External Evaluation Interim Report

ALIEN Project: Active Learning in Engineering Education

Program: Erasmus+

Action: Capacity Building for Higher Education

31st March 2019

Contents

Executive Summary	2
External Evaluation Methodology Objectives	ε
Objectives and Questions	6
	4.4
External Evaluation Methodology	11
Data Collection Tools	12
Criteria Grid	14
Criteria Gra	1 ¬
Interim Analysis and Recommendations	25

Executive Summary

The aim of the ALIEN (Active Learning in Engineering) project is to improve the quality of higher education by providing more motivating, stimulating and effective learning contexts that prepare students for their professional life by allowing them to actively develop the required competences. The underlying goal of the project, derived from its funding by the Erasmus+ Capacity Building for Higher Education programme, is to put in contact Engineering Faculties from different parts of the world to reinforce the sharing of expertise and experiences.

I the scope of the project the ALIEN consortium wants to design, implement and validate an Active Learning context based on PBL (Project/Problem) methodologies addressing real-life issues related to science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) concepts. The methodology will be supported by a Virtual Learning Environment integrating a set of digital tools that will allow teachers and students from Europe and Asia (and eventually other regions) to experiment, collaborate and communicate in an extended and multinational learning community that will also include other stakeholders like researchers.

External evaluation is part of the project's approach to Quality Assurance, defined and integrated in WP7. It complements the internal monitoring process and provides formative and summative results that contribute to the success of the project. This report focuses on the formative aspects and presents recommendations for the second half of the funding period. It is based on the analysis of products and results, documents and reports, communication between partners and interviews with key project members. A note of caution is due at this moment: as a result of several administrative issues deriving from public tender practices in Portugal, the formalization of

the external evaluation contract took much longer than anticipated and, as a consequence, it was only possible to follow the final months of the first half of the funding period. Therefore, the following conclusions and suggestions result from the work done in that period.

The most striking factor in the first half of the project were the initial administrative difficulties in finalizing the contract with the funding agency, completing the agreements with the partners and proceeding with the initial fund transfer. These steps seemed to have started already late and were made more complex by the fact that most Asian partners were not familiar with EC procedures. We can fully understand the difficulties of these initial steps and we have to accept that inevitably this led to a delay in the development of the actual project tasks. Initially there was a 5-months delay in the beginning of the project (signing of the contract took three months, then signing agreements with partners and transferring/receiving funds took at least another two months) which has been partly recovered by the consortium. Nevertheless, there is still an estimated 3-month delay at this moment.

On the positive side, we can state that:

- The proposal made a clear identification of the target groups needs and, as a consequence, the expected objectives and results of the project are clear. The adopted development methodology is adequate to these objectives, results and target group;
- The tasks and results that have been completed so far are looking quite good and promising. There are no major issues that might prevent the same to happen in the second half of the funding period;

- After some initial difficulties, all of the partners are clearly committed to the project, communicating and sharing information. Their involvement is directly related to their expertise and background. A few problems with some partners have been successfully overcome by the coordinator. In particular, the level of dialogue between the Asian and European partners is quite good;
- The level of dissemination is good but could be improved and, above all, should be more balanced between partners. There have been some good dissemination activities carried out but this could still be reinforced.

As recommendations for the final half of the project we would like to propose:

- Give special attention to the next stages of implementation, considering
 the existing delay. Next there are key activities towards project success.
 A close link to the funding agency should be maintained. In particular, to
 assess the possibility of extending the project deadline in case the delay
 is not recovered in the next few months;
- Be focused to overcome pedagogical and technical challenges that will surely appear in the next tasks of WP3 and WP4;
- Increase the level and scope of dissemination activities and ensure that all the partners are involved. Coordinate with other networks and organizations to achieve the maximum impact possible in the sector;
- Carefully consider the sustainability of the project results after the funding is finished, based on the key outcomes of the project.

External Evaluation Methodology Objectives

A comprehensive external evaluation methodology is part of a complete quality management plan that establishes procedures, criteria and resources for monitoring and evaluating (internally and externally) the progress of the project and its intermediate and final results in the light of the assumptions established in the original proposal and contract. As such the external evaluation has formative and summative objectives:

As a formative tool, it aims at providing insightful data and recommendations that contribute to the success of the project, providing an external and independent overview of activities, development and results. Therefore, it must proceed in parallel with the normal schedule of the activities of the project.

As a summative tool, it provides valuable data on the accomplishment of the projects' objectives and results.

Objectives and Questions

The evaluation data and comments are addressed at the project stakeholders, including coordinator, partners and financing bodies. Therefore, it must contextualize the analysis and recommendations under the objectives, priorities and rules of the underlying program, in this case the Erasmus+ Capacity Building for Higher Education.

The major questions to be addressed are:

- Did the project correctly address the identified stakeholders' needs, including the primary target groups, the project partners and others?
- Does the project present an appropriate development path that leads to the proposed outcomes?
- Did the project create the conditions for an effective partnership?
- Did the project clearly define and present coordination, management and financing arrangements?
- Does the project include a thorough monitoring and evaluation system?
- Did the project accomplish the expected objectives and results?
- Did the project disseminate the results and had an impact with European and Asian dimension?
- Did the project create the conditions for an effective sustainability of results after the funding period?

To answer these questions, the external evaluation focus on the following aspects:

Management of the project: evaluate the way the project is managed, in terms of monitoring and control of activities. Assess if there are clear coordination and management procedures. Evaluate the project leadership.

Consistency between work plan and activities undertaken during the lifetime of the project: assess whether the activities are carried out in accordance with the proposed work plan. Evaluate the adequacy of the approach, methodology and work plan.

Allocation of resources: assess whether the allocation of resources for the project are in line with the activities of the project, and, in particular, if it corresponds to an effective implementation of the budget.

Partnership: assess whether there is clear evidence of a genuine partnership, with collaboration and involvement and adequate task and resource distribution.

Goals, results and products: assess whether the project results and products are in accordance with the aims and specifications stated in the original proposal. Assess whether the project had the expected impact on target groups and beneficiaries.

Dissemination and exploitation: assess the scope and effectiveness of the dissemination and valorization plans and its activities. Assess the sustainability that the project may have after completion of the financing.

These aspects are further characterized in the following criteria:

- Management of the Project:
 - Quality of management procedures and tools for the project
 - Quality and effectiveness of the leadership
 - Scope of the monitoring and evaluation procedures
 - Consistency between work plan and activities undertaken:
 - Effectiveness of activity implementation
 - Respect for the original work plan, adequate justification when it has not happened and measures adopted
 - Scope of the internal indicators for measurement of quality, impact and performance

Allocation of Resources:

- Effectiveness of the participation of the human resources (category, number, work days/month, etc.)
- Effectiveness of the use of other resources (equipment, travel and accommodation, sub-contracts, other items, etc.).
- Global assessment on the Return on Investment by the funding agency

Partnership:

- Effectiveness of the communication between partners
- Development of positive attitudes and confidence between partners
- Level of commitment to the project by each partner in the context of a consortium
- o Added value created by the European consortium

Goals, results and products:

- Quality and level of compliance with the proposed objectives and results
- Degree of effective integration of activities / results of the project
 in the processes of the participating institutions
- Degree of effective integration of activities / results of the project in the processes of other, external, institutions
- Innovation in the approaches and results

- Dissemination and Exploitation:
 - Effective impact in the target audience
 - Support and communication with other projects and organizations in the same area
 - Support and communication with funding agencies and entities
 - Quality of the process of dissemination
 - Quality of promotion of the European dimension and the project's contribution to the implementation of EC policies
 - o Quality of the actions taken to ensure sustainability of the results

External Evaluation Methodology

The methodological framework for the external evaluation follows the project through the following steps:

- Detailed analysis of the proposed project and the relation with the overall process of quality assurance
- Detailed analysis of the current state of the project compared with what was proposed
- Analysis of the logic and context in the scope of the Erasmus+ Capacity
 Building for Higher Education programme
- Detailing criteria, indicators and data collection tools
- Definition of the work plan of the external evaluation
- Online meeting with the project coordinator and key partners
- Continuous improvement of the External Evaluation Methodology in line with the project's quality assurance plan

Initial Phase of the Project Evaluation (until March 2019)

- Follow up of project activities
- Implementation of the work plan for data collection
- Maintain the area of the External Evaluation in the project platform
- Analysis of documentation and communication tools
- Analysis of results
- Interviews with some selected partners (locally or at distance)

- Meetings with the coordination team
- Delivery of the Intermediate Report of External Evaluation
- Recommendations for the final part of the project

Final Phase of the Project Evaluation (until October 2020)

- Follow up of project activities
- Implementation of the work plan for data collection
- Maintain the area of the External Evaluation in the project platform
- Analysis of documentation and communication tools
- Analysis of results
- Interviews with some selected partners (locally or at distance)
- Meetings with the coordination team
- Meetings with partners
- Delivery of Final Report of External Evaluation
- Analysis of the project process and results

Data Collection Tools

- Project platform (at Dropbox)
 - Administrative documents
 - Reports and documents
- Results
 - Contents and platforms
 - Other deliverables

- Dissemination activities
 - Reports and evidence
 - Social network tools
- o Meetings
 - Minutes
- o Partnership
 - E-mailing
 - Interviews and questionnaires
- o Internal monitoring data
 - Reports and questionnaires

Criteria Grid

Criteria	Data Collection	Identified Strengths	Identified Weaknesses	Suggested
	Tools			Improvements
a. Quality of management procedures for the project, including the tools used for that purpose	Project proposal, WP reports, project reports, meeting minutes, partner interviews, project platform.	The Steering Committee has clear responsibilities. The same is true for WP leaders. The coordinator created a well-structured file sharing platform. An agreement has been signed between the coordinator and the partners that defines roles and responsibilities. Templates for cost reporting were provided by the coordinator. Partners reported a good project	Administrative workload was a difficulty for some partners in the beginning. Some partners were not familiar with EC procedures and could not react quickly. The large number of partners has created some management issues.	Consider one-to-one online meetings to support specific partner's needs. Use other communication channels more frequently, like video-conferencing, to follow this particular critical phase of development and the next steps of implementation.

melhoria contínua inovação e desenvolvimento de organizações, Ida

travessa das laranjeiras, nº 17 4150-451 porto portugal

tel 351-91-2243375 – fax 351-22-6176399

b. Qualities	Self-assessment	Leadership is clearly identified and		Act quickly on evaluation
and	questionnaires,	personalized (partners know who to		and monitoring data to
effectiveness	partner	address for issues).		establish contingency
of the	interviews			measures if needed.
leadership				
c. Scope of the monitoring and evaluation procedures	Project reports, meeting minutes, internal evaluation report, self- assessment questionnaire	A complete internal and external monitoring and evaluation approach has been setup. Different tools are available for that purpose. Partners have access to those tools and know exactly what they have to do.	Administrative workload is a difficulty for some partners and that could affect performance in the critical steps to be faced. Late contract of the external evaluator introduced some issues on this criterium.	Consider improvements in the WP reports to provide more information. Consider including a specific internal evaluation session in the next international meeting agenda. Invite the external
				evaluator for a consortium meeting.

Criteria	Data Collection	Identified Strengths	Identified Weaknesses	Suggested Improvements
	Tools			
a. Effectiveness of activity implementation	Project proposal, WP reports, project reports, meeting minutes.	The proposed methodology is adequate to the objectives of the project. Activities that took place so far have been effective and with impact.	The degree of involvement of all the partners is not the same.	The second part of the project and, more particularly, the piloting stage with this large number of partners will require a strong coordination effort.
b. Respect for the original work plan, adequate justification when it has not happened	WP reports, project reports, meeting minutes.	Activities follow the original work plan but with a delay.	Project is running with 3-month delay. This could also be an opportunity for partners to adjust and overcome	Strive to go back to the original plan. If that is not possible request an amendment for an extension of the project period. This should be

and measures			technical and pedagogical	decided in the next consortium
adopted			challenges.	meeting.
				Consider one-to-one on line meetings to support specific partner's needs.
c. Scope of the	WP reports,	The proposal identified		Assess the indicators to monitor
internal indicators	project reports,	a set of indicators for		the project progress.
for measurement of	meeting minutes	each WP.		
quality, impact and				
performance				

3. Allocation of Resources				
Criteria	Data Collection Tools	Identified Strengths	Identified	Suggested
			Weaknesses	Improvements
a. Effectiveness of the	WP reports, project	Staff involved in the		The implementation
participation of the human	reports, meeting	project has competencies		stage will mean new
resources (category,	minutes, internal			challenges to the

melhoria contínua inovação e desenvolvimento de organizações, Ida

travessa das laranjeiras, nº 17 4150-451 porto portugal

tel 351-91-2243375 – fax 351-22-6176399

number, work days/month,	evaluation report, self-	that are clearly adequate		partners. Nevertheless
etc.	assessment	for the project.		partners as Engineering
	questionnaire, partner			Faculties should be able
	interviews.			to easily implement
				those activities.
. =				
b. Effectiveness of the use	Project and WPs	The resources relate	Equipment	Ensure that all PBL Labs
of other resources	Reports.	mostly on staff, travel and	acquisition by	are setup and all the
(equipment, travel and		subsistence costs to	Asian partners to	equipment is acquired.
accommodation, sub-		events and equipment	setup their PBL	
contracts, other items, etc.).		acquisition. Their use has	Labs has been	
		been effective to a large	slow.	
		extent.		
c. Global assessment on	WP reports, project			Not applicable at the
	WP reports, project			Not applicable at the
the Return on Investment	reports, meeting			moment.
by the funding agency	minutes, internal			
	evaluation report			
	questionnaire			

Criteria	Data Collection	Identified Strengths	Identified Weaknesses	Suggested
	Tools			Improvements
a. Effectiveness of the communication between partners	Project e-mails, WP reports, self-assessment questionnaires	The level of communication is high. The dialogue between Asian and European partners is good,	The frequency of the online meetings is not adequate.	Use online communication channels more frequently
b. Development of positive attitudes and confidence between partners	Project e-mails, WP reports, self-assessment questionnaires	The f2f meetings have been very important in establishing this relation. There are no visible problems between partners.		Reinforce the use of collaborative work between partners.

c. Level of	Project e-mails, WP	All the partners have been	There are different levels of	The consortium should
commitment to the	reports, self-	involved in the project. The	involvement between the	build strengths based
project by each	assessment	multiple competencies that	Partners that should be taken	on multiple existing
partner	questionnaires	partners have are very	in consideration in the next	experiences and so
		relevant to the project. A	phases.	promoting mutual
		good partner structure		commitment and
		reinforces the project		benefice.
		development.		
d. Added value	Project e-mails, WP			Still early to assess but
created by the	reports, self-			key evidences start to
consortium	assessment			be seen.
	questionnaires,			
	project portal			

Criteria	Data	Identified Strengths	Identified	Suggested Improvements
	Collection		Weaknesses	
	Tools			
a. Quality and level of	Results, tools,	The quality of the available		The partnership should
compliance with the	contents and	results so far is quite good.		manage to incorporate
proposed objectives and	piloting			feedback from the end users
results				along the project development
				cycle to reach excellence.
b. Degree of effective	WP reports,	The results are directly related		Make sure that all the partners
integration of activities /	self-	to the current procedures and		are involved in the use and
results of the project in the	assessment	processes of the partners.		exploitation of the results.
processes of the participating	questionnaires	They can easily be reused.		
institutions				The implementation phases
				should open space for the
				necessary localization and
				adjustment to the specific
				target groups.

c. Degree of effective	WP reports,		Still early to assess but should
integration of activities /	self-		be a concern for the
results of the project in the	assessment		consortium.
processes of other, external,	questionnaires		
institutions			
d. Innovation in the	Results,	The basis in terms of contents	It should be a key issue for the
approaches and results	community	and platforms has already	second half of the project.
	tools	been developed.	

6. Dissemination and Exploitation	on			
Criteria	Data Collection	Identified Strengths	Identified	Suggested
	Tools		Weaknes	Improvements
			ses	
a. Effective impact in the target	Dissemination	The level of dissemination is	Not all the	Increase the level of
audience	activities log	already good especially with the	partners	dissemination by all the
		online channels.	have been	partners.
			equally	

melhoria contínua inovação e desenvolvimento de organizações, Ida

travessa das laranjeiras, nº 17 4150-451 porto portugal

tel 351-91-2243375 – fax 351-22-6176399

		The actual stage of project development offers increased opportunities for further dissemination actions.	involved and a wider scope can be achieved.	
b. Support and communication with other projects and organizations in the same area	Project portal, project reports dissemination reports, (other external evidence)			Contact with other networks, associations and projects related. EACEA could have initiatives to foster this networking that should be considered.
c. Support and communication with funding agencies and decision/government entities	Project portal, project reports dissemination reports, (other external evidence)	Participation in the coordinators meeting in Brussels.		Keep this involvement and challenge further involvement of other EACEA funded networks and projects.

d. Quality of the process of	Project portal, project	The WP leader produced a very	Follow closely the
dissemination	reports dissemination	good document that organizes	guidelines for
	reports, (other	dissemination and a report that	dissemination.
	external evidence)	assesses the existing activities.	
e. Quality of promotion of the	Project portal, project		Still not applicable.
European dimension and the	reports dissemination		
project's contribution to the	reports, (other		
implementation of Community	external evidence)		
policies			
f. Quality of the actions taken	Project portal, project		Still not applicable.
to ensure sustainability of the	reports dissemination		
results	reports, (other		
	external evidence)		

Interim Analysis and Recommendations

Did/Does the project correctly address the identified stakeholder's needs, including the primary target group, project partners (and respective roles), individuals, the final beneficiaries, etc.?

The proposal made a clear definition of the stakeholders and their needs. The results address those needs in a very innovative way.

Did/Does the project present an appropriate development path that lead to the proposed outcomes?

The proposed development path is clear and well-structured and the level of results achieved indicate that the development path is appropriate. However the project is running 3-month late. The consortium should be focused in recovering that delay and overcome pedagogical and technical challenges associated to the development and implementation stages.

Did/Does the project create the conditions for an effective partnership?

All the tools are in place and the meetings have been lively and with good discussion. The competencies of the partners are adequate to the project objectives. Communication and collaboration are effective and partner's commitment is recognized. The already available tools and methodologies are adequate to the mutual support needed.

Did/Does the project clearly define and present coordination, management, financing and dissemination arrangements?

Individual responsibilities are clear and leadership is manifest. The other management arrangements are in line with best practices. There are good tools for management and partners are able to use them. Project management is recognized as good and effective. The administrative workload associated to the project could require specific support to some of the Partners.

Did/Does the project include a thorough monitoring and evaluation system?

The project has a complete approach to the monitoring and evaluation, with internal and external activities. Internal monitoring tools (internal reports, questionnaires, etc.)

are available, used and effective.

Did the project accomplish the expected objectives and results?

As mentioned before, the project is running late. That had impact on the produced

results but what is available has quite good quality.

Did the project managed to disseminate the results and had an impact with

European and Asian dimension?

The level of dissemination is good but could be improved and all the partners should

be involved with their different capabilities. In the actual project stage there are

increased conditions for further actions.

Did the project created the conditions for an effective sustainability of results

after the funding period?

It is still early to fully analyze this aspect although the target groups are quite interesting.

This is important because sustainability is a challenging issue.

Porto, Março 31, 2019

Eduardo Luís Cardoso

Partner Consultant

Edundo levy landon