

WP6: QUALITY CONTROL QUESTIONNAIRE

Final ASSESSMENT. Part 1: Results

All the 16 partners have answered this questionnaire. Only the Ministry of Education has not provided it.

SECTION I: GENERAL QUESTIONS

Part 1: General management and coordination

NUMBERS OF STAFF INVOLVED

Q1. In your institution/organization, how many persons have been included in Project activities:

Results: The **16** respondents have declared in total **171** participants:

- 34** leadership and management personnel
- 36** administrative staff
- 69** teaching/academic/research staff
- 18** students
- 14** other persons from outside the institution

AGREEMENT AND PAYMENTS

Four questions give information to this issue – Q2-Q5:

Q2-Q3 Has your institution/organization signed a Partnership Agreement including installment issues provided by the Grantholder? And (Q3) have they agreed with the terms of Partnership Agreement?

Results: Only one partner declares they did not sign agreement with instalment issues without explanation.

Q4-Q5 Has the part of the grant allocated to your institution/organisation been transferred to or available for your institution/organisation (Q4) in accordance to agreed budget tables and (Q5) in appropriate time after your institution/organisation provided valid Payment instructions?

Results: Two partners have answered negative to Q4 and six – to Q5. *In case of no, please provide reasons why:*

Belgrade university: *I don't know the reasons, but in the second instalment money for equipment and indirect costs were held by the Grantholder. The second instalment was 2 months late (after the transfer from Bruxelles)*

Final evaluation of the Quality Control Questionnaire: Part 1 RESULTS

University of Novi Sad: *There has been significant delay from the coordinator to transfer the funds.*

Commissioner for Protection of Equality: *The project does not provide grant for our institution. Payment is not applicable*

Association of Roma students: *The first instalment was a bit late.*

PROGRESS OF THE PROJECT

Three questions answer to this issue – Q6, Q7 and Q13:

Q7 Have you encountered any deviations/changes in the implementation of the agreed plan in your institution/organisation?

Results: For most respondents the answer is “to a low extent” or “to a very low extent”. Some changes (3 “medium”) in the initial plan declare Nis University, Belgrade university and the Association of Students with disabilities. Only for Novi Sad University the changes are estimated as “to a high extent”.

In case of ‘to a very high extent extent’, please provide reasons why

University of Novi Sad provides explanation although they do not give the maximum points: *There has been change in the terms of workpackage leaders due to the change of contact person within the University of Novi Sad team. University of Belgrade and University of Novi Sad have agreed to switch workpackages 5 and 6 between the institutions. The budgets remained the same.*

Q6 Up to this moment, the project has been advancing according to the plan agreed by the Consortium?

Results: Average 4 (“to a high extent”). For 14 partners the answer is 4 (“to a high extent”), one partner assesses the progress 5 ‘to a very high extent’, and one - 3 (“medium”).

Q13 According to your perception, does the Project advance well?

Results: Average 4 (“to a high extent”). For 8 respondents the average answer is 4 (“to a high extent”), for 4 partners 3 (“medium”) and for 4 it is 5 (“to a very high extent”).

ORGANIZATIONAL COMMUNICATION

Four questions give information to this issue Q8-Q12:

Q8 According to your knowledge, has the coordinator been responding on time and adequate to the enquiries, proposals and suggestion which came from your institution/organisation?

Results: For the 15 partners the average answer is 4,0 (to a high extent)

Final evaluation of the Quality Control Questionnaire: Part 1 RESULTS

If you need/wish to provide a more elaborate answer please use this comment space

Novi Sad University: *The coordinator has been responding slightly with a delay and sometimes organising meetings in the last minute. Overall communication with the coordinator has been satisfactory.*

Q9 According to your knowledge, has your institution/organisation been responding on time and adequate to the enquiries, proposals and suggestion which came from the coordinator?

Results: For all respondents the average answer is 4.3 (“to a high extent”)

Q10 According to your knowledge, has your institution/organisation had any problem in communication with coordinator?

Results: For the 15 partners the average answer is 1,7 (“to a low extent”). Of them one scores 3 (“medium”), one 2 (“to a low extent”) and one 4 (“to a high extent”) communication problems.

Q11 Concerning the decision making process does your institution/organisation receive proposals in written form, including necessary supporting documents in advance and have appropriate time to consult with senior management, if necessary?

Results: All have answered “yes”

Q12 Has coordinator responded timely and accordingly to the comments, proposals or request for clarification in the course of decision making?

Results: For all respondents the average answer is 4,0 (“to a high extent”). In particular 4 partners assess with 3 (“medium”), 7 with 4 (“to a high extent”) and 4 with 5 (“to a high extent”).

PROGRESS OF WORK PACKAGES

Four questions only for the WP leaders only give information to this issue – Q14-Q17:

Q14 *As the lead partner, how would you describe the current status in the advancement of the respective work package*

Results: The WP leaders have provided information on all of the planned deliverables

University of Belgrade

- For WP2 all 6 deliverables have been fulfilled
- For WP4 only 4 deliverables have been fulfilled. D4.3 (Guidelines on the NFP-SSS in Serbia), D4.6 (Functional assistive technologies on Universities) and D4.7 (Disseminated knowledge on SSS to faculties staff) are still in progress while their deadline was in July/September 2013.

Final evaluation of the Quality Control Questionnaire: Part 1 RESULTS

- For WP5 all 5 deliverables have been fulfilled
University of Novi Sad
- For WP6 all 3 deliverables are in progress
University of Nis
- All deliverables in all work packages have been fulfilled

Q15-16 Have you noticed any problems or difficulty in the course of implementing activities of the respective work package (communication with other partners, deadlines, the quality of work etc.)? If yes, (Q16) how have you addressed these issues to improve the situation? If yes (Q17) have you informed coordinator on the encountered problems, if any?

Results:

University of Belgrade: leader for WP2, 4 and 5 has encountered problems without specifying what. They have addressed the problems by improving communication, and calling for more active participation of University management. The project coordinator was informed.

University of Novi sad: Due to the changes of the contact person there was a delay of implementing the Quality Control Plan. After completing the questionnaire to assess the overall project implementation there was difficulty in communication with partners in regard with the proposed deadlines. University of Novi Sad and the University of Veliko Trnovo have arranged Quality Control Meeting in order to summarize results from the questionnaire and find a solution to motivate other partners to fill in the questionnaire in order to have a finalized assessment of results.

University of Nis have not encountered problems. Q17 is not applicable to them since they are the coordinating institution.

COOPERATION BETWEEN SERBIAN PARTNERS

This issue has been evaluated with three questions – Q18-20:

Q18 The collaboration with the other partners has been correct and productive

Q19 In case the answer is *to a very low extent* to the previous question please explain why?

Q20 Have you informed the coordinator and consortium members on the encountered problems within your country, if any?

Results:

The collaboration is estimated with an average of 4.09 “to a high extent”. Only one partner gives a “medium” (3) answer, while two answer “to a very high extent” (5). Nobody gives poor mark and so nobody has answered Q19. Two partners, the University of Novi Sad and the Association for students with disabilities, have informed the coordinator of encountered problems.

SECTION II: WORK PACKAGES

Each WP is evaluated with identical 5 questions with a possibility to add further comments

WORK PACKAGE1: Policy Framework: equitable access to HE in Serbia

Q21 Please outline the contribution of your institution within WP1:

University of Belgrade An expert working on baseline study, team members participating in study visits.

University Arts: Overview, analysis and giving opinion on Baseline study

University of Novi Sad: contribution to the Baseline study by University of Novi Sad working group, participation in study visit to the University of Roehampton, gathering information about student services, assistive technology, regulations in regard with student support

State University of Novi Pazar: does not participate in this work package

Centre for Education Policies Fully completed tasks foreseen in the project application with eventual additional adjustments agreed on the consortium level

Commissioner for Protection of Equality: We have contributed to the following deliverables: D.1.1, D.1.2, D.1.3, D.1.4, D1.5.

Association for students with disabilities: Formulation of policies, comparative policy analysis through transfer of knowledge on international practices; Preparing final version of policy framework for diversifying and enlarging the student body;

University of Roehampton: We organized and ran (including the teaching) a one week intensive workshop at the University of Roehampton in May 2012 for 30 members of the EquiEd project in order to explain and show policies on widening access to universities and to discuss and consider related issues around such policies and their implementation. We provided a range of speakers as well as contributing in-put ourselves. We wrote a chapter for the EquiEd book on widening access, detailing an analysis of the development of Widening Participation and Access policies in Britain. We presented a version of this chapter and policy recommendations at the conference in Belgrade in December 2013.

University of Veliko Turnovo: Study of good practices in Bulgaria on student support services and students' life standard. Organization of a study visit in Veliko Tarnovo of the partner universities.

University of Niš coordinated work on Baseline study, organized stakeholder conferences and led the process of formulating policy recommendation

SCONUS: Data on students living standard collection for the Baseline study. Writing a chapter in the Baseline study on students living standards

SORS has prepared data for the Baseline study on social dimension of HE and for Key findings presented to project stakeholders.

Final evaluation of the Quality Control Questionnaire: Part 1 RESULTS

Association of Roma students: *We gave inputs on baseline studies to main researcher. We also promoted baseline findings with other non-project stakeholders*

Q22 Indicate how satisfied are you with the results achieved in WP1:

Results: The respondents evaluate their satisfaction with the results of WP1 on average with 3.91 (“to a high extent”). 11 of 16 partners have answered, or 68,8% of the partners have opinion on this question.

Q23 To what extent have the planned deliverables been achieved in WP1?

D.1.1. Baseline study on social dimension of HE:

Results: The average evaluation mark is 4.38 (“to a high extent”) given by 13 partners (81,3% answered).

D.1.2 Key findings presented to project stakeholders:

Results: The average evaluation mark is 4.25 (“to a high extent”) given by 12 partners (75% answered).

D.1.3. Policy recommendations developed:

Results: The average evaluation mark is 3.83 (“to a high extent”) given by 12 partners (75% answered).

D.1.4. Consensus on proposed policy recommendations:

Results: The average evaluation mark is 3.91 (“to a high extent”) given by 11 partners (68,8% answered).

D.1.5. Policy framework ensuring equitable access:

Results: The average evaluation mark is 3.90 (“to a high extent”) given by 11 partners (68,8% answered).

Please comment what can be improved/could have been done better in WP1:

Results: Association for students with disabilities: *Increased communication with stakeholders who weren't in project, for example Ministry of Education, Student's centers etc.*

Q24 According to your knowledge, has the lead partner of the working group been responding on time and adequate to the enquiries, proposals and suggestions which came from your institution/organisation?

Results: The average evaluation mark is 3.77 (“to a high extent”) given by 13 partners (81,3% answered).

Final evaluation of the Quality Control Questionnaire: Part 1 RESULTS

Q25 According to your knowledge, has your institution/organisation been responding on time and adequate to the enquiries, proposals and suggestion which came from the lead partner of the working group?

Results: The average evaluation mark is 4.31 (“to a high extent”) given by 13 partners (81,3% answered).

Further comments:

Results: No further comments are provided

WP2: System of collection, analysis and dissemination of data on HE (26-30)

Q26 Please outline the contribution of your institution within WP2:

University of Belgrade Managing WP, doing analysis, producing new methodologies, improving statistical procedures, participating in study visits and trainings

University Arts Participation in outlining the form for students. Collecting data – especially social dimension

University of Novi Sad: gathering information from faculties from the University of Novi Sad in regard with system of data collection, improving statistical procedures, participating in study visits and training

State University of Novi Pazar: does not participate in this work package

Centre for Education Policies Fully completed tasks foreseen in the project application with eventual additional adjustments agreed on the consortium level.

Association for students with disabilities: We contributed in developing of recommendations and improving of policies for collection and monitoring statistic data about students

University of Veliko Turnovo: We participated in the discussion on WP2 with Serbian partners during their visit to our institution

University of Maribor: We have presented the respective Slovenian solutions and situation.

University of Niš participated in the study of current status of student statistics, proposed some indicators for the student statistics and helped in improving the form for semi-annual census of student population.

SORS has been involved in: Study on current status of students statistics; Set of indicators for the student statistics; Methodology on student statistics adopted by SORS

Association of Roma students: We provided data base on number of Roma students on faculties on Universities of Novi Sad, Belgrade and Novi Sad according to our records.

Q27 Indicate how satisfied are you with the results achieved in WP2:

Results: The respondents evaluate their satisfaction with the results of WP2 on average with 4.25 (“to a high extent”). This evaluation is given by 8 partners (50% answered).

Final evaluation of the Quality Control Questionnaire: Part 1 RESULTS

Q28 To what extent have the planned deliverables been achieved in WP2?

D.2.1. Study on current status of students statistics:

Results: The average evaluation mark is 4.18 (“to a high extent”) given by 11 partners (68,8% answered).

D.2.2 Set of indicators for the student statistics:

Results: The average evaluation mark is 4.45 (“to a high extent”) given by 11 partners (68,8% answered).

D.2.3. Manuals of working procedures:

Results: The average evaluation mark is 3.78 (“to a high extent”) given by 9 partners (56,3% answered).

D.2.4. Twenty-five student statistics professionals trained:

Results: The average evaluation mark is 4.11 (“to a high extent”) given by 9 partners (56,3% answered).

D.2.5. Methodology on student statistics adopted by SORS:

Results: The average evaluation mark is 4.3 (“to a high extent”) given by 10 partners (62,5% answered).

D.2.6. Improved Semi-annual census of student population.

Results: The average evaluation mark is 4.22 (“to a very high extent”) given by 9 partners (56,3% answered).

Please comment what can be improved/could have been done better in WP2:

No comments

Q29 According to your knowledge, has the lead partner of the working group been responding on time and adequate to the enquiries, proposals and suggestions which came from your institution/organisation?

Results: The average evaluation mark is 4.18 (“to a high extent”) given by 11 partners (68,8% answered).

Q30 According to your knowledge, has your institution/organisation been responding on time and adequate to the enquiries, proposals and suggestion which came from the lead partner of the working group?

Results: The average evaluation mark is 4.18 (“to a high extent”) given by 11 partners (68,8% answered).

Further comments:

Association of Roma students: *Now is possible to collect data on students social status as the legislation on collection of data on students is changed on national level*

WP3: Legislative framework and institutional regulation regarding access to HE

Q31 Please outline the contribution of your institution within WP3:

University of Belgrade: *Doing analysis of the legislative, doing proposals for improvement of legislative, participating in workshops*

University of Arts: *Participation in work groups for change of HE Law and other legislation changes, changes of University legal documents, including Student Support Regulations*

State University of Novi Pazar: *does not participate in this work package*

Centre for Education Policies: *Fully completed tasks foreseen in the project application with eventual additional adjustments agreed on the consortium level.*

Commissioner for Protection of Equality: *D.3.1. D.3.4.D 3.3. D.3.4.*

Association for students with disabilities: *ASD participated in two thematic subgroups. Subgroup who was working within this workpackage, based on the Law Pupil and Student Standards, undertook assessment of the current institutional processes, effectiveness and efficiency of existing measures and compared their feasibility with developed policy recommendations. Other subgroup proposed legal framework who serves as a basis for development of working methodologies of Serbian Universities related to material and social aspects of access to higher education. Working group prepared guidelines and methodology for modification of internal regulations on the level of Universities. Based on these guidelines Universities modified their institutional regulations and ensured their practical implementation.*

University of Roehampton: -

University of Veliko Tarnovo: *We have provided information on the legislative regulation regarding access to HE in Bulgaria. One staff member from the Faculty of Law was involved in peer review of the legislative outputs of the project (within WP6).*

University of Maribor: *We have presented the respective Slovenian solutions and situation.*

University of Niš *took part in the first draft of legislative changes, as well as in proposing amendments to national regulations. University of Niš has changed its Bylaw installing the Student Support Centre.*

SCONUS: *Prepared first draft of legislative changes (WP3.2) and prepared amendments to national and internal (WP3.4)*

Association of Roma students: *We provided recommendations on legislative changes required for better accessibility of higher education to Roma students.*

Final evaluation of the Quality Control Questionnaire: Part 1 RESULTS

SIPRU representatives participated in drafting legal documents, such as amendments to the Law on Higher Education, amendments to the regulations on operational issues of higher education institutions in terms of equitable access to education, etc.

Q32 Indicate how satisfied are you with the results achieved in WP3:

Results: The respondents evaluate their satisfaction with the results of WP3 on average with 3.90 (“to a high extent”). The assessment is given by 10 partners (62,5% have answered).

Q33 To what extent have the planned deliverables been achieved in WP3?

D.3.1. Established Working group :

Results: The average evaluation mark is 4.09 (“to a high extent”) given by 11 partners (68,8% have answered).

D.3.2. First draft of legislative changes:

Results: The average evaluation mark is 4.25 (“to a high extent”) given by 12 partners (75% have answered).

D.3.3 Inputs from the incorporated stakeholders:

Results: The average evaluation mark is 4.20 (“to a high extent”) given by 10 partners (62,5% have answered).

D.3.4. Amendments to national and internal regulations:

Results: The average evaluation mark is 4.0 (“to a high extent”) given by 10 partners (62,5% have answered).

Please comment what can be improved/could have been done better in WP3:

Results:

University of Belgrade *There was a problem, like in the whole project, to involve Ministry of Education more actively. Student conference of Serbian universities didn't contribute sufficiently.*

Association of Roma students: *Wider participation of all partners in the process and better advocacy to decision maker for legislative changes to be made*

Q34 According to your knowledge, has the lead partner of the working group been responding on time and adequate to the enquiries, proposals and suggestions which came from your institution/organisation?

Results: The average evaluation mark is 4.0 (“to a high extent”) given by 12 partners (75% have answered).

Q35 According to your knowledge, has your institution/organisation been responding on time and adequate to the enquiries, proposals and suggestion which came from the lead partner of the working group?

Results: The average evaluation mark is 4.0 (“to a high extent”) given by 12 partners (75% have answered).

Further comments:

Results: University of Veliko Tarnovo: *Legislative initiatives in Bulgaria have been most successful when they are passed as Acts of the Council of Ministers being initiated by the Ministry of Education. In this sense the project outputs are very good, but apart from those which are University level acts, for national legislative impact the Ministry of Education must interfere. Most legislative regulations for better access to education will have financial consequence. If these decisions are taken by the Ministry of education, then the respective financial consequences will also be accounted for in the financially-related state regulations for Education.*

WP4: National Focal Points and Network of Student Support Services

Q36 Please outline the contribution of your institution within WP4:

University of Belgrade: *Managing WP, doing analysis and feasibility study, proposing models of student support services, planning procurement of assistive technologies*

University of Novi Sad: *analysis and feasibility study in regard with student support service and accessibility of premises for students with disabilities (sending of questionnaire to vice-rectors for education at the faculties of University of Novi Sad), proposing a model of student support service to the management of University of Novi Sad*

State University of Novi Pazar: *Our University has analyzed the statutes of all state universities in several faculties. The aim of this analysis was to determine whether existing university and college-legal acts allow the establishment of student support services*

Association for students with disabilities: *ASD contributed on seminars in organization of University in Barselona, and University in Maribor.*

Centre for Education Policies: *Fully completed tasks foreseen in the project application with eventual additional adjustments agreed on the consortium level.*

Commissioner for protection of equality: *We have contributed to D.4.5. Legal basis for the function of the NFP-SSS*

University of Roehampton: *We provided information and advice regarding student support services. This included advice and information on disability issues; social class and ethnicity equalities and issues around discrimination and how to address this.*

University of Veliko Tarnovo: *We have done monitoring visits to the student support services centers established in the partner universities in Nis, Novi Sad and Belgrade as a result of the project and/or benefitting from the project.*

Final evaluation of the Quality Control Questionnaire: Part 1 RESULTS

University of Maribor: *We have presented the respective Slovenian solutions and situation.*

University of Niš *has founded The Students support Centre, as the part of project activities.*

Association of Roma students: *As result of the cooperation with University of Nis office of Association of Roma Students on University of Nis have been opened on Medical faculty of Nis. Office Is provided free of charge for rental, communal costs and internet*

SCONUS: *Scope of work and jurisdiction of NFPSSS; Guidelines on the NFP-SSS in Serbia*

SIPRU: *Provided comments to the scope of work and jurisdiction of NFP-SSS, as well as guidelines on the NFP-SSS in Serbia. Participated in the study tour and exchange of practices*

Q37 Indicate how satisfied are you with the results achieved in WP4:

Results: The respondents evaluate their satisfaction with the results of WP2 on average with 4.08 (“to a high extent”). 12 partners have answered, or 75% of all partners.

Q38 To what extent have the planned deliverables been achieved in WP4?

D.4.1. Scope of work and jurisdiction of NFP-SSS

Results: The average evaluation mark is 4.2 (“to a high extent”) given by 10 partners (62,5% answered).

D.4.2. Exchanged views and experiences on NFP-SSS

Results: The average evaluation mark is 4.2 (“to a high extent”) given by 10 partners (62,5% answered).

D.4.3. Guidelines on the NFP-SSS in Serbia

Results: The average evaluation mark is 3.67 (“to a high extent”) given by 9 partners (56,3% answered).

D.4.4. NFP-SSS staff trained in line with EU best practice:

Results: The average evaluation mark is 4.25 (“to a high extent”) given by 8 partners (50% answered).

D.4.5. Legal basis for the function of the NFP-SSS

Results: The average evaluation mark is 3.5 (“to a high extent”) given by 8 partners (50% answered).

D.4.6. Functional assistive technologies on Universities

Results: The average evaluation mark is 3.75 (“to a high extent”) given by 8 partners (50% answered).

Final evaluation of the Quality Control Questionnaire: Part 1 RESULTS

D.4.7. Disseminated knowledge on SSS to faculties staff

Results: The average evaluation mark is 3.50 (“to a high extent”) given by 8 partners (50% answered).

Please comment what can be improved/could have been done better in WP4:

Results:

University of Arts: *National Focal Points aren’t established, which is in the framework of the project. The representative from Ministry of Education should have been present during the project, on the contrary nobody participated from the Ministry of Education*

University of Belgrade: *Transfer of knowledge and establishment of SSS not completed on all universities.*

University of Nis: *Faculties should apply and activate assistive technologies, showing more interest and sensibility on this topic. Additional staff training for the work with especially vulnerable groups should be made. We should continuously train and supervise staff employed in Student support centers, to facilitate their work and included various issues related to this population.*

Q39 According to your knowledge, has the lead partner of the working group been responding on time and adequate to the enquiries, proposals and suggestions which came from your institution/organisation?

Results: The average evaluation mark is 4.17 (“to a high extent”). 12 partners have answered, or 75% from all partners.

Q40 According to your knowledge, has your institution/organisation been responding on time and adequate to the enquiries, proposals and suggestion which came from the lead partner of the working group?

Results: The average evaluation mark is 4.15 (“to a high extent”). 13 partners have answered, or 81,3% from all partners.

Further comments:

Results:

University of Veliko Tarnovo: *Although a national network was not established as an outcome of this project, it was a strong motivator and contributed to the establishment of SSS centers offering psychological support in the universities of Nis and Novi Sad. We are further discussing the possibilities for joint Erasmus+ project with these two centers to develop training materials for their volunteers. Their joint experience serves as an example to be followed. At the same time all SSS services for students with disabilities have benefitted.*

WP5: Student pilot programme

Q41 Please outline the contribution of your institution within WP5:

Final evaluation of the Quality Control Questionnaire: Part 1 RESULTS

University of Belgrade: *Managing the WP, doing initial analysis, making methodologies, exchanging experiences, promoting the results*

University of Arts: *From 3 students approved by the project, only 1 student (blind person) has sign up Faculty of Music with governmental coverage of the fee, successfully completed 1. Academic year and is currently at 2. Year of his studies, still with full financial support of the government*

University of Novi Sad: *visiting high schools in Novi Sad, motivating students to participate in pilot programme, organising workshops with students who wished to enrol faculties, communication with management of faculties to ensure support for participating students, exchange of experience, promoting results.*

State University of Novi Pazar: *Our University is piloting a group of two students from marginalized groups included in the pilot group of 50 students at the level of Serbia. Workshops were organized as a support of their enrollment at the University. We are very pleased with the results that were achieved. The two female students were enrolled desired faculty and are currently in the second year of study.*

Association for students with disabilities: *ASD contributed in selection of pupils of high schools for pilot program in Belgrade.*

Centre for Education Policies: *Fully completed tasks foreseen in the project application with eventual additional adjustments agreed on the consortium level.*

University of Veliko Tarnovo: *We have not participated in this WP. We have participated in the discussion of the partners on this issue during their visit to Veliko Tarnovo University*

University of Niš *The pilot program was conducted with students from underrepresented groups, which included pupils mainly showed good results in preparation for faculty, as well as on the first year of study. It turned out that the measures applied in the pilot project have had relevance for the success on the faculty.*

Association of Roma students: *We participated in creation of criteria for selection of students for the program as well in dissemination of the information on call for students*

University of Barcelona: *EQUI-ED 2013: SEMINAR, in Barcelona, 27-31 may, 2013*

Q42 Indicate how satisfied are you with the results achieved in WP5:

Results: The respondents evaluate their satisfaction with the results of WP5 on average with 4.2 ("to a high extent"), 6 of 10 partners have answered, or 60% of those who have answered and 35,3% from all partners.

Q43 To what extent have the planned deliverables been achieved in WP5?

D.5.1. Increased motivation of pilot students to access HE

Results: The average evaluation mark is 4.11 ("to a high extent") given by 9 partners (56,3% answered).

Final evaluation of the Quality Control Questionnaire: Part 1 RESULTS

D.5.2. Pilot group students enrolled in desired faculties

Results: The average evaluation mark is 4.22 (“to a high extent”) given by 9 partners (56,3% answered).

D.5.3. Subsidized scholarships, tuition fees, accommodation

Results: The average evaluation mark is 3.78 (“to a high extent”) given by 9 partners (56,3% answered).

D.5.4. Raised awareness on equal access to HE

Results: The average evaluation mark is 4.0 (“to a high extent”) given by 9 partners (56,3% answered).

D.5.5. Gained skills and self-confidence of the students

Results: The average evaluation mark is 4.0 (“to a high extent”) given by 8 partners (50% answered).

Please comment what can be improved/could have been done better in WP4:

Results:

University of Nis: *Better regulated topic of subsidized scholarships, tuition fees, accommodation. Some of our students were not able to manage accommodation in Dormitory and had to travel every day during the academic year. It has heavily impeded the organization of their life and academic activities. Also, the system is not regulated by reducing the costs for taking exam, registration fees, for the students of low socio-economic status. Only some faculties have demonstrated their good will and free student from those fees.*

Association of Roma students: *Universities need to show more readiness to ensure tuition fees free of charge for underrepresented students. Access to HE is better as there is more psycho-social support to underrepresented students, but costs of studies still remain obstacle for poor students to enter HE*

Q44 According to your knowledge, has the lead partner of the working group been responding on time and adequate to the enquiries, proposals and suggestions which came from your institution/organisation?

Results: The average evaluation mark is 4.4 (“to a high extent”) given by 11 partners (68,8% answered).

Q45 According to your knowledge, has your institution/organisation been responding on time and adequate to the enquiries, proposals and suggestion which came from the lead partner of the working group?

Results: The average evaluation mark is 4.5 (“to a very high extent”) given by 11 partners (68,8% answered).

Further comments:

Results: No further comments are provided

SECTION III: TRAINING AND EQUIPMENT

STAFF RE-TRAINING

Three questions answer to this issue – Q46-Q48:

Q46 How many re-training activities has your institution had within the project up to now:

Event	Days	Number of Persons	Researcher or student
<i>Study visit to University of Roehampton</i>	5-7 per person	25	
<i>Study visit to HESA, UCAS, HEFCE, OFFA</i>	5-7 per person	15	
<i>Study visit to University of Barcelona</i>	5-7 per person	52	

Results: All partners who have benefitted, 13 from 16 respondents, give information for 92 participants for a period between 5 and 7 days each. 81,3% of the partners have participated in re-training activities.

Q47 Indicate how satisfied are you with staff re-training activities:

Results: The respondents evaluate their satisfaction with the study visits on average with 4.5 (“to a very high extent”).

Q48 Please comment on the implications of staff re-training at your institution (max 400 characters):

University of Belgrade: *Experiences and knowledge introduced in documents and procedures in WPs 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5*

Association of Roma students: *Study visits broadened horizons of staff in our organization in sense what we could do as students organization and what we could advocate for. Visits also gave us boost of motivation for more work.*

SIPRU: *Better insight and knowledge in terms of various support services for students in need. This has helped provide better-informed input for amendments to national and institutional HE regulations.*

EQUIPMENT

Six questions answer to this issue – Q49-Q54:

Q49 Has your institution/organization received instalment for purchasing of equipment?

Q50 Has your institution/organization started the process of purchasing the equipment?

Results: To Q49-50 answer positively only the partners who are entitled to receive equipment.

Q51 Has all planned equipment been purchased up to this date?

Results: Only the University of Nis who have complete their questionnaire at the end of the extension period answer positively.

Q52 Indicate how satisfied are you with the procurement procedure:

Results: The satisfaction is 3,17 (“moderately satisfied”).

Q53 Has all purchased equipment been installed at your institution/organisation up to this date?

Results: The answer is positive, apart from the University of Arts who have completed the questionnaire in November 2015.

Q54 Please outline where the equipment has been installed, who will benefit from it and have access to it? If unforeseen changes in your original plan occurred, indicate the type of changes and the measures taken to address them.

Results:

University of Belgrade: Several faculties, University library, useful for students with disabilities, some to all students

University of Arts: Most of the assistive equipment is placed at the Faculty of Music (for blind people), and inductive loops are placed at all 4 faculties

University of Novi Sad: Induction loops have been installed at the Central University building, as well as at the following Faculties: Faculty of Philosophy, Faculty of Sciences, Faculty of Law and Academy of Arts. The Braille Index printer is located in the Central University Library. JAWS, TTS Software and Video Magnifier have been installed at the Centre for students with disabilities. JAWS and TTS software have been installed at 8 other faculties.

University of Nis: At the University of Nis and faculties, this is equipment for students with disabilities, other students and staff.

SECTION IV: DISSEMINATION AND SUSTAINABILITY

DISSEMINATION

Three questions answer to this issue – Q55, Q56 and Q57:

Q55 How many dissemination activities (meeting with stakeholders, visibility events, publications, promotional material and media coverage) has your institution had within the project up to now:

Results: 29 events have been described by 9 partners or 56,3% have answered.

1.	University	Event	Target audience
2.	University of Novi Sad	Faculty of Technical Sciences Newspaper, dec 2014.	Students
3.	University of Novi Sad	Information to the University Senate, 26.11.2014.	University of Novi Sad Management
4.	University of Novi Sad	Novi Sad Educational Fair, 04.03.2014.	Public
5.	University of Novi Sad	Novi Sad "Dnevnik" newspaper, 19.07.2013.	Public
6.	University of Novi Sad	Information to the University Senate, 23.07.2013.	University of Novi Sad Management
7.	University of Novi Sad	Information to the University Senate, 22.11.2012.	University of Novi Sad Management
8.	University of Novi Sad	Conference Education vision and challenge for future generation, 7.12.2012., Ljubljana, Slovenia	Academic audience
9.	University of Novi Sad	Novi Sad Educational Fair, 25.02.2013.	Public
10.	University of Belgrade	More than 20 events. It was all well coordinated, best to ask WP manager	
11.	University of Roehampton	Kick off meeting	EquiEd project members and collaborators
12.	University of Roehampton	Training/staff development event at Roehampton – details above	EquiEd project members and collaborators
13.	University of Roehampton	Interim dissemination event, paper and recommendations on policy.	EquiEd project members and collaborators, and Serbian minister for Education; the Principal of the University of Nis
14.	University of Maribor	Presentation of Slovenian solution and situation to entire Serbian project audience	
15.	University of Veliko Tarnovo	Information on the website	University staff
16.	University of Veliko Tarnovo	Information in the annual reports of the European Integration and mobility department	Academic council and university staff at University of Veliko Tarnovo
17.	University of Nis	Two radio shows RTS	The general public

Final evaluation of the Quality Control Questionnaire: Part 1 RESULTS

18.	University of Nis	THE Final Conference	Partners, stakeholders,
19.	University of Nis	The debate about student services	media
20.	University of Nis	Several articles in the newspaper participation in several shows on TV	General public, General public
21.	University of Nis	The conference "Creating Equal Opportunities in the Access to Higher Education: Analysis of Measures and Recommendation	stakeholders
22.	University of Nis	Brochures	General public
23.	University of Nis	Conference in Media center	General public
24.	University of Nis	Information for UNI Senat	UNI management
25.	University of Nis	First stakeholders conference	stakeholders
26.	Association of Roma students	35 minutes TV broadcast on the project on TV Vojvodina broadcasted in December 2014	National coverage
27.	Association of Roma students	Radio broadcast on national Radio Belgrade in December 2014	National coverage
28.	Association of Roma students	News from the project regular have been updated on our internet site	National coverage
29.	University of Barcelona	EQUI-ED 2013: SEMINAR, in Barcelona, 27-31 may, 2013	27 participants from different organizations and institutions involved in access at universities of Serbs vulnerable students
30.	Social inclusion and poverty reduction unit	Conference "Jednak pristup obrazovanju za sve: koliko je daleko i kako ga podsticemo?", Belgrade, April 2012	Public institutions, higher education institutions, students associations, etc.

Q56 Indicate how satisfied are you with the dissemination activities within the project:

Results: The average answer is "satisfied" (4,27), 11 partners have answered, or 68,8% of all partners.

Q57 Further comments:

Results:

University of Roehampton: *We have not yet had a final dissemination event. The Belgrade conference was smaller than I had expected. The Minister for Education did not stay for the whole event but it was an interesting event and I think it was also very productive.*

PROJECT WEBSITE

Three questions answer to this issue – Q58, Q59 and Q60:

Q58 Indicate how satisfied are you with the project website:

Final evaluation of the Quality Control Questionnaire: Part 1 RESULTS

Results: The average answer is “satisfied” (4,33). 16 partners have answered, or 100% of the partners.

Q59 Indicate how satisfied are you with the project website according to the following:

Results: The average answer is “satisfied” for informative (4,43), structure (4,43), and for up-to-date (4,36) aspects of the website. Only one of the partners is “moderately satisfied” with the up-t-date aspect.

Q60 Further comments:

Results: no comments

SUSTAINABILITY

Two questions answer to this issue – Q61, and Q62:

Q61 Please outline the measures taken so far to realistically ensure the continuity of activities and results beyond project lifetime at your institution?

Results:

University of Belgrade: *Changes in laws and university internal legislative, introduction of new methodologies, consensus among important stakeholders, new bodies/services established at Universities.*

University of Novi Sad: *Office of Student Support Service will continue to help underrepresented student to have equal access to Higher Education, changes in laws and internal legislative, introduction of new methodologies in regard with data collection, new equipment installed at the Central University building and faculties of University of Novi Sad*

University of Veliko Tarnovo: *We have invited the Serbian Universities partners in EQUIED to sign Erasmus+ Bilateral agreements with us, so that we can keep in touch and continue exchange of good practices. As a follow up of EQUIED we are preparing a project proposal for an Erasmus+ K2 strategic partnership for developing study materials and organizing courses for volunteers in student support services at the Centers for psychological support at the Universities of Nis, Novi Sad and Veliko Tarnovo.*

University of Roehampton: *I don't think this applies to us at Roehampton.*

University of Nis: *Centre for support for students established, plan of activities of the Centre adopted at the university Senate, information pack on SSS for students and teachers prepared, assistive technology installed, staff trained on how to use it, link established with the Unit for inclusive education in the Ministry of education, so that the Unit takes over coordination and supervision of SSS activities, internal regulation has been introduced on ESTC validation of student mentoring younger students...*

SORS *has adopted all recommendations from the work group for changes in student enrolment questionnaire. In 2014/15. new questionnaire is used. All recommendations were*

Final evaluation of the Quality Control Questionnaire: Part 1 RESULTS

included in the low for higher education. We are still in the process of preparing online questionnaire.

Association of Roma students: *As effect of cooperation with University of Nis Association of Roma Students(ARS) opened branch at University of Nis. This was not planned with the project. Office will serve as service for Roma students providing services within WP 4 funded by ARS own resources of or with support donors other than EC.*

SIPRU *initiated the creation of a project consortium for a project proposal within the Erasmus+ programme which might be a continuation of some activities initiated by the Equi-Ed project.*

Q62 Further comments:

Results: no comments