

## **Eathen Project - Equitable access to higher education for students with disabilities and students from marginalized groups in Nepal**

### **Quality Assurance plan**

#### **An overview of EATHEN**

The purpose of the Quality Assurance Plan is to define the quality expectations that Eathen project must achieve and how they will be monitored and thus met.

The main principles in planning the QA are as follows:

- Quality assurance is concentrated in three WPs: WP1 (Preparation), WP2 (Development) and WP5 (Management);
- Quality assurance must be cost efficient;
- Internal quality assurance is based on self-assessment, peer assessment and feedback of participants of different actions;
- Three internal quality reports will be produced (one per each project year, 3 in total). The information for quality reports will be collected by using the quality assurance tools according to Quality assurance plan;
- Quality reports are discussed and analyzed in committees and in Project Coordinator Group (PCG)<sup>1</sup> and findings presented in the reports are used for continuing improvements of project process;
- Findings presented in the reports are used for continuing improvements of project process. Quality reports are discussed in committees and in PCG. They are also for background information for external evaluator as well as for final report.
- Internal and external assurance<sup>2</sup> reports are discussed in Steering Committee (SC)<sup>3</sup> meetings and steering committee will make proposals to improve the quality if necessary.
- External operator will execute an external quality assurance. An external evaluator will monitor the status of activities and level of implementation and achievements of objectives.

#### **Partners involved**

The Quality Plan will involve all partners of the Project: in particular, the plan will be discussed and approved by QA Committee and PCG and shared with all partners in order to improve the whole project. For each partner there will be a referent for any communication about the QA (see list):

P1. JAMK University of Applied Sciences, JAMK

---

<sup>1</sup> Project Coordinator Group (PCG) consists of Project Manager from JAMK and coordinators of each other partner institution. Its main task is to find common understanding of practical issues and quickly response to upcoming questions. It works mainly online.

<sup>2</sup> JAMK will be responsible of the external audit (subcontract).

<sup>3</sup> The Steering Committee (SC) consists of Project Coordinator, representative of MoEST Nepal, representative of each Nepalese partner University and external experts (max. 4). It is responsible for overseeing and assessing the project progress and quality results.



P2. University of Bologna, Unibo

P3. Masaryk University, MU

P4. Ministry of Education, Science and Technology in Nepal, MoEST

P5. Tribhuvan University, TU

P6. Kathmandu University, KU

P7. Nepal Open University, NOU

A Quality Assurance Committee is established and it has members from

- Kathmandu University (responsible)
- University of Bologna (assisting)
- JAMK (assisting and linking with the external evaluation)
- MoEST (assisting)

The Committee works prevalently at a distance (online meetings), using e-mail and TEAMS platform.

## Objectives of the Project

*It describes the main object of the project and the specific objectives.*

The main goal of EATHEN-project is to enhance inclusive management practices and access for people with disabilities (PwD) and from marginalized groups and regions (MG) in Nepal to higher education.

Thus, EATHEN will focus on the management of HEIs in Nepal. The goal will be reached by supporting the universities in their development towards inclusive management and practices. This enhances implementation of the inclusive policies and strategies of MoEST in Nepal.

In EATHEN, the partner universities will be supported in the improvement of their inclusive management by establishing 5 support centres for universities, including planning needs-based support services for PwD and MGs. These developments will be supported by the European partner universities and by the Associated partners. EATHEN is trying to guarantee the sustainability of inclusive improvements in the universities with focusing on the management level and that way increasing systematized planning towards ongoing improvements. The sustainability of the support services in HE institutions will be also guaranteed with creating new kind of strategic cooperation between the Nepalese partner universities and MoEST.

To start the creation of the inclusive management in HEIs a special database of PwD and MGs will be created. It'll give qualitative and quantitative information on the current situation and it'll work as a basis for the planning of the support centers, their services and of developing inclusive environment in HE institutions. There will be support centres with services established across the country. The support centers will work in close cooperation with the surrounding society. They will give information, advices and help for those, who have difficulties in access to or in participation in HE. In order to enhance the participation of PwD and MGs in their studies in HEIs, also improvements of inclusive environments will be done. In order to meet special



needs of students with visual impairment, the project also prepares a plan for creating centralized services, like translation of learning material into Braille, and a plan for scholarship program.

The strategic cooperation between universities and MoEST will emphasize the responsibility of the Nepalese partner universities for continuation of inclusive development also after the project. The universities will be closely linked to implement the strategic policies of MoEST. The establishment of the support centers demands professional expertise and trained employees. EATHEN will increase the capacity of the administration level and support centres' staff by organizing a training program and courses.

The main objectives are:

- to improve inclusive management practices and access to higher education for people with disabilities and for people from marginalized groups and regions in Nepal;
- support Nepalese universities in the development of centres for the support of disability and for the inclusion of marginalized people.

## Description of the different WP

*Briefly it describes the different WPs of the project involved in the QA Plan.*

Work package type and ref.nr	Preparation: 1
<b>Title</b>	Creation of basic for successful project implementation
<b>Related assumptions and risks</b>	<p><u>Assumptions:</u> The consortium consists of experienced team members with the level of expertise required to carry out this activity successfully. The level of stakeholder involvement and extend of partners' networks in partner countries is adequate to gathering consistent information on situation in Nepal HEI's as well as the policies and strategies of Nepal MoEST related to inclusive management and practices in order to enhance access for people with a disability and from marginalized groups and regions in Nepal to higher education. Fluent communication between project partners is important.</p> <p><u>Risks:</u> Lack of institutional support, communication and low commitment from partner members. In addition, insufficient data availability may be a risk.</p>
<b>Description</b>	<p>It is highly important to recognize the current political and university level situation in Nepal in the beginning of the project. It is possible that in national level there will be some changes in administration of project partners. The policies may have developed further also.</p> <p>Committees play a significant role in both administration and implementation of this project. Steering committee is responsible of administration amongst other things and coordinator committee supports implementation nation-wide in Nepal.</p> <p>Finalising the cooperation and communication arrangements of the consortium is important at the preparation phase (D.2.2).</p>
<b>Tasks</b>	<p>Updating the project plan to match the current situation</p> <p>Preparation of committees (SC, CC) and project coordinator group (PCG)</p> <p>Creation of common understanding in external and internal communication, communication plan</p> <p>Kick-off seminar</p>



<b>Estimated Start Date (dd-mm-yyyy)</b>	15-11-2019	<b>Estimated End Date (dd-mm-yyyy)</b>	30-02-2020
<b>Lead Organisation</b>	(JAMK)		
<b>Participating Organisation</b>	<p>All partners:</p> <p>1.1: KU (P6) assisted by MU (P3)</p> <p>1.2: JAMK (P1) assisted by MoEST (P4)</p> <p>1.3: JAMK (P1) assisted by NOU (P7), all partners (P2-P6)</p> <p>1.4: TU (5) assisted by JAMK (P1) and MoEST (P4), PCG</p>		

<b>Work package type and ref.nr</b>	<b>Development: 2</b>		
<b>Title</b>	Improving access to HE for students with disabilities and MGs		
<b>Related assumptions and risks</b>	<p>Assumptions:</p> <p>Every WP of Development phase are being implemented logically in balance with each other. During WP 2.1 and 2.2 there will be common understanding of the need for WP 2.3, which continues the work of these WP's even after the project. Every WP of Development phase supports each other's.</p> <p>Risks: The most remarkable risks of this WP are difficulty of reaching target students and possible challenges in institutional support of universities for establishing support centres, services and investments, difficulty in strategic work for guaranteeing the sustainability of the results.</p>		
<b>Description</b>	<p>This WP consists of three different parts:</p> <p>Developing organisational and physical environments (WP 2.1)</p> <p>Intellectual capacity building (WP 2.2)</p> <p>Strategic work between MoEST and Higher Education Institutions in Nepal (WP 2.3)</p> <p>Work of each part starts at Workshop in Nepal. European partners together with Nepalese are agreeing of methods used in working process. Process continues online after workshops.</p>		
<b>Tasks</b>	Every WP has its own descriptions with outcomes (e.g. 2.1.1; 2.1.2; 2.1.3)		
<b>Estimated Start Date (dd-mm-yyyy)</b>	16-02-2020	<b>Estimated End Date (dd-mm-yyyy)</b>	14-11-2021
<b>Lead Organisation</b>	Leader of WP 2.1 is TU (P5), WP 2.2 is UNIBO (P2) and WP 2.3 is MoEST (P4)		
<b>Participating Organisation</b>	All project partners		

<b>Work package type and ref.nr</b>	<b>Management: 5</b>		
-------------------------------------	----------------------	--	--



<b>Title</b>	Project Management
<b>Related assumptions and risks</b>	<p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The consortium consists of experienced team members with high level of expertise in project management and implementation</li> <li>• Infrastructure for effective communication available and functional for all partners</li> <li>• Efficient resources management</li> <li>• Common understanding and commitment among partner members</li> <li>• Timeframe suitable for the implementation of the project</li> <li>• Collaborative approach from participants to provide the information requested</li> </ul> <p>Risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Problems in financial transactions</li> <li>• Technical problems in communication between partners</li> <li>• Cultural misunderstanding</li> <li>• Currency risk</li> <li>• Project personnel resigning</li> </ul>
<b>Description</b>	<p>Work Package Aims:</p> <p>This WP aims to facilitate, support and manage the effective collaboration between all consortium partners to ensure that the consortium implements the project’s work plan effectively and efficiently. Activities will include internal communication and coordination, decision-making and conflict resolution, monitoring, administrative, financial and technical support and reporting to EC as indicated by the specific programme rules. Progress and final report needs to be submitted to EACEA.</p> <p>Methodology Description:</p> <p>The project management mechanism consists of the 4 following organs:</p> <p><u>Project Coordinator (PC)</u>: The project coordinator (JAMK) will be responsible for coordinating all project activities while providing administrative, financial and technical support to the consortium partners. JAMK will offer legal advisory, technical support for programme guidelines and internal communication as well as financial management advisory as needed. JAMK will dedicate a project manager and administrative officer for the WP 5 to handle the activities. PC will also design the online project management platform for supporting the internal communication. This will be part of communication plan in WP 1 (1.2.).</p> <p><u>Steering Committee (SC)</u>: The Steering Committee (SC) consists of project manager, representative of MoEST Nepal, representative of each Nepalese partner University, external experts (max. 4) and is responsible for overseeing and assessing the project progress and quality results. The SC will be chaired by the Joint Secretary of MoEST. DCAP (Dissemination and Communication Activities Plan) and Quality reports are discussed in SC. The aim is that there are also members of disability organizations and MGs in Steering Committee. In case of conflicts, the Steering Committee will make the final calls for conflict resolution. The Steering Committee will meet minimum 3 times during the project in Nepal (meetings are organized in the same time with seminars). It can meet more often if needed via online. All meetings are documented by records. Steering committee keeps records of its meetings.</p>

	<p><u>Coordinator Committee (CC):</u> The task of this committee is collaborative work between Nepal partners. It aims to common understanding of inclusive and education policies as well as the implementation of these policies. The CC will be chaired by MoEST. Other members of this committee are from Nepal partner universities. The committee will meet when needed, minimum 6 times during the project. Project manager is always welcome to meetings. Every half year the CC gives written report (diary) to project manager who presents them to SC. The outcome of CC meetings is under the WP 2.3.</p> <p><u>Project Coordinator Group (PCG):</u> This group consists of project manager from JAMK and coordinators of each other partner institution. Its main task is to find common understanding of practical issues and quickly response to upcoming questions. PCG approves the communication plan as well as DCAP and supports internal and external communication/dissemination. PCG works mainly by online every time when needed. Live meetings are organized only during seminars. Project manager is responsible of group's work.</p>		
<b>Tasks</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial and administrative management of the project, financial audit</li> <li>• Steering committee (SC) and PCG meetings</li> <li>• Interim and Final Reports</li> </ul>		
<b>Estimated Start Date (dd-mm-yyyy)</b>	15-11-2019	<b>Estimated End Date (dd-mm-yyyy)</b>	14-11-2022
<b>Lead Organisation</b>	JAMK (P1)		
<b>Participating Organisation</b>	All partners		

## Methodology

Quality assurance in this project is not only a formal requirement of the project, but a learning and change tool within a complex project, which involves different actors and cultures and which implements different paths and actions. In this sense, it should be emphasized that this type of evaluation aspires to have a purpose that we could define as "formative" aimed at improving the work of the different actors, to clarify the various actions envisaged in the phases and to facilitate communication between the various partners. In this context, the QA Plan will contribute to the improvement of the project itself, in a perspective of support and reflection among the partners and actors directly involved.

### QA plan aims to

1. understand the meanings and overall meaning of the project;
2. reflect on the processes favouring the explanation of the different points of view of the partners, taking into considerations feedback and critical annotations;
3. encourage reasoning about what we are doing in order to identify weaknesses, shortcomings and problems;
4. propose possible solutions and improve the project in its various phases, in case of ambiguities, conflicts, difficulties.

For these reasons, the QA Plan will use above all qualitative tools to analyse the procedural dimension, with a holistic perspective that aims to observe and collect data in a systemic perspective.



In this sense, the participation of all partners at every moment of the evaluation assumes great importance. It is therefore essential:

- sharing with all the project partners the QA Plan, its theoretical and practical approaches related to the evaluation action;
- an availability, a commitment and an active collaboration of the partners and actors involved operationally in the various WPs, which will be activated in the evaluation as evaluators;
- a network and continuous relationship between the partners combined with the maximum communication and transparency of the processes and practices carried out by each partner.

Finally, space and time limits and linguistic difficulties (English as a second language for all) will be taken into account in drafting the QA Plan. Therefore in the choice of methodology and timing of administration of the data acquisition tools, these pre-conditions will be taken into account by trying to administer the questionnaires relating to workshops, meetings and training directly in attendance; combine the assessment of issues related to different WPs within the same online interview; also use the moments of informal meeting to clarify any problems

and address issues;

As stated, Internal quality assurance is based on self-assessment, peer assessment and feedback of participants of different actions. In particular, we will use the following tools:

- semi-structured questionnaires addressed to participants for the evaluation of events such as kick-off meeting, workshops, benchmarking visits to detect the achievement of the objectives set and the adequacy of spaces, times and activities;
- semi-structured interviews (written) at the end of each year of the project (November 2020, 2021 and 2022) addressed to the responsables of each WP and to each partner involved in the project. The interviews will relate to the analysis of the processes of each WP based on the indicators and the main objective will be to bring out critical issues and positive aspects;
- semi-structured questionnaires for the evaluation of training courses to analyze the achievement of objectives, the level of satisfaction of the participants, the quality of the contents proposed, the teaching methodologies.

## **WP involved in the QA Plan**

### **WP1: PREPARATION**

Creation of basic for successful project implementation

- 1.1. Updating the project plan to match the current situation (baseline study)
- 1.2. Preparation of committees (SC, CC) and project coordinator group (PCG)
- 1.3. Creation of common understanding in external and internal communication, communication plan
- 1.4. Kick-off seminar



## What to evaluate

1.3 Communication plan	By end of April 2020
1.4 Kick-off seminar	By end of May 2020

## Tools

Questionnaire about kick-off seminar (Annex 1)

Feedback/comments about communication and dissemination plan (on going via e-mail)

## WP2: DEVELOPMENT

### 2.1. Developing organisational and physical environments

2.1.1 Support centres

2.1.2 Database

2.1.3 Support services for students with disabilities and from marginalized groups

2.1.4 Tours to remote areas in Nepal for contacting possible students

2.1.5 Improvements of inclusive education environment

2.1.6 Plan for Scholarship programme

### 2.2 Intellectual capacity building

2.2.1 Training programme for personnel of support centres

2.2.2 Courses for administrative personnel and teachers in HEIs

2.2.3. Benchmarking visit to Italy

### 2.3 Strategic work between MoEST and Higher Education Institutions in Nepal

2.3.1. A brief cooperation report

2.3.2. Benchmarking visit to Finland

2.3.3. CC meetings

2.3.4. Letter of Intent for enabling and securing the sustainability of support

## What to evaluate

2.1.1 Workshop 1	By end of May 2020
2.1.1 Benchmarking visit to MU	September 2020 (?)
2.1.2 Workshop 2	(?)
2.1.2 Usability of database	November 2020
2.1.3 Support services	November 2021





2.1.4 Tours to remote areas in Nepal	By end of project (November 2022)
2.1.5 Workshop 3	(?)
2.1.6 Workshop 7 (online)	To be defined
2.2.1 Workshop 4	To be defined
2.2.1 Training programme for personnel of support centres	To be defined (spring 2021?)
2.2.2 Workshop 5	To be defined (spring 2021?)
2.2.2 Training for administrative personnel and teachers in HEIs	To be defined
2.2.3 Benchmarking visit to Unibo	To be defined (December 2020?)
2.3.2 Workshop 6	To be defined
2.3.2 Benchmarking visit to JAMK	To be defined

## *Tools*

Questionnaire about Workshop 1 (Annex 2)

Questionnaire about Workshop 2 (Annex 2)

Questionnaire about Workshop 3 (Annex 2)

Questionnaire about Workshop 4 (Annex 2)

Questionnaire about Workshop 5 (Annex 2)

Questionnaire about Workshop 6 (Annex 2)

Questionnaire about Workshop 7 (Annex 2)

Questionnaire about virtual visit to MU (Annex 3a)

Questionnaire about virtual visit to Unibo (Annex 3a)

Questionnaire about virtual visit to JAMK (Annex 3a)

Questionnaire about benchmarking visit to MU (Annex 3b)

Questionnaire about benchmarking visit to Unibo (Annex 3b)

Questionnaire about benchmarking visit to JAMK (Annex 3b)

Questionnaire about training for personnel of support centres (Annex 4)

Questionnaire about training for administrative personnel and teachers in HEIs (Annex 4)

Questionnaire at the end of 1<sup>st</sup> year project (Annex 5)

Questionnaire at the end of 2<sup>nd</sup> year project (Annex 6)

## WP3: QUALITY PLAN Quality assurance

### 3.1. Quality assurance plan



3.2. Assessment tools for internal quality assurance

3.3. Quality reports

3.4. External evaluation reports

## WP4. DISSEMINATION & EXPLOITATION Dissemination and Exploitation

4.1. Dissemination and Communication Activities Plan, DCAP

4.2. Project website and social media webpage

4.3. Intermediate and closing seminars

4.4. Special issued publications

4.5. Awareness seminars

4.6. Participation to equality conference

4.7. Marketing materials

## WP5: MANAGEMENT

5.1. Financial and administrative management of the project

5.2. Steering committee (SC) and PCG meetings

5.3. Interim and Final Reports

### *What to evaluate*

5.1. Financial audit (external)	?
5.2 Steering committee (SC) and PCG meeting	By end of project (November 2022)
5.3 Quality of reports	At the end of second year (November 2021) By end of project (November 2022)

### *Tools*

Questionnaire at the end of project (specific questions to participant to SC and PCG) (Annex 6)





Annex 1

Kick-off meeting questionnaire

This questionnaire has been prepared to understand better your satisfaction level of the kick-off meeting carried out in order to understand which where the very positive aspects but also the aspects for improvement and thus, to prepare you the next activity better according to your needs.

Your response is confidential.

Thank you very much for your collaboration!

Gender

Female

Male

I prefer not to answer

University/Institution \_\_\_\_\_

Role \_\_\_\_\_

Please select a response that corresponds to the following five levels Likert scale for each statement:

1. Strongly disagree; 2. Disagree; 3. Neither agree nor disagree; 4. Agree; 5. Strongly Agree

KICK off MEETING IN GENERAL

	1	2	3	4	5
I found the kick-off meeting useful					
The kick-off meeting was of the right duration					
The presentations were clear and useful					
The kick-off meeting has answered many of my doubts about the project					
The language was appropriate and understandable					

ABOUT THE KICK off MEETING PURPOSE

	1	2	3	4	5

I was involved in the organisation of the kick-off meeting					
I have a better understanding on how the project will be implemented					
I feel I receive the information I need about the project and activities					
I understand how my tasks and responsibilities contribute to the project success					
I know where my contribution is required, when and how					

**KICK off MEETING ORGANISATION**

	1	2	3	4	5
I received logistical information before the meeting					
The meeting venue was appropriate					
The supporting material was appropriate					
Refreshments and food were appropriate					
My overall perception of the Kick-off meeting organization is positive					

What were the strengths of the kick-off meeting? Why?

---



---



---



---



---

What were the weaknesses of the kick-off meeting? Why?

---



---



---



---



---

Thank you for your collaboration!





Annex 2

Questionnaire about Workshops

This questionnaire has been prepared to understand better your satisfaction level of the Workshop ... in order to understand which where the very positive aspects but also the aspects for improvement and thus, to prepare you the next activity better according to your needs.

Your response is confidential.

Thank you very much!

Gender

Female

Male

I prefer not to answer

University/Institution \_\_\_\_\_

Role \_\_\_\_\_

Please select a response that corresponds to the following five levels Likert scale for each statement:

1. Strongly disagree; 2. Disagree; 3. Neither agree nor disagree; 4. Agree; 5. Strongly Agree

THE WORKSHOP IN GENERAL

	1	2	3	4	5
I found this Workshop meeting useful					
The workshop was of the right duration					
The workshop has answered many of my doubts about the project					
The language was appropriate and understandable					
The workload has been properly distributed throughout the workshop					
There was enough time for presentations, discussion and working groups					
The activities were coordinated					
There was a collaborative environment and everyone was actively participating					
The overall objectives of the workshop have been fulfilled					



**ABOUT THE WORKSHOP PURPOSE**

	1	2	3	4	5
I was involved in the organisation of the Workshop for the better definition of my needs					
The objectives of the meeting were clearly defined before so that I could prepare better for the meeting					
All the topics foreseen in the agenda have been covered					
I have a better understanding on how the WP will be implemented					
I feel I receive the information I need about the project and activities of the WP					
I understand how my tasks and responsibilities contribute to the project success					
I know where my contribution is required, when and how					
The workshop was effective (topics discussed, problems solved, next steps to be taken, etc.)					

**WORKSHOP ORGANISATION**

	1	2	3	4	5
I received a programme of the workshop before the meeting					
I received logistical information before the workshop					
The meeting venue was appropriate					
The presentations and supporting material were appropriate					
I had a proper access to the internet connection					
Refreshments and food were appropriate					
My overall perception of the workshop organization is positive					
Minutes of the meeting have been circulated within a reasonable time after the meeting and I was asked for comments for the consolidation of the final version					

What were the strengths of the workshop? Why?

---



---



---



---



---

---

What were the weaknesses of the workshop? Why?

---

---

---

---

---

---

Thank you for your collaboration!





Annex 3a

Questionnaire about virtual visits

Due to the situation of Covid19, a first virtual visit was organized.

This questionnaire has been prepared to understand better your satisfaction level of the virtual benchmarking visit to ... in order to understand which where the very positive aspects but also the aspects for improvement and thus, to prepare you the next activity better according to your needs.

Your response is confidential.

Thank you very much!

Gender

- Female
- Male
- I prefer not to answer

University/Institution \_\_\_\_\_

Role \_\_\_\_\_

Please select a response that corresponds to the following five levels Likert scale for each statement:

**1. Strongly disagree; 2. Disagree; 3. Neither agree nor disagree; 4. Agree; 5. Strongly Agree**

**THE VIRTUAL VISIT IN GENERAL**

	1	2	3	4	5
I found this virtual study Visit useful					
The duration of the virtual visit was appropriate					
The virtual visit has answered many of my doubts about the project					
The language was appropriate and understandable					
The workload has been properly distributed throughout the visit					
The activities were coordinated					
There was a collaborative environment and everyone was actively participating					
The overall objectives of the visit have been fulfilled					



**ABOUT THE BENCHMARKING VISIT PURPOSE**

	1	2	3	4	5
I was involved in the organisation of the virtual visit for the better definition of my needs					
The objectives of the meeting were clearly defined before so that I could prepare better for the virtual visit					
All the topics foreseen in the agenda have been covered					
I have a better understanding on how the support centres/training activities will be implemented					
I feel I receive the information I need about the project and activities					
I understand how my tasks and responsibilities contribute to the project success					
I know where my contribution is required, when and how					

**VIRTUAL BENCHMARKING VISIT ORGANISATION**

	1	2	3	4	5
I received a programme of the virtual visit before the meeting					
The technical information received before the virtual visit was helpful					
The technical support was appropriate					
The presentations and supporting material were appropriate					
I had a proper access to the internet connection					
My overall perception of the workshop organization is positive					

What were the strengths of the virtual benchmarking visit? Why?

---



---



---



---



---



---

What were the weaknesses of the virtual benchmarking visit? Why?

---

---

---

---

---

---

Other Comments

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Thank you for your collaboration!





Annex 3b  
Questionnaire about benchmarking visits

*If it will be possible, there will be a benchmarking visit to MU, Unibo and JAMK.*

This questionnaire has been prepared to understand better your satisfaction level of the benchmarking visit to ... in order to understand which where the very positive aspects but also the aspects for improvement and thus, to prepare you the next activity better according to your needs.

Your response is confidential.

Thank you very much!

**Gender**

- Female
- Male
- I prefer not to answer

**University/Institution** \_\_\_\_\_

**Role** \_\_\_\_\_

Please select a response that corresponds to the following five levels Likert scale for each statement:

**1. Strongly disagree; 2. Disagree; 3. Neither agree nor disagree; 4. Agree; 5. Strongly Agree**

**THE VISIT IN GENERAL**

	1	2	3	4	5
I found this Study Visit useful					
The duration of the visit was appropriate					
The visit has answered many of my doubts about the project					
The language was appropriate and understandable					
The workload has been properly distributed throughout the visit					
The activities were coordinated					
There was a collaborative environment and everyone was actively participating					
The overall objectives of the visit have been fulfilled					





**ABOUT THE BENCHMARKING VISIT PURPOSE**

	1	2	3	4	5
I was involved in the organisation of the visit for the better definition of my needs					
The objectives of the meeting were clearly defined before so that I could prepare better for the visit					
All the topics foreseen in the agenda have been covered					
I have a better understanding on how the support centres/training activities will be implemented					
I feel I receive the information I need about the project and activities					
I understand how my tasks and responsibilities contribute to the project success					
I know where my contribution is required, when and how					

**BENCHMARKING VISIT ORGANISATION**

	1	2	3	4	5
I received a programme of the visit before the meeting					
The logistical information received before departure was helpful					
The meeting venue was appropriate					
The presentations and supporting material were appropriate					
I had a proper access to the internet connection					
Refreshments and food were appropriate					
The hotel accommodation was appropriate					
My overall perception of the workshop organization is positive					

What were the strengths of the benchmarking visit? Why?

---



---



---



---



---



---





What were the weaknesses of the benchmarking visit? Why?

---

---

---

---

---

---

Other Comments

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Thank you for your collaboration!





Annex 4

Questionnaire about training (for learners)

(one questionnaire for each training)

This questionnaire has been prepared to understand better your satisfaction level of the training about ... in order to understand which where the very positive aspects but also the aspects for improvement and thus, to prepare you the next activity better according to your needs.

Your response is confidential.

Thank you very much!

Gender

Female

Male

I prefer not to answer

University/Institution \_\_\_\_\_

Role \_\_\_\_\_

Please select a response that corresponds to the following five levels Likert scale for each statement:

1. Strongly disagree; 2. Disagree; 3. Neither agree nor disagree; 4. Agree; 5. Strongly Agree

	1	2	3	4	5
The objectives of the training were clearly defined					
I received a programme of the training before starting					
The objectives have been relevant to the fields of concern (.....)					
Content and topics were appropriate to my role and responsibilities					
Content and topics were relevant for the Nepalese context					
Contents have been coherent with the intended objectives					
The training improved my understanding of the subject					
I will be able to apply the knowledge acquired					
Visual and supporting material were useful and easy to follow					



Online content was useful and relevant					
The online platform was well structured					
The online platform was user friendly					
The workload has been properly distributed throughout the training					
Participation and interaction were encouraged					
Feedbacks from trainers were					
I could share my ideas and experience with the other participants					
I could establish connections with other participants					
There was a correct balance between theoretical, exercises and discussions					
I was able to make strong links between theory and practice					
The trainers were well prepared					
The language was appropriate and understandable					
The overall objectives of the training have been fulfilled					
The duration of the training was appropriate					
During the lectures in presence,					
My overall evaluation of the training is positive					

Which was the most interesting topic of the training? Why?

---



---



---



---



---

Which was the less interesting topic of the training? Why?

---



---



---



---



---

Which are the most important skills you have achieved thanks to the training?

---



---



---



---



---





Which has been the main strength of the training? Why?

---

---

---

---

Which has been the main weakness of the training? Why?

---

---

---

---

Which aspects do you think could be improved for the next training?

---

---

---

---

Thank you for your collaboration!







Annex 5

Questionnaire about 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> year of project

This questionnaire has been prepared to understand better your overall level of satisfaction with the Eathen project, in its first/second year. With this we aim to assess the project activities and your involvement in them based on your opinions. We also aim to evaluate the benefit for you and your work as well as the impact of Eathen at your institution on the basis of your answers.

It is very important that all of you answer the below questions- it will not take too much of your time. The input you give us will help us to assess the value of Eathen and to improve the quality of next activities to take place in the coming years.

Your response is confidential.

Thank you very much!

**Gender**

Female

Male

I prefer not to answer

**University/Institution** \_\_\_\_\_

Role \_\_\_\_\_

On a scale from 0-10 please answer the following questions, 0 being: not at all satisfied; 10 completely satisfied

1. Communication:

How satisfied are you in general with

The information flow throughout the project's during this year?	
The communication with the coordinator?	
The communication with other Eathen partners?	
The use of website/Eathen platform (Teams)?	
The use of social media for the communication during the project?	
The communication in WP 1 "Creation of basic for successful project implementation"?	
The communication in WP 2 "Improving access to HE for students with disabilities and MGs"?	



The communication in WP 3 “Quality Assurance”?	
The communication in WP 4 “Dissemination and Exploitation”?	
The communication in WP 5 “Project Management”?	
The quality of the interim report? <sup>4</sup>	
Comments/feedback	

## 2. Contents/Methodology

How satisfied are you with

The contents of the project until now?	
The methodology of the project- coordination?	
The methodology of the work package leaders?	
The methodology of the structure of network?	
The usability of database?	
The time and space allocated for the discussion issues during workshops (in presence)?	
The time and space allocated for the discussion issues during workshops (online)?	
The methodology used during training sessions? <sup>5</sup>	
The methodology used during benchmarking visits?	
The fulfilment of objectives envisaged during this first/second year?	
Comments/feedback	

## 3. In your opinion, until now how beneficial has being a partner in Eathen been for

your personal, professional work?	
your students/colleagues ?	
your institution ?	
Comments/feedback	

## 4. How useful are Eathen’s outcomes (training materials<sup>6</sup>, support centres, benchmarking visits, regional networks) for

your personal, professional work?	
your students/colleagues ?	
your institution ?	
Others (please specify)	

<sup>4</sup> Only for the second year.

<sup>5</sup> Only for the second year.

<sup>6</sup> Only for the second year.





5. Until now how satisfied are you with your personal participation/involvement in the project?

From 0 to 10

Comments/Explanations for the rating are very welcome

---

---

---

---

6. Please reflect on your contribution to the project's activities and success: how satisfied are you?

From 0 to 10

Comments/Explanations for the rating are very welcome

---

---

---

---

7. What did you like the most until now?

---

---

---

---

8. What did you like the least until now?

---

---

---

---

9. Did you miss anything?

Yes

No





If yes, please specify

---

---

---

---

---

10. Please let us know your overall satisfaction with the project until now.

From 0 to 10

Comments/Explanations for the rating are very welcome

---

---

---

---

---

11. Do you have any recommendations/comments/suggestions for improvement for next year project?

---

---

---

---

---





Annex 6

Final interview about the project

This questionnaire has been prepared to understand better your overall level of satisfaction with the Eathen project, as it is coming to an end in a few weeks. With this we aim to assess the project activities and your involvement in them based on your opinions. We also aim to evaluate the benefit for you and your work as well as the impact of Eathen at your institution on the basis of your answers. In addition we ask you to state your interest in future cooperation.

The questionnaire is designed similar to the satisfaction surveys applied after each year of the project.

It is very important that all of you answer the below questions- it will not take too much of your time. The input you give us will help us to assess the value of Eathen and to improve the quality of further activities to take place in the coming years.

Your response is confidential.

Thank you very much!

**Gender**

Female

Male

I prefer not to answer

**University/Institution** \_\_\_\_\_

Role \_\_\_\_\_

On a scale from 0-10 please answer the following questions, 0 being: not at all satisfied; 10 completely satisfied

1. Communication:

How satisfied are you in general with

The information flow throughout the project's duration?	
The communication with the coordinator?	
The communication with the other Eathen partners?	
The use of website/Eathen platform (Teams)?	
The use of social media for the communication during the project?	
The communication in WP 1 "Creation of basic for successful project implementation"?	

The communication in WP 2 “Improving access to HE for students with disabilities and MGs”?	
The communication in WP 3 “Quality Assurance”?	
The communication in WP 4 “Dissemination and Exploitation”?	
The communication in WP 5 “Project Management”?	
The communication of Steering committee (SC)? (if you were involved)	Add also NA
The communication during PCG meetings? (if you were involved)	Add also NA
The quality of the final report?	
Comments/feedback	

## 2. Contents/Methodology

How satisfied are you with

The contents of the project in general?	
The methodology of the project- coordination?	
The methodology of the work package leaders?	
The methodology of the structure of network?	
The usability of database?	
The methodology of the Inclusion Awareness Seminar? (if you participated)	add also NA
The time and space allocated for the discussion issues during workshops (in presence)?	
The time and space allocated for the discussion issues during workshops (online) ?	
The methodology used during training sessions ?	
The methodology used during benchmarking visits ?	
The fulfilment of objectives envisaged?	
Comments/feedback	

## 3. In your opinion, how beneficial has being a partner in Eathen been for

your personal, professional work?	
your students/colleagues ?	
your institution ?	
Comments/feedback	

## 4. How useful are Eathen’s outcomes (training materials, support centres, benchmarking visits, regional networks) for

your personal, professional work?	
your students/colleagues ?	
your institution ?	



Others (please specify)	
-------------------------	--

5. How satisfied are you with your personal participation/involvement in the project?

From 0 to 10

Comments/Explanations for the rating are very welcome

---

---

---

---

6. Please reflect on your contribution to the project's activities and success, how satisfied are you?

From 0 to 10

Comments/Explanations for the rating are very welcome

---

---

---

---

7. What did you like the most?

---

---

---

---

8. What did you like the least?

---

---

---

---

9. Did you miss anything?

Yes

No





If yes, please specify

---

---

---

---

10. Please let us know your overall satisfaction with the project

From 0 to 10

Comments/Explanations for the rating are very welcome

---

---

---

---

11. Do you have any recommendations/comments/suggestions for improvement of implementing such a network project?

---

---

---

---

Future Cooperation

12. Here you have space to voice your interest in engaging in further common projects (research projects/ teacher and student exchange projects/ workshop projects / Conferences / Network projects etc.), we are gathering these to hopefully engage in cooperative projects beyond Eathen.

It would be great to receive very concrete ideas- themes

---

---

---

---

