MIETC External Evaluation
TERMS OF REFERENCE

v1.1/ 4.1
October 15, 2021

DEVELOPMENT OF A MASTER PROGRAMME IN THE MANAGEMENT OF INDUSTRIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP FOR TRANSITION COUNTRIES

610198-EPP-1-2019-1-ES-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

Partners

Table of Contents

QUALITY MANAGEMENT & OBJECTIVES OF THE PROJECT EXTERNAL EVALUATION

Introduction and Contents of the document

This document represents the Terms of Reference that will be used for the external evaluation of the **ERASMUS+** project **MIETC (***DEVELOPMENT OF A MASTER PROGRAMME IN THE MANAGEMENT OF INDUSTRIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP FOR TRANSITION COUNTRIES***)**, a project developed under the Key Action 2 (Cooperation for innovation and the exchange of good practices) in the specific line "**Capacity Building in the field of Higher Education**".

This document is structured in the following main **sections**:

1. A detailed description of the different **criteria, questions and indicators** that will be considered for the evaluation.

2. The **methodology** that will be used for the **data collection and analysis**.

3. The **contents** and **methods** for both the **Interim** and **Final Evaluation Report**.

4. The **Workplan Schedule** for each of the main Evaluation outputs.

The aspects addressed in the evaluation will be in line with specific **objectives** of the **ERASMUS+ Programme** and the **project** itself: *to build a capacity of Central Asian HEIs (Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, Tajikistan) and the managers of techno parks in Industrial Entrepreneurships by providing high quality elaborated and country-tailored curriculum and study materials and intensive trainings using lean approach for teachers and technopark's managers with big share of practical insights.*

External evaluation: a key part within Quality Management

The evaluation and monitoring of the project's results are thoroughly put into practice during the development of Work Package 4 (WP4). Quality assurance, evaluation and monitoring processes are of utmost importance for the Management Board (MB), composed by one representative by country.

In this regard, the Quality Management is composed of the following main tasks:

- A detailed **Quality Assurance Plan**, detailing issues, such as quality standards, quantitative/qualitative indicators to measure and monitor, reporting and revision procedures, learning modules' quality assurance mechanisms, methodological training means evaluation, monitoring of the satisfaction and needs' orientation of learning deployments.
- An **External Evaluation**, in order to assess, under an independent approach, the project's results and processes, as well as its exploitation and sustainability levels. There will be one interim and one final evaluation exercises. These quality assessments will

identify potential project shortfalls, methods to address them, potential process redesign needs and other project implementation changes.

Thus, a key part of the Quality Management work package (Work Package 4) is the realization of an external evaluation (4.1), in line with the Quality Assurance Plan, document which details the main instruments, tools and procedures to be followed for a high-quality project implementation and that defines quality frameworks for each work package and task (tangible outputs, quantitative indicators, qualitative indicators and quality control actions/mechanisms).

As indicated in such Quality Assurance Plan of the project, it is the responsibility of the External Evaluator to "*assess the project's results and processes, as well as its exploitation and sustainability levels. All partners, led by the QA managers, will provide to the External Evaluator all necessary information/data related to the Evaluation exercise. There will be one interim and one final evaluation exercises. These quality assessments will identify potential project shortfalls, methods to address them, possible process redesign needs and other project implementation changes*".

In summary, the development of the external evaluation is aimed to monitor and assess the development and performance of the whole work programme and to measure the achievement of results and objectives.

In order to carry out this task with objectivity and expertise, the Lead Partner on ERASMUS+ MIETC project (University of Santiago de Compostela) has outsourced the external evaluator role to EOSA, based on its experience in the management and evaluation of European Projects.

Evaluation: definition & relevance for EU-funded programmes

The evaluation is defined as a process of determining the merit or worth or value of something; or the product of that process. The special features of evaluation include a characteristic concern with cost, comparisons, needs, ethics, and its own political, ethical and cost dimensions; and with the supporting and making of **sound value judgments**, rather than hypothesis-testing. The term is sometimes used more narrowly to mean only systematic and objective evaluation. Other complementary process is the parallel task of monitoring. It is aimed to the continuous process of examining the context of the intervention and the delivery of outputs to intended beneficiaries. It is carried out during the implementation of the project by the management team, with the intention of immediately correcting any deviation from operational objectives.

The evaluation is an important element in each European programme. *COUNCIL OF EUROPE EVALUATION GUIDELINES* (October 2020) which cover evaluations in relation to all the pillars of the biennial Programme and Budget financed by ordinary budget, other budgets, including partial agreements and extrabudgetary resources. It explains that each European programme follows the cycle of programme development, identification of projects, appraisal of projects, financing of the projects, implementation -through the funded operations- and evaluation of the programme. The projects are an important part of each programme, since the most part of their resources is implemented through them. Therefore, the beneficiaries and coordinators at each

project should be involved by compiling and providing useful information necessary for the evaluation of the whole European programme.

Monitoring: the basis for evaluation

At the level of a project and in connection with the compilation of information, **monitoring** also becomes an important element. Monitoring is the on-going process necessary for collecting and using standardised information to assess progress towards objectives, resource usage and achievement of results and impacts. Regular monitoring should provide detailed operational information (mainly on outputs and results achieved by the projects, financial absorption and the quality of implementation mechanisms) and facilitate the detection of warning signs. It forms the basis for evaluation and should provide valuable data for the evaluation. The methodology we are going to use to assess the ERASMUS+ MIETC project will combine both: monitoring and evaluation.

At a project's level the analysis focuses at every phase of the implementation, from the development and concretion until the analysis of short- term real and potential impacts. The **evaluation is a process of systematic assessment of the information about the project**, and it will finally enable to consider which are its outputs and outcomes and contrast with the programmed actions and results. This task is established over some strategic principles:

- It should be **useful**, especially for the Project's managers and technicians, as well as for the decision makers. For this reason, the information will be analysed and commented to identify those strengths or weaknesses and so to improve the performance of the operation as well as for optimization of future interventions.
- It should be **transparent**. The methodology and results of the evaluation process will be transmitted and confirmed with the management board of the project. And once they are checked, they will be disseminated to all the stakeholders involved in the implementation and management of the operation.
- It should be **oriented to learning**. The final objective is not to penalize, but to learn more from the mistakes or deviations, and to share and spread those practices which produce positive and successful results.

The approach of this evaluation will take into account the following elements:

- **Consistency with the methodological guidelines** for evaluation of projects and programmes from the European Commission.
- Identification of the **aspects to be improved** in order to feed the management of the project and to be integrated as a part in the life cycle of the project. Detection of the deviations and necessary reschedule of the work plan (Interim or mid-term-evaluation).
- Production of the **deliverables** with the information compiled and the results of the monitoring and assessment of the project.

The evaluation will cover the whole duration of the project, from the beginning till the closing of the execution phase. Nevertheless, the final evaluation of the project is not an "ex- post evaluation", but still an interim evaluation, because it will be developed during the execution phase (the Final Evaluation Report will be delivered 2 months before the end of the project).

Therefore, the measure of impacts will be only estimated as potential effects in a medium- or long-term, further than the direct effects reached in persons or systems during the execution (outcomes). The inclusion of this potential wider effect assessment will allow **drawing some recommendations** in order to drive all those necessary measures before closing the project, especially those connected with dissemination, exploitation and continuity.

Multi-level evaluation

The object to be evaluated is diverse. It pursues to analyse the processes within the management and the execution, the development and progress of the activities within the work plan and the effects on the target public and stakeholders. The analysis will be based on the traditional evaluation criteria: coherence, effectiveness, efficiency and economy, relevance-utility and European added value and continuity or sustainability. Depending of the approach, there are different types of evaluation: strategic, which generally focuses on the longer term and includes the broader policy context to decide on current or future strategic decisions; thematic, which focuses on a specific theme, such as innovation or equal opportunities; cross-programme, which focuses on several programmes; and operational, which deals with operational issues such as application procedures or performance of the project/programme.

This evaluation of the ERASMUS+ MIETC project is an operational evaluation and the efficiency and effectiveness will be the central focus, as well as its contribution to the priorities established in the ERASMUS + programme, specifically under the KA2 – Cooperation for innovation and the exchange of good practices – Capacity Building in the field of Higher Education.

A way to reflect on the project's performance is to draw up the evaluation questions, which ask about some critical issues to facing the final reason why the project has been promoted and financed.

2 Reports: Interim and Final

The products of this evaluation work will be the **Interim Report** and the **Final Report**. A mid-term evaluation is carried out at the half-way stage* of the intervention and a final evaluation is conducted towards the end of an intervention (final delivery 2 months before the end of the project).

*Considering the delay of the implementation the MIETC Project due to COVID-19 pandemic situation, the "mid-term" evaluation will be carried out from the beginning of the project until the month 22 of project implementation.

The final evaluation and the Final report will be more focused in an analysis of the potential impacts and capitalization and assessment with proposals after project's ending.

These deliverables will include all the main data compiled from the Project's documents and from the techniques implemented ad hoc. It will describe and analyse the project from the beginning to the closing, focused in the criteria and the principles previously mentioned. As a part of it, the **reports will provide some conclusions and recommendations** as support for the strengthening of the potential impacts in the field of action of the project and identifying those best practices with a higher possibility of continuity.

THE MIETC PROJECT: MAIN DATA

Purpose, aim and objectives

The **purpose** behind the MIETC project is to build the capacity of the human capital in the HEIs of Central Asian countries on industrial entrepreneurship aiming to provide students skills and competences more aligned to the needs of their labour markets.

MIETC outcomes will fill the gaps in relevant knowledge and skills of local HEIs, students and business in Industrial entrepreneurship and its ability to be constantly linked to the market.

The project's main **aim** is:

• To **strengthen academic capacity of HEIs in Industrial Entrepreneurships in Central Asia** by the development and implementation of interdisciplinary Master program and to establish sustainable cooperation between partner´s HEI and labour market.

Within the general aim the specific **objectives** are:

1. To **create the curriculum the of the master programme** taking into account the experience of the local HEI's and firms and the knowledge of the EU HEI's using a co-design strategy.
    a. To collaboratively (private sector and academia) design and frequently update a curriculum consisting of the following initially defined thematic topics.
    b. To test the above curriculum with custom methodologies tailored to the specific needs of market.
   This will guarantee that curriculum and study material are market relevant satisfying the need of different target groups (students, HEI's staff). This is particularly relevant to Kazakhstan since one of their problems is student migration to study in other countries due to the low quality programmes which are not connected to the labour market.

2. To frequently **update and present the material in plain and easy-to-understand language** (in three different language for each partner), in an open and unrestricted access manner, to reach and engage the widest audience of participants. This will secure that the program is up to date.
   The project's methodology will follow an agile and lean-training approach in order to be easily accessible to all target-audiences. Learning methodology and content will be frequently evaluated and updated throughout the project to maximise knowledge transfer.

3. To **build the capacity of local HEIs by train the trainers in Industrial Entrepreneurship**. Local trainers will be trained in 12 subjects based on 4 initially defined thematic priorities: Data usage, Management, Business positioning, Engineerships. This will guarantee the sustainability of the programme since the e knowledge transferred will be not limited just receivers but they will spread it to future generations of the students. MIETC project is a highly relevant and timely project, especially for Transition Countries and in particular for Tajikistan, such as Entrepreneurship is the main driver of the Economy, as well as a lot of universities, has not such kind of Master's degree program.

4. To **establish strong university-business cooperation** to facilitate knowledge exchange among stakeholders of the project. The curriculum and syllabuses will be on open-access mode to widen the audience reached. Academic and business consortium members will be collaboratively designing and testing the curriculum. Additionally, the training validation and foresight exercises will effectively mix academic insights with real-world cases and entrepreneurial practical examples for the benefit of all target-groups. In these central Asian countries, there is not much collaboration between HEI's and local industries, so this project will also address this problem.

5. To **facilitate the internationalization of HEIs**, local business and students through building long-term cooperation between participants. Academic partners will provide academic exchange between students of the different partners countries to support culture and knowledge exchange. Associated partners from private sectors will provide internship for graduates of the project keeping some openings for students from the master of the other partners countries. Additionally, this master will be first and effective Master's degree program Industrial Entrepreneurship in these Central Asian countries which it can attract a lot of new students from the neighbours countries.

6. To **address effectively gender, inclusiveness and sustainability** issues of higher education in CA partners by competence building of teachers throughout incorporating this issues to some subject such as Strategic Management and in the practical trainings for HEI'S staff where proposals such introducing quotas for females, marginalised and minority groups will be considered.

SCOPE OF THE EXTERNAL EVALUATION: CRITERIA, QUESTIONS AND INDICATORS

The evaluation will be carried out following the main criteria recommended by the European Commission, in line with those reflected in the technical specifications of the contracting process launched by the Lead Partner of the ERASMUS+ MIETC project (University of Santiago de Compostela).

Thus, based on these key evaluation issues, the process will be implemented by measuring and analysing the results of the intervention or project and by answering the evaluation questions, which are the guide to know in depth the performance of the European project.

EVALUATION BY CRITERIA

Technical specifications – contracting process

In the technical specifications of the contracting process launched by the Lead Partner of the ERASMUS+ MIETC project (University of Santiago de Compostela), the following criteria has been reflected:

1. Assessment of the **quality and effectiveness of project implementation and cooperation**: work processes and mechanisms, activities and results of each work package;
2. Assessment of the **effort and competences of the partners** in each work package;
3. Identification of **weaknesses and problems** and proposal of **adjustments and improvements** to address and solve them;
4. Evaluation of the aspects related to the **long-term sustainability** of the results and recommendations;
5. Verification of **correspondence and adherence** to the internal work plan and the objectives and results defined in the proposal;
6. **Impact** of the activities and results developed and their relevance at national and international level;
7. Assessment of **cross-cutting issues relevant to the EU and its partner countries** (gender balance, sustainable development, unemployment, social cohesion, inclusion, etc.).

Criteria and questions recommended by the European Commission

Such criteria will be covered by the following **criteria and questions** recommended by the European Commission:

❖ **Effectiveness**: This issue is one of the most important at an evaluation of a project or operation within the context of a Programme. It basically refers to the verification of outputs and achievements against the objectives and priorities, as well as the indicators foreseen in the application form. Effectiveness can be assessed in 2 different directions:

- o External: by evaluating the project contribution and its effect on the objectives of the programme and sub-programme and the degree to which the project reaches the different beneficiary groups in a balanced way.

- o Internal: by evaluating the partnership and the internal cooperation between the different entities working towards the success of the project.

❖ **Efficiency**: it refers to the relationship between the resources used in the implementation of activities and actions and the outputs and/or outcomes achieved by them. The terms economy and cost minimisation are sometimes used in much the same way as efficiency. This is a crucial but often very sensitive issue requiring constant verification through both monitoring and evaluation processes.

❖ **Pertinence / Relevance**: it refers to the adequacy between the objectives of the project and the context: partners involved in the project, target population, etc. The relevance aspect checks if the project is still relevant in the policy context, if it is dealing with the issues that are needed, as defined in the application form.

❖ **Sustainability**: it refers to the extent to which the results and outputs of the intervention are durable, to what extent positive effects are likely to last after an intervention has terminated. It could also be considered at a broader scale as the sustainability of institutional changes as well as socio economic impacts. Other concepts linked with the duration of the results are:
  - o Durability and effectiveness of cooperation, by assessing impact among the partners and other target groups, the lasting effect of project outcomes, the future cooperation, etc.
  - o Capitalization and exploitation of the results: including the profitable and not profitable effects generated thanks to the project in future target groups, institutions or organizations.

❖ **Impact**: it refers to the estimation of the long-term effect of interventions on the environment in which they operate, i.e. the contribution to achieving the programme's objectives. Impact is usually measured after the project has ended and the socio-economic changes promoted by the project can be analysed.

❖ **Other:** Other criteria such as equity or effects on environment and equal opportunities are also often used in European projects evaluation. In addition, evaluation criteria and evaluation questions that derive from them may relate to the negative and positive unintended consequences of interventions. Special attention should be paid to:
  - o Cross-cutting issues relevant to the EU and its partner countries (gender balance, sustainable development, unemployment, social cohesion, inclusion, etc.).
  - o Added value of the international cooperation.
  - o Innovativeness of the project and its outputs.

- o Synergy and complementarity with the objectives and tasks of the participating entities collaborating as project partners.

> *Summary of the evaluation questions related to the main evaluation criteria*
>
> Effectiveness: To what extent have the objectives been achieved? Have the interventions and instruments used produced the expected effects? Could more effects be obtained by using different instruments?
>
> Efficiency: Have the objectives been achieved at the lowest cost? Could better effects be obtained at the same cost?
>
> Pertinence/Relevance: To what extent are the programme objectives justified in relation to needs? Can their purpose still be proved? Do they correspond to local, national and European priorities?
>
> Sustainability: Are the results and impacts including institutional changes durable over time? Will the impacts continue if there is no more public funding?
>
> Impact: Are the expected or unexpected effects globally satisfactory from the point of view of direct or indirect beneficiaries?

During the evaluation process, the assessment includes the achievement of **Project's specific goals** and its **contribution to the challenges** identified on the **ERASMUS + programme**, focusing on those more related to the **Capacity Building in higher education** line.

OPERATIONALISATION OF THE EVALUATION CRITERIA:

Operationalisation is a process that defines how each evaluation question will be measured or answered. Logical relationships will be established between questions, indicators, or measurement systems and will be put into a matrix.

Evaluation matrix: evaluation questions, criteria, indicators and sources of verification.

The evaluation matrix is a table in which information related to the different dimensions of the problem being evaluated are uploaded. It establishes a set of information needs to which the assessment needs to respond. Subsequently, the appropriate instruments to do so are defined.

The steps to be followed are described below:

1. **Establishing criteria**: Evaluation criteria are the critical elements on which the evaluation process is built, i.e. they are those aspects by which results will be measured and assessed during the period subject to evaluation.
2. **Establishing Information Ne**eds: these are the demands that different stakeholders make on the evaluation.
3. **Formulating evaluation questions**: The simplest and most intuitive way to organise any enquiry process is to formulate questions and seek answers to them. The questions should involve an assessment and should be directed towards those aspects to be assessed.

4. **Establishing indicators**: This is the reporting mechanism that will allow the evaluation questions to be answered.
5. **Selecting the sources of information**: these are the ones that provide data to feed the defined indicators, combining primary and secondary sources.

INDICATORS

As it will be seen, the proposed indicators have the following characteristics:

*   **Relevant**: with respect to the information that is intended to be extracted from them.
*   **Accessible**: within the difficulties of identifying and contacting certain key informants, especially the students of the programmes to be evaluated.
*   **Verifiable**: as they can be observed and recorded.
*   **Balanced**: in terms of the use of qualitative and quantitative strategies and techniques that allow for a global vision of the results and at the same time focus on specific elements.
*   **Useful**: they have the capacity to provide practical information for conclusions and recommendations.

The *Quality Assurance Plan* establishes a quality framework, defining the quantitative and qualitative indicators to be monitored as well as the mechanisms and instruments for quality control, with the final aim to improve the overall quality of the project.

In this regard, the different indicators addressed in the Quality Assurance Framework per Work Package and task will be taken into consideration when planning the evaluation matrix of the following section.

PROPOSED EVALUATION MATRIX

Criterion	Reporting needs	Questions	Indicator	Verification source
Effectiveness	Degree of achievement of the general objective	Has the academic capacity of HEIs in Industrial Entrepreneurships in Central Asia been strengthened?	(*Project objective*) Strengthened academic capacity of HEIs in Industrial Entrepreneurships in Central Asia	Gathering information through fieldwork
	Degree of achievement of the specific objectives / outcomes	Have the needs and competences been analysed?	Developed reports o need and competences based on survey results and analysis of international programmes	
		Has a model for the development of the structure of the master been produced?		
		Has the Curriculum and the syllabi for each course of the	Developed curriculum	Gathering of information through

Criterion	Reporting needs	Questions	Indicator	Verification source
		Master Programme been developed and approved?		the review of the reports produced in the framework of the project.
		Has academic staff been trained in the establishment of Entrepreneurship centres?	Number of trained staff in the establishment of Entrepreneurship Centres	
		Have the contents of the Master subjects been developed?	Developed and approved course materials	
		Have Entrepreneurship Centres been established in CA countries?	Established Entrepreneurship Centres	
		Has academic staff been trained in the Master Programme subjects?	Number of trained staff in Master program disciplines	
		Has the Master Programme been implemented?	Number of Master students enrolled per year	
Criterion	**Reporting needs**	**Questions**	**Indicator**	**Verification source**
Efficiency	The resources were adequate to achieve the objectives.	Has the project planning and implementation time been adequate for the objectives and expected results?	Number of variations to the work schedule	Gathering of information through the review of the reports produced in the framework of the project.
Criterion	**Reporting needs**	**Questions**	**Indicator**	**Verification source**
Pertinence/ relevance	Adequacy of the actions conducted so far to achieve the objectives of the Project's objective	Were the actions implemented so far adequate to implement project actions according to expectations?	Achievement of the expected results and deliverables	Gathering information through fieldwork
	Adequacy of the actions to achieve the objective of the programme ERASMUS+ - Capacity Building - HEI	To what extent has the project contributed to increasing the capacity of the human capital in the HEIs of Central Asian countries on industrial entrepreneurship?		
	Adequacy of the actions for the achievement of the Project's objective	Were the actions implemented adequate to improve the project objectives?		
Criterion	**Reporting needs**	**Questions**	**Indicator**	**Verification source**
Sustainability	Likelihood of continued benefits from the activity (implementation of Master Programme,	To what extent can the continuity of the measures put in place be ensured?	Sustainability of implemented measures	Sustainability Strategy Implementation Plan + Gathering information through fieldwork
	Lasting cooperation European - Central Asian partners	Do project beneficiaries plan to continue to cooperate and share information after the project has ended?	Expectations of sustaining cooperation between project beneficiaries over time.	Sustainability Strategy Implementation Plan + Gathering information through fieldwork

Criterion	Reporting needs	Questions	Indicator	Verification source
	Lasting cooperation university-business	Do CA universities and business plan to continue to cooperate after the project has ended?	Expectations of sustaining cooperation between CA universities and business over time.	Sustainability Strategy Implementation Plan + Gathering information through fieldwork
Impact	Knowing the effects of the programme and project.	Has there been an improvement in the capacity of local HEIs in the field of Industrial Entrepreneurship?	Perception of HEIS capacity increase in the field of Industrial Entrepreneurship	Gathering information through fieldwork
		What effects has the programme had – Are there any unintended effects?	Perception of the FUTURE IMPACT by the organisations that make up the partnership (effects caused, expected or not).	Gathering information through fieldwork

METHODOLOGY: DATA COLLECTION AND TECHNIQUES

At a first phase of the evaluation the sources of information must be identified. How is the information system of the project, which documentation will be the main source for the data collection? And also at this stage the techniques that are going to be implemented in order to complete the quantitative and qualitative information about the project can be proposed.

The following tasks and techniques are proposed as the methodology for MIETC evaluation:

1. **Terms of Reference**: The preparation of the Terms of Reference is the first task at the beginning of the evaluation process. This present document explains and describes the objective of the external evaluation, the object to be evaluated, how will be evaluated, the methodology and techniques, and the description of the deliverables to be provided. The objective is to make clear what is exactly an evaluation and how it can be useful for the project.

2. **Identification of the information system and data sources**: As "secondary" or documental information sources, the main stream of information about the implementation of the project will come from the management system and documents generated within the project. They will be analysed and compiled in collaboration with the Management Board (MB) of the project and they would be at least:
   - Project's application form (technical part, financial parts).
   - Schedule of the work plan and the different reschedules and modifications approved by the Programme's Authority (EACEA).
   - Internal protocols and manuals.
   - Interim and final reports.
   - Technical memories and reports.
   - Target groups evaluation results.
   - Steering Committee minutes.
   - Publications generated by the project.
   - Website and newsletters, media releases.
   - Products and deliverables (including online products developed by the project).
   - Statistics of the tools.

   The constantly updated "*TABLE OF ACHIEVED / PLANNED RESULTS*" document, as well as the different reports submitted to the Programme's Authority (EACEA) will be key in this regard.

3. **Review of the indicators matrix**. At the design phase of the project some indicators of results were defined in the application form. These pre-defined indicators will be the main element to monitor and contrast the execution. Nevertheless, in order to have a complete vision of the project's performance and about the concrete effects reached by the project, per each work package more outputs and outcomes indicators will be proposed and gathered, as well as impacts indicators to take into account and to

measure those broader effects, the transfer and continuity of its results after the project's end.

4. **Design and development of the primary information sources and evaluation techniques**. In order to complete the data coming from the information system of the project, some techniques will be implemented as a part of the evaluation. With this objective, for the preparation of the **Interim Report**, a **survey** to the whole partnership will be carried out, in the form of a questionnaire with open and closed questions to ask about different issues in connection with the project's performance. The issues will be related with difficulties for the implementation, assessment of the outcomes, identification of good practices and learned lessons, the prevision of continuity and broader impact by each activity and foreseen measures by each partner. Then, for the preparation of the **Final Report**, and once the project has developed most of its activities, a **focus group** addressed to project partners will be conducted in order to draw conclusions on different aspects related to the project implementation, its impact and future perspectives. Such focus group will be complemented with a new **survey** addressed to key project actors / stakeholders in order to get information from an external perspective on the project impact and results.

5. **Monitoring and check of the products and deliverables**: As a part of the monitoring and evaluation a check of the outputs produced by the partners will be developed. These outputs could be the documents, digital products, edited materials, websites and guidelines. Together with the review of each product some information about the distribution and dissemination carried out by the partners will be compiled.

6. **Resources consumption**: considering the criteria of efficiency and economy, the necessary inputs used during the project's execution will be measured, such as human resources, external experts, subcontracting and use of equipment or venues. The time needed for preparation and implementation of the activities will be a variable also to be measured. This will allow finding out how long is the duration for implementation and testing of new products or innovations developed and the time needed for an effective use of the implemented tools and its quality.
The documentation provided by the Lead Partner regarding information on budget expenditure and achievement indicators under Work Package 1 will be key in this regard, as they will serve as the main source of information for the preparation interim and final reports and they also provide data for impact assessment and quality assurance. The *TABLE OF ACHIEVED / PLANNED RESULTS* will be a reference document in order to check the project state of implementation, updating and summarising the main activities to be done and indicators to be achieved.

7. **Evaluation Reports:** Elaboration of the evaluation reports, as described in the following sections. As it was previously mentioned, the products of this evaluation work will be the Interim Report and the Final Report. A mid-term evaluation is carried out at the half-way stage of the intervention and a final evaluation is conducted towards the end of an intervention (to be finished and delivered two months before the end of the project). Thus, the Interim evaluation will focus on project implementation so far, identifying potential project shortfalls, methods to address them, possible process redesign needs

and other project implementation changes, while the final evaluation and the final report will be more focused in an analysis of the potential impacts and capitalization and assessment with proposals after Project's ending.

THE INTERIM REPORT: CONTENTS AND METHODS

The Interim Report will consist in the monitoring of the execution of the project (since its beginning till the month 22) and in a first assessment of some criteria, mainly: effectiveness to achieve the foreseen products and results, contrasts of baseline values and real values of indicators, and efficiency (with the data available at the moment).

The structure of this report will include the following aspects:

1. **Introduction**

1.1 Introduction to project evaluation

2. **Description of the Project**

3. **Methodology used in the evaluation process**

3.1 Evaluation by criteria

4. **Analysis of the evaluation criteria**

4.1 Efficacy

4.2 Efficiency

4.3 Pertinence / relevance

5. **Conclusions and recommendations**

6. **Annexes**

THE FINAL REPORT: CONTENTS AND METHODS

The last task and final product of the evaluation process will be the elaboration of the final report. This evaluation report will compile the data about the whole performance of the project, from the beginning till the end, based on the documentation and information system of the project as well as from the implemented techniques like the partners inquiry through a focus group and the survey addressed to key project actors / stakeholders in order to get information from an external perspective on the project impact and results.

The objectives and functions of this report are basically:

- Facilitating the compilation of all the detailed information and data about the project execution, especially useful for preparing the Final Report to submit to the Managing Authority (EACEA) as a part of the monitoring system of the Programme.
- Checking if the content and products obtained are those foreseen at the design phase and checking the estimated calendar and milestones.
- Matching the estimated budget and the final resources consumption made by the partners, in comparison with those foreseen at project's application.
- Identification of deviations and barriers that interfered in the project's execution.
- Facilitating the relevant opinions and qualitative information about the intervention coming from the main actors, as partners, teams or participants involved at project's activities.
- Identification of the good practices and results with potential to be capitalised and transferred into the educational systems.
- Advice and recommendations about those steps necessary to get a broader impact and transfer of results.

In the final report the evaluation questions (by focus groups with project partners means and through a survey) will be answered, based on the quantitative and qualitative data. The values reached on the indicators will also be contrasted. Together with the foreseen results and outputs of the project, other indicators of outputs, outcomes and potential impact will be considered.

The structure of the final evaluation report will include the following contents:

1. **Introduction**
1.1 Introduction to project evaluation
2. **Methodology used in the evaluation process**
2.1 Evaluation by criteria
3. **Analysis of the evaluation criteria**
3.1 Efficacy
3.2 Efficiency
3.3 Pertinence / relevance
3.4 Sustainability
3.5 Impact
4. **Conclusions and recommendations**
5. **Annexes**

EXTERNAL EVALUATION WORKPLAN SCHEDULE

Action	Date of delivery
Terms of Reference / Methodology	15/10/2021
Analysis of project activities and results so far	15/10/2021 – 30/11/2021
1st partners' inquiry (survey)	30/11/2021 – 10/12/2021
Interim Evaluation Report	15/12/2021
Analysis of project activities and results so far	12 – 10 weeks before the end of the project
2nd partners' inquiry (focus group)	12 – 10 weeks before the end of the project
1st inquiry to key project actors / stakeholders (survey)	12 – 10 weeks before the end of the project
Final Evaluation Report	2 months before the end of the project

The information and views set out in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the European Union. Neither the European Union institutions and bodies nor any person acting on their behalf may be held responsible for the use which may be made of the information contained therein.