

Strengthening Capacities and Mechanisms for Enhancement of Quality Assurance System in Higher Education in Bosnia and Herzegovina (SMEQA)

Project: 101128889 – SMEQA – ERASMUS-EDU-2023-CBHE

SMEQA Quality plan

Document History

Version	Date	Revision Description	Responsible Partner
v.01	10/06/2024	Creation of document	University of Banja Luka
v.02	27/06/2024	Final version	All partners

Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor granting authority can be held responsible for them.





Table of Content

1. INTRODUCTION.....	3
1.1. PURPOSE OF THE QUALITY PLAN.....	3
1.2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION.....	4
1.3. PROJECT PARTNERS.....	5
2. WORK PACKAGES, DELIVERABLES AND RISK MANAGEMENT.....	6
2.1 WORK PACKAGES.....	6
2.2. DELIVERABLES.....	6
2.3. RISK MANAGEMENT.....	8
3. PROJECT QUALITY ASSURANCE.....	8
3.1. QUALITY ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES.....	8
3.1.1. Task leader.....	9
3.1.2. Task co-author.....	9
3.1.3. Work-package Leader.....	9
3.1.4. Quality Assurance Team.....	9
3.1.5. Project Consortium Board.....	10
3.1.6. Project coordination team (Project Coordinator).....	10
3.1.7 External quality expert.....	10
3.1.8. EACEA Project Officer and National Erasmus+ Office (NEO).....	10
3.2. QUALITY TOOLS AND EXPECTATIONS.....	11
3.2.1. Quality of document-based deliverables and other results.....	11
3.2.2. Quality of the Events.....	11
3.2.3. Quality of website and social network profiles.....	13
3.2.4. Quality of promotional materials.....	13
3.2.5. Quality of overall project implementation.....	14
3.3. QUALITY MONITORING.....	14
3.3.1. Internal quality monitoring.....	14
3.3.2. External quality monitoring.....	15
3.4 QUALITY PROBLEM SOLVING.....	16
3.5. PROJECT CHANGES.....	17
3.6. QUALITY REPORTING.....	17
4. ANNEXES.....	17



Abbreviations and Acronyms

Abbreviation/Acronym	Meaning
QA	Quality Assurance
QAT	Quality Assurance Team
QP	Quality Plan
PCB	Project Consortium Board
WP	Work package
WPL	Work package leader
PO	EACEA Project officer
CAPA	Corrective and preventive actions
EU	European Union
EACEA	Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency
NEO	National Erasmus Office
LFM	Logical Framework Matrix
CBHE	Capacity Building in Higher Education
EHEA	European Higher Education Area
HEI	Higher Education Institution



1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. PURPOSE OF THE QUALITY PLAN

Within Work Package 6 "Project Monitoring and Quality Assurance" of the SMEQA project, the preparation of the Quality Plan (Deliverable 6.1) is foreseen.

The main purpose of the Quality Plan is to define the procedure for monitoring and controlling the quality of the processes and results produced during the project life cycle, to reduce the risk of poor implementation and to provide evidence to be used in external audits.

The quality plan lays down a minimum set of guidelines in the form of principles, requirements and procedures needed to implement effective quality assurance and ensuring a high level of quality of project results. Using these guidelines will enable better cooperation among consortium members and ensure that the entire consortium is responsible and engaged in the implementation of project activities. It also provides certain quality tools in the form of templates as annexes to the Plan.

The structure of the Quality Plan is given as follows:

- Through Chapter 1 "INTRODUCTION" the purpose of creating the Quality Plan and basic information about the SMEQA project (purpose, goals, expected results, structure of the consortium) are given.
- Chapter 2. "WORK PACKAGES, DELIVERABLES AND RISK MANAGEMENT" shows work packages, deliverables with deadlines and responsibilities for their achievement, as well as risks recognized for the realization of the project.
- Chapter 3 "PROJECT QUALITY ASSURANCE" defines roles and responsibilities related to quality in the project, and gives general guidelines of the project consortium that should be followed regarding the project as a whole, its deliverables, document management, project events (meetings, study visits, conferences, workshops, trainings, and round tables), promotional materials, website and electronic tools, as well as project management. In this chapter, project quality monitoring is described and the procedure for solving potential problems, project changes and reporting related to quality is given.
- In Chapter 4 "ANNEXES" there are forms templates that will be used as quality tools for collecting essential information about the realization of the project.

The quality plan will be updated as necessary in order to improve it, and compliance with the processes and procedures specified in it is mandatory for all activities carried out within the project.



1.2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

SMEQA is a project based on the need of BH society for resolving the issue of accreditation of study programmes, improving Quality Assurance system at higher education institutions and capacity building at all institutions in B&H for the future process of accreditation. The project activities are focused on institutional and national strengthening of accreditation mechanisms, harmonization of processes in B&H and systematic implementation of the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG).

The general objective of the project is "Strengthening Capacities and Mechanisms for Enhancement of Quality Assurance System in Higher Education in Bosnia and Herzegovina".

The project has set the following specific objectives:

- Analysis of legislative framework in Bosnia and Herzegovina and accreditation models.
- Understanding of different European approaches concerning accreditation of study programs taking into account historical, social, financial and institutional autonomy aspects that characterized such approaches.
- Development of Models for accreditation of study programs in Bosnia and Herzegovina based on the needs of all competent educational authorities and in line with already adopted documents of the Agency for Development of Higher Education and Quality Assurance (HEA). The project consortium will be in close contact with all key stakeholders and educational institutions in order not to duplicate already started initiatives and efforts.
- Establishment of a mechanism of coordination and harmonization of the QA system in higher education analysis and strengthening of human capacity at all institutions involved in the accreditation process in Bosnia and Herzegovina.
- Strengthening cooperation between institutions involved in accreditation procedures finding appropriate models of their cooperation, and finding best solutions for regional cooperation as an additional value of the project.
- Strengthening the capacity of domestic and international experts and developing the Plan of education of experts in B&H, making a clear distinction between minimum requirements for providing higher education in Bosnia and Herzegovina from standards, criteria, and indicators that assure the quality of higher education.

Project outputs are oriented on detailed analysis of the current state in B&H, strengthening of Agencies, Ministries and HEIs through developing, improving and implementing the model for study programme accreditation, improving, coordinating and harmonizing current affairs of accreditation process in B&H at various levels, establishing mechanism of coordination and harmonization of QA system in higher



education in B&H, developing Recommendations for regulating the internal evaluation procedure and offering trainings of experts from the list of HEA.

The expected impact of the project is to assure the quality of higher education in Bosnia and Herzegovina as the main pillar of BiH society.

1.3. PROJECT PARTNERS

The coordinator of the project is the University of Zenica. State and private universities, ministries and agencies for quality assurance in higher education from Bosnia and Herzegovina are also participating in the project (Table 1). Partners from the European Union are the University of Ljubljana and Agency for Quality Assurance of Higher Education (NAKVIS) from the Republic of Slovenia, and the University of Split and the Agency for Science and Higher Education (AZVO) from the Republic of Croatia.

Table 1: SMEQA project partners

Name of the project partner	Acronym	Country
UNIVERSITY OF ZENICA	UNZE	BA
UNIVERSITY OF MOSTAR	SUM	BA
UNIVERSITY OF BANJA LUKA	UBL	BA
UNIVERSITY OF SARAJEVO	UNSA	BA
UNIVERSITY HERZEGOVINA	UNHE	BA
UNIVERSITY OF VITEZ	UNVI	BA
PAN-EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY "APEIRON"	APEIRON	BA
MINISTRY OF SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT, HIGHER EDUCATION AND INFORMATION SOCIETY, REPUBLIC OF SRPSKA	MNRVOID	BA
MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, SCIENCE AND YOUTH OF SARAJEVO CANTON	MONKS	BA
MINISTRY OF EDUCATION OF THE HERZEGOVINA-NERETVA CANTON	MONKSHNK	BA
MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, CULTURE AND SPORTS OF THE ZENICA-DOBOJ CANTON	MIZDK	BA
MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, SCIENCE, SPORTS AND CULTURE OF THE CENTRAL BOSNIA CANTON	MICB	BA
AGENCY FOR DEVELOPMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND QUALITY ASSURANCE B&H	HEA	BA
AGENCY FOR HIGHER EDUCATION OF THE REPUBLIC OF SRPSKA	AVORS	BA
CENTRE FOR INFORMATION AND RECOGNITION OF QUALIFICATIONS IN HIGHER EDUCATION	CIP	BA
AGENCY FOR SCIENCE AND HIGHER EDUCATION	AZVO	HR
AGENCY FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE OF HIGHER EDUCATION	NAKVIS	SI
UNIVERSITY OF LJUBLJANA	UL	SI
UNIVERSITY OF SPLIT	UNIST	HR



2. WORK PACKAGES, DELIVERABLES AND RISK MANAGEMENT

2.1 WORK PACKAGES

The project consists of 6 work packages (WP). By dividing the project into work packages, it is possible to monitor the project more easily (from both financial and time management aspects) and simultaneously work on different project activities in parallel with multiple teams. In order to ensure the quality of project activities, each work package is coordinated by one partner (Table 2) chosen as the expert for a given segment of the project.

Table 2: Work-package Leaders

WP Code	WP Name	WPL Acr.
WP1	Project management	UNZE
WP2	Improving models of external evaluation	SUM
WP3	Development of internal quality assurance system and evaluation principles	UNSA
WP4	Strengthening capacities of the quality assurance in higher education system	HEA
WP5	Dissemination	UNHE
WP6	Project Monitoring and Quality assurance	UBL

2.2. DELIVERABLES

The project defines 14 deliverables (Table 3) that need to be submitted to the European Commission for inspection within the exactly planned deadlines. All deliverables are of the "R - Document, report" type, except for D5.1 - Final conference, which is of the "E - event" type. The Dissemination Level of all deliverables is "PU - Public", which means that there are no restrictions on their access, that is, they are all intended for public use.

Table 3: Deliverables in the SMEQA project

Deliverable No	Deliverable Name	Description (including format and language)	WP No	Lead Beneficiary	Due Month	Due Date
D1.1	Progress report	The report will be developed in English language	1	UNZE	M18	30.06.2025.
D2.1	Analysis Report of Quality Assurance (ARAQ)	The report will be developed in local language and translated into English	2	SUM	M4	30.06.2024.



D2.2	Conclusions from International Conference on Key Principles and Elements for Models of External Evaluation in Institutional and Program Accreditation	The document will be prepared in local language and translated into English	2	SUM	M12	31.12.2024.
D2.3	Proposal of Enhanced Models of External Evaluation	The document will be developed in local language and translated into English	2	SUM	M14	28.02.2025.
D2.4	Proposal of Mechanism for Coordination and Harmonization	The document will be developed in local language and translated into English	2	SUM	M20	31.08.2025.
D3.1	Report on "Analysis of the existing models of internal quality assurance systems and evaluation in B&H"	The report will be developed in B/H/S languages and English language	3	UNSA	M20	31.08.2025.
D3.2	Document "Recommendations for regulating the internal quality assurance systems and evaluation procedures at the HEIs in B&H"	Final documents would be developed, adopted and published in the form of a Rulebook by each HEI (electronic and printed) The document will be developed in B/H/S languages and in English language	3	UNSA	M24	31.12.2025.
D3.3	Study program internal evaluation reports	Internal evaluation reports of 5 study programs at each HEI, electronic and printed/, BSH, translated to E	3	UNSA	M31	31.07.2026.
D 4.1.	Plan of Education of Experts developed by HEA	Based on the experience from study visits HEA will create an Education Plan for Experts for accreditation in Bosnia and Herzegovina.	4	HEA	M28	30.04.2026.
D4.2	Report from held trainings and workshops	Report from held trainings, agenda, presence list, evaluation , presentations	4	HEA	M32	31.08.2026.
D5.1	Final conference	Final conference will serve as a forum for presentations of overall results of the project – printed and recorded materials will be distributed over internet, social- and mass-media	5	UNHE	M36	31.12.2026.



D6.1	SMEQA Quality plan	electronic/ English	6	UBL	M6	30.06.2024.
D6.2	Periodical Quality reports	electronic/ English	6	UBL	M36	31.12.2026.
D6.3	External Evaluation Report	electronic/ English	6	UBL	M36	31.12.2026.

2.3. RISK MANAGEMENT

Project risk management, as part of internal quality assurance, is an important activity of the Project Consortium. In the Project Proposal, six risks were recognized and described, an assessment of the level of risk and measures for their reduction/elimination were given. Identification and assessment of new risks that arise during project implementation is the joint responsibility of all project partners. Identified new risks must be urgently communicated by the project partners to the project coordinator, possibly proposing possible interventions and solutions. All essential elements of risk management are described in detail in the *Risk Management Plan*.

3. PROJECT QUALITY ASSURANCE

3.1. QUALITY ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

All partners are responsible for the quality of project implementation in terms of defined activities and results, with full respect for the signed partnership agreements. The quality plan defines different roles and responsibilities in the application of quality assurance procedures during the implementation of planned project activities.

In relation to the aspect of quality, the roles of Task Leader, Task co-author, Project coordinator, Work-package leader (WPL), Quality Assurance Team (QAT), Project Consortium Board (PCB), External quality experts (External Evaluator), EACEA Project Officer (PO) and National Erasmus+ Office (NEO) and their responsibilities are given below.



3.1.1. Task leader

- development and achievement of deliverables in accordance with the project plan and delivery template,
- assigning and coordinating parts of the work to other partners involved in the activity,
- submitting the draft to WPL (1st level control) and together with WPL to QAT and Project coordinator (2nd level control),
- implementation of WPL and QAT suggestions,
- reporting to WPL all problems that arise during the implementation of activities.

3.1.2. Task co-author

- realization of his part in the deliverable according to the instructions of the Task leader,
- implementing amendments to his contribution requested by the WPL or QAT team from the Task Leader.

3.1.3. Work-package Leader

- coordinates the work package and ensures that all WP activities are implemented in accordance with the planned time frame and that they provide the expected outcomes,
- ensures that all partners cooperate smoothly in order to implement activities and achieve goals,
- responsible for delivering up-to-date information on WP progress,
- gives comments and suggestions on the draft deliverables (1st level control), and verifies the satisfactory implementation of the recommendations,
- if necessary, schedules and conducts a meeting related to the implementation of the work package,
- gives comments and suggestions to Task Leaders on draft deliverables (1st level control) and collaborates with Task Leaders in ensuring the implementation of QAT team and project coordinator suggestions (2nd level control), as well as with PCB (3rd level control) and verifies adequate implementation of recommendations,
- reports all difficulties in the implementation of the WP to the Project coordinator.

3.1.4. Quality Assurance Team

- has the most responsible role related to the quality control of deliverables and in general for the quality aspect of the project,
- receives each draft deliverable from the WP leader and provides feedback,



- verifies adequate implementation of recommendations,
- preparation of periodic Quality reports in coordination with the project coordinator,
- cooperates with the project coordinator and the PCB on general issues related to the quality level of the project results.

The list of members of the Quality Assurance Team is given in Annex A.

3.1.5. Project Consortium Board

- officially approves and finally accepts the major deliverables and periodical Quality reports,
- identifying potential risks.

3.1.6. Project coordination team (Project Coordinator)

- general day-to-day quality management of the project, where coordination is primarily focused on WP Leaders and institutional coordinators,
- informs project partners about all significant changes to the project that may affect the time schedule or content of relevant results,
- accepts results or gives final comments to Task leaders and WP leaders (2nd level of control),
- daily monitoring of project activities and initiation of corrective actions where necessary,
- officially submits to the EACEA portal all approved results (at the 3rd level of control),
- project risk management, including the development of contingency plans.

3.1.7 External quality expert

- independent audit of the project implementation and achieved results,
- preparation of External Evaluation Report.

3.1.8. EACEA Project Officer and National Erasmus+ Office (NEO)

The contact point in the EACEA for the project coordinator is the Project officer who monitors the implementation of contractual obligations through the established reporting system, maintains constant communication with the project coordinator and implements supervisory visits.

Visits to project partners for the purpose of monitoring the project are also carried out by the national Erasmus offices (NEO) of the partner countries.



3.2. QUALITY TOOLS AND EXPECTATIONS

Within the implementation of the activities of the SMEQA project, various outcomes are planned in the form of deliverables and other important results that can be classified as *meetings, reports, plans, study visits, conferences, workshops, trainings, round tables, project internet site, etc.*

A common quality expectation for deliverables and other results is their relevance to the achievement of the overall objective and specific project objectives, and their timely delivery in accordance with the project plan. The consortium has established certain tools in the form of survey questionnaires for monitoring the quality of the project process and results.

3.2.1. Quality of document-based deliverables and other results

A consistent and common format for all deliverables and other results based on documents (reports, presentations, etc.) should be followed by all partners using agreed templates. If necessary, deviation from the given templates is acceptable when creating documents intended for external users, where the design of documents such as brochures, newsletters, etc. plays an important role.

When partners produce studies and publications as deliverable, they are obliged to put flag of the European Union with sentence "Co-funded by the European Union" and they must use following disclaimer on the inner pages "Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them." on the cover or the first page.

3.2.2. Quality of the Events

The SMEQA project includes the implementation of various events such as meetings (Kick-off meeting, Project Consortium Board meetings, Meetings of QAT), study visits, conferences, workshops, trainings, round tables, etc. by using various documentation and quality control tools (attendance lists, meeting minutes, training report, evaluation questionnaires, etc.). Table 4 prescribes the mandatory (minimum) documentation that should be kept for a certain type of event and its availability on the SMEQA website and Google Drive platform.



Table 4: Documentation of SMEQA events

Type of Event	Materials	Available at	
		SMEQA website	SMEQA Google drive platform
Kick-off, PCB meetings, Meetings of QAT, conferences and round tables	News/Info	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Agenda/Program	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Participants list	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Minutes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Gallery	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Presentations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Quality questionnaires	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Workshops, trainings, study visits	News/Info	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Agenda	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Participants list	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Training materials	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Gallery	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Quality questionnaires	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Organizers should deliver essential information to participants in a timely manner, including the agenda, invitation letter and note on logistics (information on travel arrangements, venue, accommodation suggestions, etc.).

The organizers ensure the registration processes (Participant List - Annex B is used) and the availability of all necessary materials (e.g. training materials and promotional materials).

A roll-up poster and other promotional materials will be displayed during the event. Each event will be documented with different materials as described in Table 4. After each event, participants will be able to fill out a survey about its quality (Event evaluation form - Annex C). The organizer will decide whether the survey will be completed on a hard copy of the questionnaire or online. It is recommended that, whenever possible, the survey be filled out online for more efficient analysis. The questionnaires include closed questions (5-point Likert scale) and open questions where the event participant can give more detailed answers. At least 70% of the registered participants of the event must fill in a questionnaire to gain significant conclusions.

The time for completing the survey should be limited to a maximum of 10 days after the realization of the event. If an online survey is conducted, the participants must be



informed of the date by which they can complete the survey, after which it will be closed and unavailable. The organizer of the meeting performs a statistical analysis of the survey (when conducting a training or workshop, the analysis of the survey is integrated into the report on the implementation of the event), give, if necessary, suggestions for improvement and submits it to the project coordinator within 20 days after the implementation of the event.

3.2.3. Quality of website and social network profiles

The project envisages the establishment of a public SMEQA website and appropriate electronic tools (Google Drive, etc.) for project management.

The project website will enable monitoring and presentation of project activities and achievements. It will serve as an information base for all interested parties, and also as a communication and management platform for the partner institutions of the consortium. Customized information will be available on the project's social network profiles. The target social networks are defined by the *Dissemination & Exploitation Plan* in order to ensure the visibility of the project in the sphere of social media. All partners are requested to promote the SMEQA project on their websites and through social networks such as: Facebook, Twitter and LinkedIn, etc.

The University of Herzegovina (UNHE) will be responsible for setting up and maintaining the SMEQA website. All project partners are obliged to timely deliver to UNHE prepared information and materials for posting on the website in order to effectively communicate the results of the project. The channels and method of communication are defined in more detail in the *Communication Management Plan*.

The project coordinator (UNZE) will be responsible for reporting on project progress to the EU Funding & Tenders electronic portal.

All information dissemination tools will be used in such a way that essential information about the project is presented to the target stakeholders in a timely manner.

Significant quality indicators are Number of website and social network profiles visits. The quality of the website will be evaluated by the consortium members 6 months after its establishment using the "SMEQA website evaluation form" given in Annex D of this document. Filling out this form will also be possible for all visitors of the SMEQA project website.

3.2.4. Quality of promotional materials

University of Herzegovina is responsible for designing all promotional materials, project logo and basic template of documents and presentations. Working versions of



promotional materials will be delivered to all partners for comments and suggestions, before their presentation to external stakeholders.

The promotional material will reflect the visual identity of the project and the Erasmus+ program and is an important part of the dissemination activities detailed in the *Dissemination & Exploitation Plan*.

Promotional materials will be distributed by all project partners at relevant events (project meetings, conferences, workshops, study visits and other dissemination events) to make information about project goals, progress, results and achievements visible. In addition to the publications that will arise from the realization of the project activities, it is foreseen that related articles in the mass media, partner institutions' newsletters or bulletins will foster the presentation of the project and its activities.

3.2.5. Quality of overall project implementation

The project partners will perform a comprehensive evaluation of the project in the middle (M18) and at the end of the project (M36), evaluating elements such as Project Management, Project Progress and Implementation, Partnership and Cooperation and Dissemination, using the "Project Evaluation Questionnaire" (Annex E). The results will serve to improve the project and produce final reports on internal quality assurance.

3.3. QUALITY MONITORING

3.3.1. Internal quality monitoring

Internal quality monitoring through self-evaluation will be carried out by all members of the consortium. Inputs to the self-evaluation will be the logical framework matrix (LFM), project implementation plan, budget and cash flows, analyses of satisfaction surveys of participants of various events and periodical quality reports, reports from PCB meetings, etc.

The quality of the project results will be internally assessed by the following three-level internal approval procedure: (1) Task leader (TL) and WP leader (WPL), (2) Project coordinator and Quality Assurance Team (QAT) level, and (3) Project Consortium Board level (PCB).

(1) Task leader and WP leader (1st level of control)

The presentation of the deliverables and activities of the project is the joint responsibility of the Task Leader, the partners involved in the implementation of the task and the corresponding WPL. The task leader should constantly perform self-control so that the deliverable is in accordance with all the set requirements. The draft



deliverable should be distributed to the WP Leader, at least 3 weeks before the delivery due date. WP Leader will check the deliverable and give a grade on the "Deliverable review form (Annex F)" which can be:

- *Fully accepted* - Deliverable meets the required criteria and is sent to a higher review level (Project Coordinator and QAT),
- *Revisions required* – The deliverable proposal is accepted with minor revisions required,
- *Rejected* - If the quality of the results is not satisfactory and/or does not comply with the quality criteria, the deliverable is returned to the author for re-realization, and the Project Coordinator is informed about this.

Implementation of the necessary corrections - major interventions are the responsibility of the Task Leader. After the changes, WPL performs the control again. This process is repeated until the quality of the deliverable is satisfactory.

(2) Project Coordinator and QAT level (2nd level of control)

The draft deliverable should be distributed to the Project Coordinator and QAT, at least 15 days before the Delivery due date. WP Leader and QAT members have 5 working days to respond by sending comments using the template "Deliverable review form" (Annex F). The deliverable authors (Task leaders) have 5 more working days to conform to the reviewer's comments or send their written objections.

In case of deep disagreements between reviewers and Task leaders, the project coordinator will try to resolve the issue together with them, with the possibility of involving the rest of the consortium if necessary.

A draft deliverable that has passed the 2nd level of control will still be checked by the Coordinator for final comments and when accepted it will be forwarded to the Project Consortium Board for formal approval (if required).

(3) Project Consortium Board level (3rd level of control)

Control by the PCB represents the 3rd and highest level of deliverable control. If the draft deliverable has passed the 2nd level of control without deep discrepancies, due to the set deadlines it is possible to include it in the project reports even if it has not yet received formal approval from the PCB.

3.3.2. External quality monitoring

An external expert, selected on the basis of his expertise and specific competencies by QAT and PCB, will prepare an External Evaluation Report. As part of the Report, the external expert will, along with a comprehensive analysis of the project, give an



independent opinion on the quality of the implementation of the project's activities and the quality of the achieved results. The External Expert will propose project improvement measures within the report. External Evaluation Report should be considered at QAT and PCB.

Comprehensive monitoring of the quality of the project will be carried out by the National Erasmus Office (NEO) and the EACEA according to their project monitoring process schedule. Monitoring by the NEO includes assessment of various aspects of project implementation, such as effectiveness (achievement of specific goals) and efficiency of the project (timely implementation of activities and quality of their implementation, quality of achieved results), relevance (whether project results are still significant for stakeholders) impact (the scope of the project's impact within the consortium members and its impact on the environment) and sustainability (sustainability of the project's effects after its completion).

3.4 QUALITY PROBLEM SOLVING

During the implementation of the project, certain problems related to quality assurance may occur. They are most often related to delays in the implementation of tasks, incomplete implementation of tasks, insufficient quality of project results, lack of transparency and smooth communication within the consortium, internal conflicts, etc.

It is expected that these problems will first be identified by the WP leaders who coordinate the implementation of the tasks within the work packages and who should try to find a solution to the problem in direct communication with the partners involved in the conflict. Otherwise, they should inform the project coordinator and QAT about the problems, who will initiate the necessary actions to solve them in accordance with the document *Conflict Resolution Template*.

If, in particular, insufficient quality of intellectual results is determined, the partners will take immediate measures to solve these problems.

After reviewing periodic reports on quality, QAT, in case of identification of major problems, initiates corrective and preventive measures and monitors their implementation through the template "Problem report - Corrective measures form" (Annex G).



3.5. PROJECT CHANGES

The implementation of the project should be in accordance with the Project Proposal. However, the planned project activities are based on the assumptions made at the time of submitting the project proposal. The conditions of the environment (internal and external) can change over time, which is why there is a need, and sometimes it is necessary to make certain changes to the project in order to adapt to the real situation that the project partners are facing.

Any requests for project changes that have no impact on the deliverables are submitted in writing to the PCB with a detailed explanation for approval. These requests are approved by the PCB.

Significant changes related to the deliverables and the achievement of the project's objectives require a detailed written request from the coordinator to be submitted to the EACEA. In doing so, the provisions of the Grant Agreement signed at the beginning of the project implementation must be respected.

3.6. QUALITY REPORTING

Internal Quality reports will be created every six months from the beginning of the project (M6, M12, M18, M24, M30, M36), and based on the information obtained from the evaluations (see Chapter 3.2) for the activities and deliverables realized in the previous period. The Quality Reports will identify potential problems and delays and give recommendations for improvement.

Reports will be prepared by QAT and will be delivered to Project Consortium Board (PCB).

External quality assessment expert will also verify the quality of the project, the achievement of deliverables, milestones and objectives, and evaluate the results of each work package in the External Evaluation Report (M24).

The Project coordinator, with the cooperation of all members of the consortium, will prepare an Interim report (M18) and a Final report (M36) that will be submitted to the EACEA. They will include all important elements related to the quality of the project. Internal Quality reports and External quality report will be one of the primary sources for writing this segment of given reports.

4. ANNEXES

Annex A - SMEQA Quality Assurance Team

Annex B - Participants List

Annex C - Event evaluation form



Annex D - SMEQA website evaluation form

Annex E - Project Evaluation Questionnaire

Annex F - Deliverable review form

Annex G - Problem report / Corrective measures form

Strengthening Capacities and Mechanisms for Enhancement
of Quality Assurance System in Higher Education in Bosnia
and Herzegovina (SMEQA)

Project: 101128889 – SMEQA – ERASMUS-EDU-2023-CBHE

SMEQA QUALITY ASSURANCE TEAM

No.	Institution	Person	e-mail
1	UNIVERSITY OF ZENICA	Hasan Avdušinović	hasan.avdusinovic@unze.ba
2	UNIVERSITY OF MOSTAR	Monija Malešević	monija.malesevic@sum.ba
3	UNIVERSITY OF BANJA LUKA	Goran Janjić	goran.janjic@mf.unibl.org
4	UNIVERSITY OF SARAJEVO	Aida Hodžić	aida.hodzic@vfs.unsa.ba
5	UNIVERSITY HERZEGOVINA	Dragana Jerković	glavna.tajnica@hercegovina.edu.ba
6	UNIVERSITY OF VITEZ	Jamila Jaganjac	jamila.jaganjac@unvi.edu.ba
7	PAN-EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY "APEIRON"	Živana Kljajić	zivana.m.kljajic@apeiron-edu.eu
8	UNIVERSITY OF LJUBLJANA	Sabina Otoničar	sabina.otonicar@fdv.uni-lj.si
9	UNIVERSITY OF SPLIT	Doris Žuro	dzuro@kbf.unist.hr
10	MINISTRY OF SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT, HIGHER EDUCATION AND INFORMATION SOCIETY, REPUBLIC OF SRPSKA	Vlado Davidović	v.davidovic@mrv.vladars.rs
11	MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, SCIENCE AND YOUTH OF SARAJEVO CANTON	Marina Cicović	marina.cicovic@mon.ks.gov.ba
12	MINISTRY OF EDUCATION OF THE HERZEGOVINA-NERETVA CANTON	Hilzema Tabaković	hilzemat@windowlive.com
13	MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, CULTURE AND SPORTS OF THE ZENICA-DOBOJ CANTON	Alma Suljić	alma.suljic@zdk.ba
14	MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, SCIENCE, SPORTS AND CULTURE OF THE CENTRAL BOSNIA CANTON	Fatima Jelčin	fatima.jelcin@sbk-ksb.gov.ba
15	AGENCY FOR DEVELOPMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND QUALITY ASSURANCE B&H	Bojan Stevandić	bojan.stevandic@hea.gov.ba
16	AGENCY FOR HIGHER EDUCATION OF THE REPUBLIC OF SRPSKA	Tatjana Radaković	t.radakovic@avors.org
17	CENTRE FOR INFORMATION AND RECOGNITION OF QUALIFICATIONS IN HIGHER EDUCATION	Dženan Omanović	dzenan.omanovic@cip.gov.ba
18	AGENCY FOR SCIENCE AND EDUCATION, CROATIA- AZVO	Sandra Bezjak	sandra.bezjak@azvo.hr
19	SLOVENIAN QUALITY ASSURANCE AGENCY FOR HIGHER EDUCATION- NAKVIS	Gregor Rebernik	gregor.rebernik@nakvis.si

Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor granting authority can be held responsible for them.



Strengthening Capacities and Mechanisms for Enhancement of Quality Assurance System in
Higher Education in Bosnia and Herzegovina (SMEQA)

Project: 101128889 – SMEQA – ERASMUS-EDU-2023-CBHE

[Title of event]

PARTICIPANTS LIST

[Date: ...]

[Venue: ...]

No	NAME	INSTITUTION	E-MAIL	PHONE	SIGNATURE*
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
...					

**By signing, consent is also given to the publication of photos and similar materials from the event for the purpose of documenting project activities and promoting the project.*

Strengthening Capacities and Mechanisms for Enhancement
of Quality Assurance System in Higher Education in Bosnia
and Herzegovina (SMEQA)

Project: 101128889 – SMEQA – ERASMUS-EDU-2023-CBHE

EVENT EVALUATION FORM

A. To what extent are you satisfied with? (1-very low, 5-very high)					
Information provided before the event	1	2	3	4	5
Usefulness of the materials available	1	2	3	4	5
Timeliness of the organisation	1	2	3	4	5
Venue	1	2	3	4	5
Information provided during the event	1	2	3	4	5
Social activity	1	2	3	4	5
B. Please, evaluate the overall quality of organisation: (1-very low, 5-very high)	1	2	3	4	5
C. Did the event meet your expectations? (1-not at all, 5-to a great extent)	1	2	3	4	5
D. Please, make any comments, if appropriate (e.g. positive and/or negative aspects of the event, recommendations to organisers for the future events of this type)					

Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor granting authority can be held responsible for them.



Strengthening Capacities and Mechanisms for Enhancement
of Quality Assurance System in Higher Education in Bosnia
and Herzegovina (SMEQA)

Project: 101128889 – SMEQA – ERASMUS-EDU-2023-CBHE

SMEQA website evaluation form

Please find the project website at address:

<http://xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

After analyzing the website, please answer each question with an evaluation from 1- 5, where 1 is Poor and 5 is Very Good.	1	2	3	4	5
What is your opinion of the general user friendliness of the website? (fast load time, responsiveness, simple navigation, readable content ...)					
Did you find the information on the website useful?					
Evaluate the ease of navigation of project's website.					
To which extent did the use of the website live up to your expectations?					
Evaluate the website aesthetics (graphics, colors, fonts, etc.).					
Does the website suit your professional needs?					
Would you recommend visiting the website to somebody else? YES/NO					
<i>Comments and recommendations:</i>					



Strengthening Capacities and Mechanisms for Enhancement
of Quality Assurance System in Higher Education in Bosnia
and Herzegovina (SMEQA)

Project: 101128889 – SMEQA – ERASMUS-EDU-2023-CBHE

Project Evaluation Questionnaire

(To be filled in by each partner).

Partner:						
Quality Control point	Statements	1 - Strongly Disagree 5 - Strongly Agree				
1. Project Management	The management structure was efficient.	1	2	3	4	5
	The management and coordination meetings were managed well.	1	2	3	4	5
	The structural documents were well prepared and available to all partners.	1	2	3	4	5
	The necessary adjustments in the course of project implementation were easily agreed between the partners.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Project Progress and Implementation	Compared with the actual expenses of the project activities, the budget estimation was accurate.	1	2	3	4	5
	Tasks and deliverables were well prepared and achieved on time?	1	2	3	4	5
	The project activities and deliverables are relevant and useful.	1	2	3	4	5
	Project activities and outputs were available accessible to target groups and relevant stakeholders.	1	2	3	4	5
	Dissemination of project activities and outputs was satisfactory.	1	2	3	4	5
	Web site of the project gives precise and updated information on the project activities	1	2	3	4	5
3. Partnership and Cooperation	Communication between partners was satisfactory.	1	2	3	4	5
	Trust has developed between partners.	1	2	3	4	5
	Partners were committed to the project.	1	2	3	4	5
	There are conditions for developing future projects with the same consortium of partners?	1	2	3	4	5
Any suggestions or comments?						

Date: _____



Strengthening Capacities and Mechanisms for Enhancement
of Quality Assurance System in Higher Education in Bosnia
and Herzegovina (SMEQA)

Project: 101128889 – SMEQA – ERASMUS-EDU-2023-CBHE

The review performed by:

Quality Assurance Team

Project Coordinator

Work-Package Leader

DELIVERABLE REVIEW FORM

Deliverable ID and name:			
A. Timing of document release	<input type="checkbox"/> not delivered	<input type="checkbox"/> delayed	<input type="checkbox"/> on time
B. Content of document	<input type="checkbox"/> low	<input type="checkbox"/> average	<input type="checkbox"/> high
C. Technical quality of document	<input type="checkbox"/> low	<input type="checkbox"/> average	<input type="checkbox"/> high
Deliverable is:	<input type="checkbox"/> Fully accepted	<input type="checkbox"/> Revisions required	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejected
If Revision is required, the following recommendation for quality improvement are given:			
1. Recommendation ... 2. Recommendation ... 3. ...			
Date of review		Reviewed by	Signature

Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor granting authority can be held responsible for them.



Co-funded by
the European Union

Strengthening Capacities and Mechanisms for Enhancement
of Quality Assurance System in Higher Education in Bosnia
and Herzegovina (SMEQA)

Project: 101128889 – SMEQA – ERASMUS-EDU-2023-CBHE

PROBLEM REPORT/ CORRECTIVE MEASURES FORM

Problem reported by:	
Date:	

Problem description	
Possible causes of the problem	

Corrective measures (undertaken to solve the problem)	
Deadline	
Responsible institution and person(s)	

Responsible for verifying the elimination of the problem	
Problem solved	Yes No Comment:
Date of verification and signature	

Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor granting authority can be held responsible for them.



Co-funded by
the European Union