higher Education (E+CBHE))

Prepared by Dr. Santi Kongmany (NUOL) and Estel Guillaumes
(WUSMED)

31/12/2021

30/06/2021

Project Title: Development of innovative multilevel formation programs for the new water leading professionals in South East Asia

Project Acronym: INOWASIA

Project number: 619225-EPP-1-2020-1-ES-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

Document Information

Criteria	Details
Document title:	Project Quality Control Report
Document author:	INOWASIA
Version:	1
Date:	30/12/2022

Document Version Control

Version	Date	Description
1	30/09/2021	Draft 1 Estel Guillaumes
1	15/10/2021	Draft 1 Bogdana Marchis
1	30/10/2021	Draft 1 Santi Kongmany
1	30/01/2022	Final Version Estel Guillaumes

Content

1. BACKGROUND	5
1.1 Introduction	5
1.2 Timeline	5
2. GENERAL EVALUATION OF THE PROGRESS OF THE PROJECT	6
3. EVALUATION OF THE PROGRESS BY WORK PACKAGE	12
3.1 WP1: PREPARATION	12
3.2 WP2: Development I: modular curriculum development and teaching capacitation	12
3.3 WP3 M Development II: Implementation of the modules and water living labs in PC's HEI Campus	12
3.4 WP 4: Quality Plan	13
3.4.1 QA Plan Evaluation	13
3.5 WP 4: DISSEMINATION & EXPLOITATION	14
3.5.1 Dissemination and Communication Plan	14
3.4.2 Project Website and Dissemination Material	17
3.6 WP6: Project management	18
3.6.1 Project Management meetings KOM	18
3.6.2 September consortium meeting evaluation	20
Annexes	22

1. BACKGROUND

1.1 Introduction

This report is the fourth quarter of twelve-months since the beginning of the project in January 2021 up until January 2022. It will be re-produced and updated during the project’s lifetime. This report is made as the internal evaluation which is part of the Quality Assurance Plan. Finding results of the evaluation was derived from the information with comments provided by all partners of this project. The information has been collected through different surveys.

The report is structured in three sections.

- The first one provides a general overview of the progress of the project. It also gives information on what partners think is working well and what needs to be improved. The second section analyses the progress of each Work Package (WP). First with a short description of what has been accomplished. It also reevaluates the progress of the WP through the analysis of the achievement of the tasks and deliverables expected and at what time both have been achieved. This allows to be aware of any delays and take the necessary measures to mitigate its effects. The final section is the conclusion of the report and some recommendations. Being this an intermediate report, the conclusions are intended to help keep the project on track and improve any aspect that can help make this project successful.

1.2 Timeline

All partners of the INOWASIA consortium agreed to follow the timeframe indicated below for the successful accomplishment of all QA internal procedures:

Nº	Title	Month	Survey/ Draft	Due date/ Final Report
1	Monitoring Evaluation Plan (D4.1)	2-4	April 2021	2023*
2	Trimonthly technical reports (D4.2)	3.6.9.12.15.18.21 24.27.30.33.36	January 2021	January 2024
3	Monitoring and Evaluation Report 2 (D4.3)	12.24.36	January 2022	January 2024

Table 1: Quality plan results expected

**To be updated throughout the project life cycle*

2. GENERAL EVALUATION OF THE PROGRESS OF THE PROJECT

According to the activities described in the project proposal, those to be done by 12M are:

WORK PACKAGE		Due date	Date finish	Leader/Coleader	Status
WP1: Preparation		15/01/2021	14/06/2021		
1.1	Research and Analysis	15/01/2021	14/06/2021	FSUB/ Co- UBB	Done
1.2	Define local emphasis	15/02/2021	15/05/2021	FSUB/ Co- UBB	Done
WP2: Development I		15/04/2021	14/07/2022		
2.1	Develop academic content and structure	15/04/2021	15/01/2022	ITC/ Co- UdG	Done
2.2	Teaching methodology establishment	15/06/2021	15/10/2021	ITC/ Co- UdG	Done
2.3	Start of the Accreditation procedures	15/08/2021	15/01/2022	ITC/ Co- UdG	Not started
2.5	Implement teacher training and mobility	15/08/2021	15/07/2022	ITC/ Co- UdG	Not started
WP4: Quality Plan		14/02/2021	14/01/2024		
4.1	Define and implement a monitoring and evaluation plan	15/02/2021	15/05/2021	NUOL/ Co- WUSMED	Done
4.3	Project quality control reports	15/03/2021	14/01/2024	NUOL/ Co- WUSMED	Ongoing
4.4	External evaluation	14/01/2022	14/01/2024		Ongoing
WP5: Dissemination & Exploitation		15/01/2021	14/01/2024		
5.1	Dissemination plan	14/02/2021	14/03/2021	IRD/ Co- SU	Done
5.2	Dissemination campaign	14/02/2021	14/01/2024	IRD/ Co- SU	Ongoing
5.3	Local dissemination events	14/03/2021	14/01/2024	IRD/ Co- SU	Not started
5.4	Planning for sustainability	14/01/2022	14/01/2024	IRD/ Co- SU	Not started
WP6: Management		15/01/2021	14/01/2024		
6.1	Establishment of the management structures and procedures	15/01/2021	15/03/2021	UdG/ Co- VNU	Done
6.2	Management plan	15/02/2021	15/02/2021	UdG/ Co- VNU	Done
6.3	Financial and administrative management	14/01/2022	14/01/2024	UdG/ Co- VNU	Ongoing
6.4	Management of project progress	15/02/2021; 15/07/2021; 15/02/2022; 15/07/2022	15/02/2021; 15/07/2021; 15/02/2022; 15/07/2022	UdG/ Co- VNU	Ongoing


Table 2: Project workplan

This general evaluation has been made with the following interim questionnaire M12.


On January 2022, all partners answered an Interim Questionnaire about the progress of the project once the first year has finished. 93,9% of the partners agrees the progress of the project it is going between excellent and very well. The clearness of the structure was also highly evaluated.

In terms of feedback provided by the project management to partners, for some partners it could be improved despite by most of them is excellent and very good.

The overall progress of the project




Project Management provides feedback to partners




Regarding financial aspects, the majority of the partners agree it is well explained and the information needed to complete WPs is clear and timely in most of the cases despite it could be improved in few cases. 93,8% of the partners agree the agendas and reports are clear and well-organized.

Meeting agendas and reports are clear and well-organised




Information, needed to complete work packages, is clear and timely




Appropriate strategies have been created in order to maintain the involvement of the partners which was evaluated as fair and poor for the 18,8% despite the 81,2% agrees it is very good and excellent. This brings to the conclusion that some improvements have to be made in order that all partners are involved. It is noticed that some partners do not understand the management structure and the involvement required from them and specific attention to them could improve everyone's understanding and involvement.

Feedback from management structure is appropriate




Involvement of partners is maintained through appropriate strategies




In terms of communication channels effectiveness and fluency, the majority of the partners evaluates it excellent and very good, which means there is very good communication between partners and the target groups.

Communication (e-mails and website) is fluent and timely




Channels of communication are clear and effective.




When asked about the face-to-face meetings, the agendas were evaluated excellent and very good despite the concern of many partners about the Covid-19 situation that did not allow face-to-face meetings to take place. Even so, face-to-face meetings have been well evaluated with the growing need in mind to be held soon so that some points are clarified and easier to understand for some partners, especially for whom require more clarifications.



II Face-to-face meeting agendas are clear and timely




Face-to-face meetings are useful




In general, all partners agree the management steering is clear and the deadlines of the work plan are met despite according to some partners it could be improved to reach Excellency.

Work plan deadlines are met through clear management steering




Evaluating the contribution of all parts involved in the project, the coordinator’s contribution is highly valued; oneself contribution is very good and to some extent could be improved, similar as others partner contribution which could be higher too.

My own contribution



Other partners' contribution



In terms of strengths, next areas were mentioned: management, financial, training, communication and dissemination, partner involvement and well organization and coordination.

About the challenges and difficulties experienced, it is mentioned: the missing face-to-face meetings to make communication and participation of everyone easier in order to understand every task of the Work Packages and deliverables.

Evaluating the budget spending, most of the partners do not have difficulties or require alteration of the initial budget allocation despite a few partners found it difficult to spend into the limits of the budget.


Regarding the budget, some partners still have not received the allocated budget which might cause late deliverables.

In addition, some partners from a teacher's perspective found the experience very interesting.

Arriving to the end of this questionnaire, partners were asked to evaluate the outputs for the first year. The results are described below:


- The project management plan in general is highly evaluated between excellent and good.

Deliverables (D) [Project Management Plan]




- In general, the Quality Assurance Plan satisfied very much. .

Deliverables (D) [Quality Assurance Plan]




- Regarding the Dissemination Plan, all partners agreed it is well presented and coordinated. However, it was suggested that some aspects could be improved.

Deliverables (D) [Dissemination Plan]




- Lastly, the project website was excellently evaluated by all partners.

Deliverables (D) [Project Web]



- Most partners agreed that the dissemination materials were well presented and coordinated.

Deliverables (D) [Dissemination Material]



3. EVALUATION OF THE PROGRESS BY WORK PACKAGE

3.1 WP1: PREPARATION

This work package covers research, analysis and other preparatory activities for the establishment of the knowledge base for the modular formation programs in Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam. This WPs has not yet been completed. For this reason, the evaluation will be implemented later and the evaluation result will be presented in the next QA report (M15 report).

3.2 WP2: Development I: modular curriculum development and teaching capacitation



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

work package aims to develop the co-design of the academic content of the modules and the potential structure in each participating universities covering student mobility, specific formation for (1) Asian academics and selected students in problem-based learning (PBL), (2) Asian academics on the innovative water technologies and concepts, monitoring activities, as well as the validation of the methodology. In order to evaluate it, the following questionnaires have been done:

Not started yet

3.3 WP3 M Development II: Implementation of the modules and water living labs in PC's HEI Campus

This work packages cover the implementation of (1) the modules in the existing Master and/or PhD programs in each participating Cambodia, Vietnam and Laos universities, (2) student mobility, monitoring activities as well as the validation of the methodology and (3) water living labs in the South East Asian IHE campus in order to evaluate it the following questionnaires has been done:

Not started yet


3.4 WP 4: Quality Plan

The objective of this work package is to establish criteria, tools and procedures for monitoring and evaluating the project in terms of both processes and outputs. Therefore, this WP covers the monitoring, evaluation activities according to quality criteria established for key elements of each WP to ensure the quality of the project activities. From this work package, there have been completment of different deliverables:

- (1) Trimonthly Interim Evaluations Report (month 3,6, 9)
- (2) The first draft of Quality Assurance Plan (1st QAP). It was expected to be completed by the end of April 2021. The 1st QAP was evaluated by all partners for comments, and it was then revised as final version and approved by steering committee for its implementation throughout the project lifetime

3.4.1 QA Plan Evaluation

The plan is drafted based on the nature and requirements of EU projects, respecting the quality management



In June 2021, the Questionnaire for Quality Assurance Plan Evaluation was sent to all partners. In terms of clarity of presentation of the plan, about the adequacy to the requirements and specifications of the commission and proposal based on the requirements of EU projects regarding the quality management 80% of the partners agreed and completely agreed on these statements.




ERASMUS+ Programme –INOWASIA Project Number:



Overall content of the plan was evaluated in a very positive way as well-organised; the procedures were evaluated by the most as clearly explained and by few to be improved. Majority agrees that disclaimers and logos are included on every deliverable and WP. Deliverables actions can be improved for some partners that demand specific help.


Appropriate revisions were made to the plan throughout the project's life-cycle in accordance with specific needs that emerged



According to different indicators, all partners agreed that the public plan to all partners and the specific dimensions were presented explaining the different aspects of the project that will be evaluated. Despite two members consider that the plan was not revised, the rest of the partners agreed on the appropriate revisions were made to the plan throughout the project's life-cycle in accordance with specific needs.

In general, all partners agreed that the quality management/ quality assurance was explained in order to be assessed throughout the project's life cycle and reach the expected indicators explained in the application form.

Evaluation questions were provided to explain how quality management/quality assurance would be assessed throughout the project's life-cycle



3.5 WP 4: DISSEMINATION & EXPLOITATION


This work package covers all dissemination activities and exploitation of results for ensuring the sustainability of the project and activity implementation success, which will permit spreading the methodology around Asia. In order to evaluate it, the following questionnaires has been done.

3.5.1 Dissemination and Communication Plan

In June 2021, a questionnaire was sent to all partners to evaluate the dissemination and communication plan and the evaluation results are as follows

Around 80% of the partners believe that the scope of the project dissemination plan is clearly presented, meets its intended objectives as defined by the project and the tone and writing style are appropriate for the intended audience.


The purpose/scope is clearly presented



Regarding the structure of the plan, most partners agreed that the content is well-organized however it is important that a revision with the dissemination leader and coordinator has to be done.


Partners highly agreed that Ideas and issues related to the main points presented are thoroughly discussed and the methodology followed is clearly described.

The overall content is well-organised




Partners agreed that appropriate solutions and recommendations are presented, and the arguments and ideas and clear evidence have been provided. Regarding the participation in meeting discussions by all partners, A few partners suggested for improvement, . However, the results unveiled that there is very good participation in general.

The methodology followed is clearly described




Partner's participation in meeting discussions




Partners were asked to evaluate about the requirements and specifications of the commission and the proposal, most partners agreed the plan is formatted accordingly and the logos and disclaimers are included.

Regarding the dissemination and sustainability plan of the project, being decided and made public to all partners there is a division of opinion and it reflects that it can be improved by controlling and providing it to the rest of partners. Most of the partners have received the strategic dissemination and sustainability plan.

A strategic dissemination & sustainability plan was drafted and explained to all partners



The dissemination & sustainability activities were adequate for each dissemination & sustainability level as specified by the partnership



The timeframe to complete the activities was difficult to be accomplished by most partners. On the other side, most of them agreed that the activities were appropriate for the key target groups and in line with the scope and objectives of the project. In general, all the activities were evaluated adequate for each

level specified by the partnership.

The objects for each subsector were developed successfully and effectively defined by all partners. In contrast, the communication channels and modalities were appropriate according to the majority of the partners. Regarding the requirement agreed for dissemination on each partner level, it is reflected that more than half have not completed it yet.

Finally, it is noted that the strategy to monitor the dissemination progress needs to be improved and it could include all the target languages.

3.4.2 Project Website and Dissemination Material


During November 2021, partners were asked to evaluate the evolution of the website and the dissemination material once the project progress to the end of the first year. The evaluation results are as follows:

Fifty-five percent of Partners agree that the website meets its defined objectives 60%. However, 45% of partners partially agreed. In terms of project website organization, most partners gave aesthetically pleasant in general.






The website meets its intended objectives as defined by the project




The quality and quantity of the material and information shared on the website was highly satisfactory although the quantity could be

The quantity of the project material and information shared is satisfactory




The quality of the project material and information shared is satisfactory




improved suggested by some partners.

When asked to evaluate the facility to locate information, most of the partners agree it is easy to find. For this one which is partly agree or neither agree we understand that cases, some partners found difficulty in access and improvement is needed. In general, the Website was easy to navigate by more than 65% of the partners.

Information can be easily located



The project website was updated regularly by all partners



Finally, when asked about the updates made by all partners regularly there have been scattered responses, which leads to improvement at this section due to more collaboration from all partners. Logos and Disclaimers included were well perceived by the most of partners.


3.6 WP6: Project management

This WP covers all project activity management with its objectives to (1) ensure the overall progress and timely delivery of the planned project activities, (2) coordinate the consortium within an effective management and communication mechanisms, (3) periodically control the financial expenditures of the project consortium and report the project progress to the EU Project Officer.

3.6.1 Project Management meetings KOM

The Kick Off Meeting was taken placed virtually (Due to COVID – 19), on February 26th, 2021. From the main indicators asked for, the most relevant one had a very good satisfaction. In general, over 50% valued the meeting excellent, followed by 45,5% good. Regarding the meeting agenda, partners gave same results.

As main important point, partners evaluated the overall organization of the meeting by the project leader as excellent and good.



For the improvement of specific issues all partners gave through their answers include (1) participation and communication among partners, (2) clarifications with responsibilities for each partner (to do list), more and (3) some minor issues regarding time control, internet connection from some partners and ambient noise.

It would be due to the interruption of COVID – 19 on the face-to-face meetings, not all questions could not be answered by a few partners. Regarding this, the coordinator could avoid it by arranging smaller meetings with country partners, particularly a representative member who is in charge on this matter, to the level of preparedness by each partner or ask to the leading partners to send a list with the main issues to be discussed during the meeting.

On the other hand, partners agreed about the good organization of the meeting, the good communication among the participative partners, which ended-up with a good discussion about better approaches to the development of innovative multilevel formation programs for the new water leading professionals in South East Asia.



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

y, the questionnaire gave open questions aiming at having suggestion for improvements. It was suggested that a minute for the coordinator would be highly appreciated, and open questions at the end of the meetings could be opened despite it was also offered in this KOM.

Last but not least, partners mentioned that face-to-face meeting are much needed in order to understand better and solve doubts. Some have concerns about the budget.



Fundació Solidaritat
UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA



Institut de Recherche
pour le Développement
FRANCE
French National Research Institute for Sustainable Development



UNIVERSITÉ
TOULOUSE III
PAUL SABATIER




VNU
ĐẠI HỌC QUỐC GIA HÀ NỘI
Vietnam National University, Hanoi




In September 2021, the Consortium Meeting was held. The Evaluation of this meeting was implemented by sending a questionnaire survey to all consortium partners. The evaluation results unveil the very good and

The meeting in general




Meeting agenda



excellent perception of the meeting and the agenda.

The overall project management and the information provided to complete the work packages were rated with the excellent and very good range, demonstrating a great satisfaction to project coordinator. In addition, partners are very satisfied with the communication channels including e-mails and website, and further face-to-face meetings are expected.

Clarity of project aims, objectives and work to be completed



Most of partners highlighted efficiency, clear descriptions and activities, good participation of partners and good communication between coordinator and partners. In contrast, a few partners mentioned that more



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

Participation from some partners are needed for improvement; receiving the material in advance are required, and more leadership from other partners and dissemination should be improved.

The improvement proposed by some partners are (1) more participation and proactivity from some partners, (2) more leadership and meetings with HEI partners to understand and make clear the activities, reminders for deadlines, (3) more communication and discussion between WP leaders and coordinator. Furthermore, it was suggested that the face-to-face meetings could help very much on implementation and understanding.

Despite some points that the partners need to improve, the general feeling is that the project has come a long way despite the global situation regarding Covid-19 and its difficulties.

Regarding internal concerns, it should be highlighted that the involvement of target groups to answer questionnaires was hard to reach the expected number of answers.

4. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

In terms of conclusions, the general perception after analyzing the responses given by the partners is that the project is proceeding in a satisfactory way. However, main Work Packages have not started yet and this report have compiled partner's perception from the KOM, Dissemination and Communication plan, the QA plan, September Consortium Meeting, Website Dissemination Project and 12 months Interim Evaluation. All work packages are performing well despite some difficulties of few partners that need special attention at a certain time.

The main problem identified in these firsts nine months of the project is the uncertainty due COVID-19 and how it may affect to the project implementation in terms of partner's coordination and reaching the target students and teachers. Regarding COVID-19 there is also the concern about the implementation and coordination of the Living Labs, Workshops and Events celebrated in different countries. On the other side, partners are motivated and they perceived good feeling to work together despite the pandemic situation.

Regarding internal coordination, the information provided by the Project coordinator to partners is perceived well organized and coordinated taking in account there have not been face-to-face meetings.

Based on the perception of the majority of the partners, the strategy of dissemination and communication could be highly improved and organized and the progressive collaboration of the partners is expected.

It must be taken in consideration this report analyses the first twelve months of implementation of the project. Being at the start of the project the information available is limited. This makes that no big conclusions can be drawn yet. This report is useful though in providing the first insight and be a baseline that will allow us to see the evolution of the project through the comparison of the responses in this report with the ones provided in successive reports. This will let us know how the perception changes and detect if there are any deviations that need to be corrected.

Finally, it is important to highlight the positive evaluation referred to the project implementation and management. In addition, the quality team reminds all partners about the obligation of answering all questionnaires; proactivity and contributions to improve project development is highly desired. In this sense, we encourage all partners in charge of the respective tasks to take steps to improve the deliverables and keep fulfilling their commitment



Fundació Solidaritat
UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA



Institut de Recherche
pour le Développement
FRANCE
French National Research Institute for Sustainable Development



UNIVERSITÉ
TOULOUSE III
PAUL SABATIER



VNU
VIỆT NAM NATIONAL UNIVERSITY, HANOI



LTC
LITHUANIAN TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY



LTC
LITHUANIAN TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY



LTC
LITHUANIAN TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY



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

Annexes

