



Co-funded by the  
Tempus Programme  
of the European Union

# Progress Report on Quality Assurance and Internal Evaluation Plan

## SIPUS – Strengthening of Internationalisation Policies at Universities in Serbia

Date: 15.12.2015  
Author: WUS Austria  
WP 4 – Quality Plan

### Content

1. Introduction.....	2
2. Overall Approach and Values.....	2
3. Evaluation Responsibilities.....	3
4. Methodological Approach.....	4
5. Evaluation Time Plan.....	7
6. Monitoring Visit of the National Erasmus+ Office in Serbia .....	12
7. Conclusion.....	15
8. ANNEX 1: Evaluation Form Meetings.....	16
9. ANNEX 2: Questionnaire on Quality Issues .....	19



Co-funded by the  
Tempus Programme  
of the European Union

## 1. Introduction

Work package 4 of the TEMPUS project SIPUS is 'Quality Plan'. The aim of this work package is to initiate and coordinate internal monitoring and evaluation processes. In addition to the external evaluation procedure, support and inputs by the EU universities are planned.

Internal evaluation is seen as support and counselling mechanism which aims at ensuring good cooperation, high quality of outputs, user orientation etc. In general it is the goal to outline improvement potentials in order to support the project management in ensuring good project performance and to guarantee that the internationalisation efforts are valuable.

## 2. Overall Approach and Values

### *Objectives of ensuring quality*

- To assure quality in the structure, processes and results of the project.
- To be able to respond effectively to emerging changes and challenges in the project environment.

### *Principles of quality management*

- *Quality management concerns all partners.* WUS Austria coordinates quality management but all partners are responsible for implementing the quality procedures laid out in this project and support the implementation of activities for quality assurance.
- *Quality management does not happen automatically if you work well.* The project has to provide a platform for discussions, supervision and conclusions.
- *Quality management is not about finding fault in our work.* It is about discussing and using our experience for improving the project implementation and its deliverables.
- *Proper documentation and sharing information is a key to quality management.* All partners need to have access to relevant information at all times/at the earliest stage possible in order to ensure a quality culture, trusting relationships between partners and an environment that supports an effective work flow.

### 3. Evaluation Responsibilities

This section outlines the specific evaluation and quality assurance procedures planned in SI-PUS by firstly giving an overview about the responsibilities of the partners in general, then providing a short overview on different evaluation and quality assurance activities and expected outputs.

WUS Austria leads work package 4 – ‘Quality Plan’, and will cooperate closely with the project coordinator University of Novi Sad and all other partners.

#### WUS Austria

- Holds evaluation sessions at the project meetings.
- Provides evaluation tools (e.g. questionnaires, interview guidelines etc.) and guidelines for partners how to use the evaluation tools as outlined below.
- Gives feedback to the project coordinator and the partners.
- Drafts an interim (this document) and the final evaluation report summarising all evaluation activities (meetings, workshops, etc.), quality assurance of project actions, achievements and results (Q1 “Quality reports on project actions” and Q2 “Evaluation reports on project achievements”)

#### University of Novi Sad (UNS)

- Close cooperation with WUS Austria and provision of relevant information.
- Will coordinate the draft of a summary report on Q4 “Fine tuning of university procedures & regulations” with the input of all participating Serbian HEIs

#### University of Ghent and University of Pecs

- University of Ghent and University of Pecs will perform peer reviews of university documents – strategies and action plans, regulations and new practices of internationalisation – and will be responsible to draft Q3 “Peer review of procedures developed at HEIs”



Co-funded by the  
Tempus Programme  
of the European Union

#### All partners

- Provide the requested information completely, faithfully and in time. Internal and external evaluation processes can only be successful, when all partners are cooperating.
- Serbian HEIs will perform fine-tuning of university procedures and regulations conducted based on the feedback received from other Consortium members – EU university partners, WUS and NIS. Result will be a summary report on these actions drafted by UNS (Q4 “Fine tuning of university procedures & regulations”)

## 4. Methodological Approach

The structure of the project reflects three main pillars of quality management within the project:

- A.) Quality review of main knowledge products
- B.) Development and implementation of specific QA tools
- C.) Evaluation of meetings and trainings

### C.) Quality review of main knowledge products

For the success of the project it is essential to ensure sufficient feedback loops which allow for several layers of review and contributions by all partners. The outputs which are the objectives of quality review are:

- WP1: Development and Advancement of National Legislative for Internationalisation
- WP2: Advancement of University Integrative Function through Internationalisation of Education, Research and Academic Mobility
- WP3: Enhancement of Institutional Capacities for Participation in Large-Scale International Collaborations
- WP4: Quality Plan
- WP5: Dissemination
- WP6: Exploitation
- WP7: Management

The partner/s responsible for the development of the outputs (work package leader) provide a schedule which allows all partners to review the product/output before its finalization. Key partners for the development of the product/output must be included into the development of the



Co-funded by the  
Tempus Programme  
of the European Union

product/output throughout all stages and should be allowed to provide feedback more than once.

The time allowed for providing feedback should be communicated in advance and should relate to the size and complexity of the document and to the resources needed for review. It is furthermore advised to take into account that partners may not be available to provide feedback over religious or national holidays.

The partner/s responsible for the development of the outputs (work package leader) need to communicate any changes or risks for the further development of the product/output or activities supporting its development to the project coordinators and all partners. The project coordinator, together with the work package leader is responsible for providing a platform which allows for discussion and solution finding. WUS Austria as coordinator of quality management is responsible for supporting any actions for solution finding and will coordinate and moderate related actions (e.g. joint skype calls, quality session/risk management sessions during project meetings, trouble shooting mission etc.).

## **B.) Development & implementation of specific QM tools**

The quality management tools for successful implementation of this project are worked out and presented in this progress report:

- Creation of procedures and templates for Quality Management: Progress report including quality criteria and approach, training/event evaluation methodology, product and process evaluation

The following activities and schedule for quality review are seen as both necessary and feasible:

Name of activity	Activity description	Time
Quality assurance session I	Quality assurance session during the consortium meeting in February 2015, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Presentation of progress report on quality issues</li> <li>– re-calling the main features of quality management within the project</li> <li>– discussion of immanent threats to the quality of the project results</li> <li>– identification of immediate next steps and responsibilities for ensuring quality</li> </ul>	Consortium meeting in Belgrade/Serbia in February 2015
Quality assurance session II	One session for reflection at the final event including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Presentation of final QA report</li> <li>– Discussion on lessons learnt</li> </ul>	At the last meeting with all partners
Event reporting and quality assessment of events/trainings	Events are evaluated via a questionnaire (see chapter “Templates”/i. Event evaluation_template 1) including a summative narrative of the results and recommendations for further events if applicable.	Ghent/June 2014, Graz/September 2014, Belgrade/February 2015, Novi Sad/March 2015, Pecs/April 2015, Alicante/June 2015
Review of project products/outputs (intermediate and final)	WUS Austria develops a questionnaire on all relevant quality issues in the project to review all products/outputs with a view of quality assurance regarding content and processes. All partners fill in these questionnaires.	January 2015, January 2016
Progress report on Quality Assurance (intermediate and final)	Summative intermediate and final quality report to be provided by WUS Austria including recommendations.	October 2015, October/November 2016
External financial audit Report of Factual Findings on the Final Financial Report	An external financial audit is foreseen within this project and is to be carried out by a sub-contractor which will be supported in his/her work by the project	End of project implementation

	<p>coordinator, WUS Austria and all partners. The external audit is complementary to the internal quality assessment which is carried out by WUS Austria.</p>	
--	---	--

### C.) Evaluation of meetings & trainings

- Evaluation of study visits, workshops and project meetings
- Issuing of reports on event evaluation including recommendations

Each study visit, workshop, training and project meeting within the project is evaluated based on a template to be filled in by the participants of the event (see Annex 1). Evaluation reports include the statistical data, a summative narrative of the data and recommendations for the implementation of upcoming events within the project if applicable. The evaluation reports are presented at the project website.

## 5. Evaluation Time Plan

Internal peer review among the consortium members in the SIPUS project focuses (1) on monitoring of progress and processes, and (2) on assuring that all intermediate and final results meet the declared objectives of the proposal.

In addition to the planned evaluation steps, peer review visits will be organised by EU partners in order to provide Partner Country Universities with first-hand information about their internationalisation strategies.

The following plan gives a brief overview on the different evaluation levels, time scheduling, aims, methods and expected outputs as well as responsibilities.

- **Evaluation/monitoring of progress and processes**

- Meeting & Progress evaluation

Responsible: WUS Austria

Contributions by all partners

When	Evaluation aims and methods	Outputs
7/02/2014 Novi Sad/Serbia	Kick-Off-Meeting at University of Novi Sad Presentation of the project partners, presentation of the project itself, administrative and financial rules, project management, reporting, NTO monitoring, presentation on QA, presentation of workpackages. After the meeting questionnaire to assess the meeting.	Presentations, Meeting minutes, Meeting evaluation report
16/06/-20/06/2014 Ghent/Belgium	Study visit at Ghent University Presentations and discussions on higher education in Flanders, joint degrees and accreditation of internationally oriented study programmes, QA in internationalisation, HR excellence in research, integrated policy plan internationalisation. After the meeting questionnaire to assess the meeting.	Presentations, Meeting minutes, Meeting evaluation report
22/09-26/09/2014 Graz/Austria	Study visit at University of Graz/WUS Austria Presentations and discussions on internationalisation strategy, operative mechanisms, cooperation and joint degrees. Project management. After the meeting questionnaire to assess the meeting.	Presentations, Meeting minutes, Meeting evaluation report
18/02/-19/02/2015 Belgrade/Serbia	Consortium Meeting at University of Belgrade Overall organisational, technical and financial progress, progress of WP1 and WP2, report on quality issues, update on dissemination activities, preparation of interim report, planned activities for the second project year, reports from all partners. After the meeting questionnaire to assess the meeting.	Presentations, Meeting minutes, Meeting evaluation report
23/03/2015 Novi Sad/Serbia	Joint Degree Workshop at University of Novi Sad Introduction to Joint Degrees, Developing and running joint degree programmes incl. practical examples, current situation in Serbia, accreditation of joint programmes. After the meeting questionnaire to assess the meeting.	Presentations, Meeting minutes, Meeting evaluation report
20/04/-24/04/2015 Pecs/Hungary	Study visit at the University of Pecs Presentations and discussions on Internationalisation process of Hungarian HEIs, International Education and Internationalisation in Research. After the meeting questionnaire to assess the meeting.	Presentations, Meeting minutes, Meeting evaluation report
03/06-05/06/2015 Alicante/Spain	Study visit at the University of Alicante Presentations and discussions on International Relations functioning and cooperation, Research Management and Technology Transfer, International Project Management Office. After the meeting questionnaire to assess the meeting.	Presentations, Meeting minutes, Meeting evaluation report
15/11-17/11/2015 Ghent/Belgium	Study visit at the University of Ghent Presentations and discussions with representatives of ministries and working group coordinators	Presentations, Meeting agenda, Meeting evaluation report in progress
19/11-20/11/2015	Consortium Meeting at Singidunum University	Presentations,



Belgrade/Serbia	Presentations and discussion, feedback on project progress. After the meeting questionnaire to assess the meeting.	Meeting minutes, Meeting evaluation report
<b>Upcoming meetings</b>		
<b>When</b>	<b>Evaluation aims and methods</b>	<b>Outputs</b>
February/March 2016	Workshop on building best practices in building institutional capacities for participation in ERA at University of Belgrade. After the meeting questionnaire to assess the meeting.	Presentations, Meeting minutes, Meeting evaluation report
October 2016 Novi Sad/Serbia	Final Meeting at University of Novi Sad Final presentations and discussions. After the meeting questionnaire to assess the meeting.	Presentations, Meeting minutes, Meeting evaluation report

- Interim and final questionnaires on quality issues and work progress

Responsible: WUS Austria

Contributions by all partners

When	Evaluation aims and methods	Outputs
January 2015	All partner organisations who were involved in project activities were invited to complete a questionnaire focussing on the objectives of the SIPUS project, the development of strategies and policies, the quality plan, dissemination and project management. WUS Austria prepared the questionnaire, invited partners to provide their feedback and elaborated a short feedback report.	Short interim feedback report during consortium meeting in February 2015 (see Annex 2).
January 2016	All partner organisations who will be involved in project activities will be invited to complete a questionnaire focusing on specific quality assurance activities. WUS Austria will prepare the questionnaire, invite partners to provide their feedback and elaborate a short feedback report.	Short final feedback report

- Management reports

Responsible: University of Novi Sad

Contributions by all partners

When	Evaluation aims and methods	Outputs
20/12/2014	First Financial partner report for the period of 01/12/2013-30/11/2014	Interim financial reports sent to the coordinator.
15/04/2015	Second Financial partner report for the period of 01/12/2014-01/04/2015	
15/12/2015	Third Financial partner report for the period of 02/04/2015-30/11/2015	
15/06/2016	Fourth Financial partner report for the period of 01/12/2015-01/06/2016	

	Internal review of the interim financial reports which will be submitted by the project coordinator to the EACEA. Method: All partners compile their financial reports and upload them in the Dropbox in time.	
01/06/2015	Intermediate Report on Implementation of the Project	Intermediate technical report
30/12/2016	Final Financial partner report for the period of 02/06/2016-30/11/2016	Financial report sent to the coordinator.
30/01/2017	Final Report on Implementation of the Project	Final technical report

- **Evaluation of the intermediate and final results**

- Results checklist

Responsible: Project management / WUS Austria

WP, Del.Nr.	Deliverable Title	Nature of Del.	Language/s	Deadline	Implementation status (On Time: Y/N, Comments)
A1	Reports on existing national legislatives	Report	EN,	2014-05-31	Done on time.
A2	Know-how on internationalisation legislatives	Training	EN,	2014-05-31	Done on time, study visit to University of Ghent was merged with C1.
A3	Accreditation standards for joint/ double degrees	Other products	SR,	2015-03-31	On-going, slight delays due to reasons out of the reach of the Consortium.
A4	National strategy on mobility and recognition	Other products	SR,	2015-06-30	On-going, slight delays due to reasons out of the reach of the Consortium.
A5	National strategy on internationalisation of HE&Research	Other products	SR,	2015-06-30	On-going, slight delays due to reasons out of the reach of the Consortium.
A6	Information on national funding schemes	Other products	EN, SR,	2016-05-31	Pending
A7	National benchmarks for incoming mobility	Methodology	EN, SR,	2016-05-31	Pending
B1	Models of internationalisa-	Report	SR, EN,	2015-05-31	B1.1 (study visits

	tion transferred and implemented					to Graz and Pecs) re-scheduled for a few months later but finished by now; B1.2 (workshop) done; B1.3 (guidelines) needs to be concluded.
B2	University strategies on internationalisation	Methodology	EN, SR,	2016-06-30	Ongoing	
B3	University strategies for increasing quality and scope of academic mobility	Methodology	EN, SR,	2016-06-30	Ongoing	
C1	Training of staff from Serbian universities	Training	EN,	2015-04-30		Done, study visit to University of Ghent was merged with A2.
C2	Conditions for the recruitment of foreign PhD students, teachers and researchers	Report	SR,	2016-05-31		Draft recommendations (new workshops)
C3	Action plan for participation in ERA	Training	EN, SR,	2015-02-28		Pending, workshop in Feb/March 2016 at UB.
C4	Research Project Management and Talent Development	Methodology	SR,	2016-10-31		Ongoing, C4.2 (seminars on competences of graduates) scheduled in 2015 and 2016.
Q1	Quality reports on project actions	Report	SR, EN,	2016-11-30	Ongoing	
Q2	Evaluation reports on project achievements	Report	SR, EN,	2016-09-30	Ongoing	
Q3	Peer review of procedures developed at HEIs	Report	EN,	2016-07-31	Pending	
Q4	Fine tuning of university procedures & regulations	Report	EN,	2016-09-30	Pending	
D1	Campaign for raising awareness on internationalisation	Events: Conferences and Seminars	SR, EN,	2016-10-31		Ongoing, organise dissemination conferences and PR (link with activities C3, M1)
D2	Campaign for promotion of Serbian HE and research	Events: Conferences and Seminars	EN,	2016-10-31		Ongoing, advertise Serbian HE and research in Serbia and abroad

					(EAIE 2016)
D3	Project website	Other products	EN, SR,	2016-11-30	Ongoing, maintain project website
D4	Promotional materials	Other products	SR, EN,	2016-10-31	Ongoing, design, publish and distribute promotional material
E1	Internationalisation policies and strategies	Other products	SR,	2016-11-30	Ongoing, monitor implementation of national and institutional internationalisation policies and strategies at HEIs
E2	Higher quality of international projects and strategic partnerships	Other products	SR, EN,	2016-11-30	Pending, activity was postponed to last project year in order to follow C4.1 outcomes.
E3	Advanced support systems for academic mobility	Other products	SR, EN,	2016-11-30	Ongoing
M1	Report on project management	Report	SR, EN,	2016-11-30	Ongoing
M2	Consortium meetings	Other products	SR, EN,	2016-10-31	Ongoing, final consortium meeting in October 2016 (UNS)
M3	Reports on partners' activities	Report	SR, EN,	2016-11-30	Ongoing
M4	Financial reporting	Report	SR, EN,	2016-11-30	Ongoing

## 6. Monitoring Visit of the National Erasmus+ Office in Serbia

On 1/12/2014 a monitoring visit took place at the Rectorate of the University of Novi Sad. After the visit the UNS received a set of recommendations to consider in the further project implementation. Below it is listed how the project consortium will consider the recommendations in the upcoming project activities.

### **Recommendation 1**

Bearing in mind that this project is a Structural Measure, the consortium should try to ensure the long-term sustainability of the project results through drafting of standards for the work of international relation offices that are dealing with organisation of the mobility and overall project management.

### **Feedback UNS**

This specific issue is being dealt in a continuous way by the two Tempus projects dealing with different aspects of internationalisation in the Republic of Serbia (SIPUS and FUSE). These two projects have established a very good cooperation and both aim at long-term sustainability of the project results. Since the project SIPUS deals with strategic issues in WP1 (national level) and WP2 (institutional level), the standards of work of the international relations offices at Serbian universities is part of the WP1 (institutional level – legal framework) and WP2 (institutional level – mobility services) of the project FUSE.

However, in the WP3 of the project SIPUS (institutional level), we aim in the last project year to strengthen the role, position and standards of the project management offices/sectors/departments at Serbian universities, since this SIPUS work package is dealing with enhancement of all (and particularly scientific) projects' management.

### **Recommendation 2**

Considering the fact that national strategy on internationalization should define the geographical areas relevant for internationalization actions of higher education institutions in Serbia, we would suggest the project participants to organise a round table and discuss the perspectives of internationalization of higher education with relevant ministries (the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Internal Affairs).

### **Feedback UNS**

On 10 July 2015, the SIPUS coordinator, together with the representative of the National Erasmus+ Office in Serbia, had a meeting with the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development which included discussion on this topic. On 15 July 2015, the SIPUS coordinator sent an official letter to the Ministry, initiating the formation of the working group tackling, among other issues, the one of geographical areas relevant for internationalisation. SIPUS gave, in its letter of 15 July 2015 a detailed proposal of:

- AIMS OF THE WORKING GROUP
- TOPICS ON ITS AGANDA
- TIMETABLE FOR ITS WORK

We hope to see the first steps taken by the Ministry from September 2015.

### **Recommendation 3**

Considering the importance of the revision of the national standards for the accreditation of the joint degrees, as recommended by NEO, the project team should ask the EU partner (responsible for a comparative report on Analysis of the existing national legislatives underpinning internationalisation in EU partners) to extend this report with a detailed comparative analyses on concrete accreditation standards for joint degrees in the EU countries targeted by the project.

**Feedback UNS**

The comparative report by the EU partner responsible has been finalized to the extent it was possible. The workshop on the same topic, as well as the meeting with the Accreditation Commission was also undertaken. In the next phase of WP1 dealing with the national standards for the accreditation of the joint degrees, we expect to see a more active role of the National Council for Higher Education and the Accreditation Commission, since these bodies have the relevant authority to finalize this particular SIPUS outcome.

**Recommendation 4**

As the SIPUS project also focuses on development of research capacities of partner country universities, appropriate measures and activities should be planned for training of younger teaching staff for participation in international research projects. In this respect and bearing in mind the nature of some of these programmes, multidisciplinary through inter-faculty cooperation should be encouraged.

**Feedback UNS**

Since the WP3 is envisaged in the project to start later than WP1 and WP2, the activities there will gain a lot more impetus from September 2015. The SIPUS team will have in mind that the training of younger teaching staff for participation in international research projects is encouraged, especially bearing in mind multidisciplinary through inter-faculty cooperation. The idea behind WP3 is to enhance institutional capacity building in order to ensure exactly that: longstanding conditions for such training and large-scale participation of staff across fields and faculties.

**Recommendation 5**

Activities related to the project quality assurance process should be reinforced and it would be useful if the participants responsible for these activities could draft a plan on how the project progress will be followed, especially on the basis of the indicators defined in the project application.

**Feedback UNS**

The SIPUS coordinator did the dissemination of EACEA feedback to all project partners, including WUS Austria, leader of the work package for the quality assurance process. WUS Austria reinforced the QA mechanisms of the project and made sure that indicators of progress are monitored within a quality plan (this document).



Co-funded by the  
Tempus Programme  
of the European Union

## 7. Conclusion

The SIPUS project provides new know-how, introduces new practices and advances university services. It promotes the extension of the internationalisation concept to various university activities. Thanks to the commitment and dedication of all project partners it is a successful project. A lot of activities have already been finished in time and as planned, other activities had to be re-scheduled due to circumstances out of the reach of the consortium. However, these delays will not endanger the successful completion of the project. The regular consortium meetings make sure that all project-related issues can be discussed in detail and that open questions can be clarified among all partners.

The project already contributed to a great shift when it comes to the perception of the term and role of internationalisation within Serbian HEIs. It started from the international cooperation and developed towards internationalisation as one of its core activities and horizontal priorities in the provision of education, research, mobility and services. By now all participating Serbian HEIs have made a qualitative leap in the process of internationalisation and that can be regarded as one of the most valuable outcomes in the project lifetime so far.

Unfortunately, there is a lack of commitment of the Serbian national bodies in charge of higher education and research to strengthen and develop internationalisation policies and strategies. However, in the last six months there has been a renewed effort to strengthen the cooperation with both national councils.

On the whole the project partners have reached a very good level of communication and established fruitful collaborative links. All partners share a common understanding what the project is about and are perfectly familiar with the underlying concepts, aims and objectives. Due to this fact the consortium looks forward to the last project year and to successfully finish this project.

## 8. ANNEX 1: Evaluation Form Meetings

SIPUS
STRENGTHENING OF INTERNATIONALISATION POLICIES AT UNIVERSITIES IN SERBIA
Evaluation Form

Event Title:	Study Visit/Consortium Meeting at University XY
Event Date:	XY
Event Location:	University of XY

Please take a couple of minutes to complete this evaluation form and to rate various aspects of the meeting (1 poor, 2 satisfactory, 3 average, 4 good, 5 excellent).

### 1. ORGANIZATIONAL ISSUES

**1.1. Overall, how satisfied were you with the organization of this event?**

1     2     3     4     5

**1.2. Overall, how satisfied were you with the content of this event?**

1     2     3     4     5

**1.3. The preparatory information provided by the organizers was sufficient**

Yes     No





Co-funded by the  
Tempus Programme  
of the European Union

**1.4. How satisfied were you with the facilities (venue, technical equipment)?**

1     2     3     4     5

**1.5. How satisfied were you with the refreshments and meals?**

1     2     3     4     5

Any further comments?

---

---

---

## 2. QUALITY OF THE EVENT

**2.1. How clear and informative were the inputs (e.g. presentations, handouts, etc.) of the speakers?**

1     2     3     4     5

Comments:

---

---

---

**2.2. There was enough room for everyone to contribute.**

Yes     No



Co-funded by the  
Tempus Programme  
of the European Union

Comments:

---

---

---

**2.3. What did you find most useful?**

---

---

---

---

**2.4. What did you find not so good / annoying / unsatisfactory?**

---

---

---

---

**2.5. Any further comments?**

---

---

---

---

**THANK YOU FOR YOUR CONTRIBUTION!**



Co-funded by the  
Tempus Programme  
of the European Union

## 9. ANNEX 2: Questionnaire on Quality Issues

### Questionnaire on Quality Issues

Please indicate to which extent you agree with the statements in the table below.

Please tick a score from 1 to 5,  
whereby

1 = do not agree at all

2 = do not

agree

3 = neither agree nor

disagree

4 = agree

5 = fully

agree

I do not agree at all	I do not agree	Neither agree nor disagree	I agree	I fully agree	I do not know
-----------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------------------	------------	------------------	------------------



Co-funded by the  
Tempus Programme  
of the European Union

1 2 3 4 5

**Objectives of the SIPUS project**

The project supports conversion of Serbian Higher Education and Research within the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) and European Research Area (ERA).						
Government of Serbia supports internationalisation of Serbian HEI and provides relevant documents and legislative basis to introduce internationalisation strategies and policies.						
SIPUS partners on the national level (Ministry and National Councils) have taken concrete measures to support internationalisation of Serbian HEI by starting to provide relevant documents and legislative basis.						
Management of my university has recognized the importance of and supports internationalisation.						

<i>Please feel free to make any comments to complement or explain your answers and opinion.</i>						
---	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Development of Strategies and Policies**

In-depth analysis and assessment report of the current national framework were presented in a clear and understandable way.						
Self-assessments of the Serbian universities gave relevant information of the status quo.						



Co-funded by the  
Tempus Programme  
of the European Union

Comparative study on existing national legislatives for internationalisation in EU partner countries gave relevant inputs for the development of the Serbian internationalisation strategies.						
Study visit in Ghent was well organized and it reached its targets.						
Study visit in Graz was well organized and it reached its targets.						
In WP2, which deals with institutional strategies and policies, my university is carrying out its work as planned (developing the foreseen institutional documents).						

<i>Please feel free to make any comments to complement or explain your answers and opinion.</i>						
---	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Quality Plan, Dissemination, Management**

The evaluation of the study visits was presented in a clear and understandable way.						
Project website is functional and well organised.						
Staff and students at my university are aware of the SIPUS project.						
Project has been made visible in the public (in Serbia and abroad).						
Information about the project is well delivered and easily available to project participants.						
Project management is well organised.						
Project coordinators are successful in their work.						
The financial management support is sufficient.						



Co-funded by the  
Tempus Programme  
of the European Union

<i>Please feel free to make any comments to complement or explain your answers and opinion.</i>						
---	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Statements for specific partners only (please answer these statements only if you are from the specific partner)**

<b>NIS/Petroleum Industry of Serbia:</b> Seminar on internationally related competences of graduates was helpful and reached its targets.						
<b>ESN/Erasmus Student Network:</b> Project activities so far have improved recognition of ESN and have fostered collaboration between ESN and Serbian HEI.						
<b>Ministry and National Councils:</b> Do you encounter any obstacles in this project? If yes, please specify below.						

<i>Please feel free to make any comments to complement or explain your answers and opinion.</i>						
---	--	--	--	--	--	--