



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

**Modernisation of Higher Education in
Central Asia through New
Technologies (HiEdTec)**



EVALUATION OF THE PROGRESS REPORT REPORT ON WORK PACKAGE 5 QUALITY ASSURANCE

**Project: Modernisation of Higher Education in Central Asia through New
Technologies (HiEdTec)**

Project No: 598092-EPP-1-2018-1-BG-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP

Project Coordinator: ANGEL KANCHEV UNIVERSITY OF RUSE



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

**Modernisation of Higher Education
in Central Asia through New
Technologies (HiEdTec)**



Editor

Deliverable number: 5.12

Title: Evaluation of the Progress report

Type of nature of deliverable: Report

Dissemination level: International level

Status/Version: Final, Updated

Date: April 09, 2020

Main authors

AUREL MACHALEK – UNIVERSITY OF LUXEMBOURG

STEFANIE OESTLUND – UNIVERSITY OF LUXEMBOURG

LATIF LADID – UNIVERSITY OF LUXEMBOURG

Contributing persons

STOYANKA SMRIKAROVA – UNIVERSITY OF RUSE

TSVETELINA HARAKCHIYSKA – UNIVERSITY OF RUSE

TZVETOMIR VASSILEV – UNIVERSITY OF RUSE

HABIB HALMAMEDOV – INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY FOR THE HUMANITIES AND DEVELOPMENT

ALL PROJECT PARTNERS



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

**Modernisation of Higher Education
in Central Asia through New
Technologies (HiEdTec)**



This document has been produced with the support of the European Commission under the ERASMUS+ Programme, KA2 – Capacity Building in the Field of Higher Education: 598092-EPP-1-2018-1-BG-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP. It reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

No part of the report may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording; and may not be quoted or cited, without prior permission in writing from the Project Coordinator.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	6
1 Introduction	7
2 Project Overview	7
3 Evaluation report on the questionnaire, survey and report	10
4 Quality Evaluation of the Meetings using Questioners	16
4.1 Conclusion	19
5 Evaluation of the Syllabus	19
6 Evaluation of the developed concept of adapting the higher and postgraduate education system to the digital generation	24
7 Risk Register	30
7.1 Risk Register by partners	30
7.1.1 University of Ruse P1	30
7.1.2 University Eurasian national university P3	31
7.1.3 Innovative University of Eurasia P4	32
7.1.4 Ala-Too International University P5	33
7.1.5 K. Tynystanov Issyk-Kul State University P6	34
7.1.6 Kyrgyz State Technical University P7	35
7.1.7 Technological University of Tajikistan P10	37
7.1.8 International University for the Humanities and Development P11	39
7.1.9 Tashkent State University of Economics P15	41
7.1.10 University of Pavia P17	43
7.1.11 University of Luxembourg P18	45
8 Conclusion	47



List of Abbreviations and Meanings

HiEdTec	–	<i>Modernisation of Higher Education in Central Asia through New Technologies</i>
QA	–	<i>Quality assurance</i>
MG	–	<i>Management Group</i>
EB	–	<i>Evaluation Board</i>
KPI	–	<i>Key Performance Indicator</i>
WP	–	<i>Work Package</i>
WP LT	–	<i>WP Leading Team</i>
MP	–	<i>Management Plan</i>
UR	–	<i>University of Ruse Angel Kanchev</i>
ATU	–	<i>Almaty Technological University</i>
InEU	–	<i>Innovative University of Eurasia</i>
AIU	–	<i>Ala-Too International University</i>
IKSU	–	<i>Issyk Kul State University named after K.Tynystanov</i>
KSTU	–	<i>Kyrgyz State Technical University named after I. Razzakov</i>
KhoSU	–	<i>Khorog State University named after M.Nazarshoev</i>
TTU	–	<i>Tajik Technical University named after academician M.Osimi</i>
TUT	–	<i>Technological University of Tajikistan</i>
IUHD	–	<i>International University for the Humanities and Development</i>



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

**Modernisation of Higher Education
in Central Asia through New
Technologies (HiEdTec)**



TITU	– <i>Oguz Han Engineering and Technology University of Turkmenistan</i>
SEIT	– <i>State Power Engineering Institute of Turkmenistan</i>
AndMI	– <i>Andijan Machine-Building Institute</i>
TSUE	– <i>Tashkent State University of Economics</i>
TUIT	– <i>Tashkent University of Information Technologies named after Muhammad al-Khwarizmi</i>
UPV	– <i>Università degli Studi di Pavia</i>
UL	– <i>University of Luxembourg</i>
UC	– <i>University of Coimbra</i>
MES	– <i>Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan</i>
MES	– <i>Ministry of Education and Science of the Kyrgyz Republic</i>
MES	– <i>Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Tajikistan</i>
MET	– <i>Ministry of Education of Turkmenistan</i>
MHSSE	– <i>Ministry of Higher and Secondary specialized education of the Republic of Uzbekistan</i>



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

**Modernisation of Higher Education
in Central Asia through New
Technologies (HiEdTec)**



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document presents the results of the Internal Evaluation System and a Quality Assurance (QA) Plan for the *Erasmus Project 2018 – 3331 / 001 – 001, Modernisation of Higher Education in Central Asia through New Technologies (HiEdTec)*. This document is mapping all work done in Work Package 5 reports, analyses and methodology. The base for the evaluation is deliverable D5.1 Internal Evaluation System, Quality Assurance.

The project evaluation plan is an integral part of the QA plan. It outlines the elements of project evaluation, the set of quality indicators against which progress and quality of project outputs will be measured, the evaluation mode and the evaluation instruments to be used. It will show the quality of the project outputs and mark the interim results achieved.

The main objectives of this deliverable:

- Express common understanding of project mission
- Control ongoing work in Work Package 5
- Evaluation of the methodology used for self-assessment
- Create clear procedures for delivery of quality results
- Evaluate guidance for project reporting with regard to the quality of the completed activities and envisaged products
- Evaluate the templates for project outputs evaluation



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

**Modernisation of Higher Education
in Central Asia through New
Technologies (HiEdTec)**



1 INTRODUCTION

A Quality Assurance (QA) Plan is needed to enable success of the project.

The QA Plan for the *HiEdTec Project* is a document establishing the methods, responsibilities, and procedures for ensuring the quality of all Project activities, interim and final outputs, products and results.

The report addresses the overall project work for the period up to the Progress Report, to which it will be annexed. Additionally, it will encompass the internal evaluation of the developed project materials and meetings undertaken (which will have been prepared by then). The partner responsible for this deliverable is P18 as WP5 lead partner and all members of the EB.

In summary- during the whole project period the main tasks performed in the frame of WP5 to ensure quality and successful implementation of the HiEdTec project are:

- A plan for ensuring the project quality has been created and fulfilled;
- Project evaluation plan for ensuring the project quality has been developed and fully realised;
- Procedures for the evaluation of the all project deliverables have been organized, conducted and reported;
- The results of the project QA activities have been spread among the partners in regular basis;
- Internal evaluations of the interim and final results of the project have been organized and conducted.

The Quality Assurance takes into account the guidelines and tools published as *Survival Kit for Lifelong Learning Projects* (<http://www.european-project-management.eu/indexd61c.html?id=5>) to support coordinators and partners of Projects under the Lifelong Learning Programme to reflect on the value and quality of the project outputs in an objective way and evaluate successfully whether the targets have been met.

2 PROJECT OVERVIEW

The main aim of the project is to adapt the education system in the Central Asian Partner Countries (PCs) to the digital generation through introduction and effective use of ICT-based Innovative Educational Technologies and Didactic Models (IET&DMs) in the teaching process.

This aim corresponds to the strategic priorities for development of education in each of the PCs, i.e. supporting the use of digital technologies and online delivery to improve pedagogies and assessment methods.



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

Modernisation of Higher Education in Central Asia through New Technologies (HiEdTec)



The project will help turn the partner higher educational institutions (HEIs) into innovative universities and will improve the quality of the trained specialists who are necessary to perform the Digital Transformation of Industries (Industry 4.0).

The consortium comprises of 24 full partners – HEIs from 4 EU countries and 5 partner countries.

The consortium includes two types of higher education institutions (HEIs): European HEIs with solid experience in the innovative educational technologies and HEIs from Central Asia which want to introduce these technologies and open pedagogies in the field of higher education in order to improve and extend the supply of high-quality learning opportunities tailored to the needs of digital learners. The consortium also includes all PC Ministries of Education that will contribute to the dissemination, extension of impact and sustainability of project results in each partner country.

The EU partners are well-known European universities with rich experience in innovative educational technologies (IETs). In addition, a part of them have established contacts and cooperation with some of the partners from the PCs and are therefore familiar with the higher education system, the facilities available and the main challenges which HEIs in the partner countries face. This provisional knowledge of some of the EU partners of the partner countries and the universities in them is an essential prerequisite for establishing successful collaboration from the project start.

Aims and objectives

Aim:

The overall **aim** is to give the opportunity for EVERYBODY to learn at ANY time and at ANY place with the help of ANY lecturer, using ANY device – computer, laptop, tablet, phablet, smart phone, etc. the consortium will create centres for innovative education technologies.

Main project outcomes and products are:

- Sustainable academic network for sharing experience and exchange of good practices in the field of innovative educational technologies and didactic models;
- 5 Concepts for adapting the education system to the digital generation - 1 per PC;
- 15 Centres for innovative educational technologies - 1 at each PC university;
- 45 active learning classrooms - 3 at each PC university;



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

**Modernisation of Higher Education
in Central Asia through New
Technologies (HiEdTec)**



- Virtual classrooms – 1 at each PC university;
- Handbook of innovative educational technologies;
- Courses for trainers for the acquisition of digital skills and learning methods;
- Courses for lecturers for the acquisition of digital skills and learning methods;
- 75 e-Learning courses - 5 at each PC university;
- 75 PowerPoint presentations of lectures, suitable for delivering using interactive electronic white board - 5 at each PC university;
- Cloud-based Virtual Library of the digital educational resources.

Relevant documents:

- Deliverable D5.1 Internal Evaluation System, Quality Assurance plan
- D5.2 HiEdTec Evaluation of Questionnaires (D1.1 and D1.3) and Deliverables 1.2 and 1.4. final
- D5.11 Evaluation of questionnaires
- D5.6 Evaluation of the syllabus of the course for the acquisition of digital skills and innovative teaching and learning methods.
- D 5.3_Evaluation of the developed Concepts of adapting the education system to the digital Generation considering the specific conditions of Uzbekistan,
- D 5.3_Evaluation of the developed Concepts of adapting the education system to the digital Generation considering the specific conditions of Turkmenistan
- D 5.3_Evaluation of the developed Concepts of adapting the education system to the digital Generation considering the specific conditions of Kyrgyzstan
- D 5.3_Evaluation of the developed Concepts of adapting the education system to the digital Generation considering the specific conditions of Tajikistan
- D 5.3_Evaluation of the developed Concepts of adapting the education system to the digital Generation considering the specific conditions of Kazakhstan



3 EVALUATION REPORT ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE, SURVEY AND REPORT

The objective of the deliverable D5.2 Evaluation report on WP1, was to evaluate the questionnaires developed in WP1, which collect information about:

- the good practices in the field of innovative educational technologies and didactic models;
- the status quo in terms of the level of implementation of digital technologies and the level of competences of academic staff in the use of ICT tools in higher education;

To achieve this goal it was set up questionnaire with this structure:

1. Which country are you from?

Mark only one oval.

- Luxembourg
- Italy
- Portugal
- Bulgaria
- Turkmenistan
- Uzbekistan
- Kyrgyzstan
- Tajikistan
- Kazakhstan

2. Overall, please tell us how well structured the questionnaire D1.1 and 1.3 are using a 1 to 5 scale where 1 means not at all well structured and 5 means extremely well structured.

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not at all well structured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Extremely well structures



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

**Modernisation of Higher Education
in Central Asia through New
Technologies (HiEdTec)**



3. 3. Please tell us how you rate the quality of the questions in D1.1 and 1.3 using a 1 to 5 scale where 1 means very bad and 5 means extremely good.

Mark only one oval.

	1	2	3	4	5	
very bad	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	extremely good



4. 4. Now we have a few questions about the content. Please tell us your level of agreement with the following statements about the questionnaires D1.1 and 1.3 using a 1 to 5 scale, where 1 means you strongly disagree and 5 means you strongly agree. If a statement does not apply to you, please select "NA."

Mark only one oval per row.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
The questionnaire's objectives were clearly communicated	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The objectives were met	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Follow-up actions resulted from the questionnaires (the Deliverables 1.2 and 1.4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The questionnaires were well understandable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The right people were addressed by the questionnaires	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The technical instrument (google forms) used for the survey was easy to use	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The questions in the questionnaires were practical and dynamic	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The questionnaires add a sense of accomplishment and a feeling of progress for the project	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The questions were appropriate	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



5. We would also like your feedback on the outcomes of the questionnaire, the reports (D1.2 and 1.4). Note that there is one document per partner country (5 documents total) for 1.4. Please tell us your level of agreement with the following statements using a 1 to 5 scale, where 1 means you strongly disagree and 5 means you strongly agree. If a statement does not apply to you, please select "NA."

Mark only one oval per row.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
The D1.2 was the appropriate length	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The D1.4 (one per PC) were the appropriate lengths	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D1.2 was well structured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D1.4 were well structured	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D1.2 met all the objectives	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D1.4 met all objectives	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D1.2 was well understandable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D1.4 were well understandable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D1.2 the language used was appropriate	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D1.4 the language used was appropriate	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D1.2 The document has been produced in 2 languages (EN+RU)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
D1.4 The documents have been produced in 2 languages (EN+RU)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

**Modernisation of Higher Education
in Central Asia through New
Technologies (HiEdTec)**



6. 6. If any of the deliverables were not appropriate in length, which one and what was too long or too short?

7. 7. If you disagree with any of the point above in No.5, please comment here mentioning the reasons and the concerned document.

8. 8. Was the questionnaire sent on time?

Mark only one oval.

- Yes
 No

9. 9. Did you have appropriate time to fill in the questionnaires?

Mark only one oval.

- Yes
 No



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

**Modernisation of Higher Education
in Central Asia through New
Technologies (HiEdTec)**



10. 10. Was D1.2 produced in an appropriate time after the questionnaire was closed?

Mark only one oval.

Yes

No

11. 11. Were D 1.4 produced on time?

Mark only one oval.

Yes

No

**12. 12. If you answer no for questions No. 10
and 11, which of the documents do you
refer to (Country)?**

**14. 14. If the answer to question 13 was no,
which document(s) do you refer to?**

15. 15. Ideas for future questionnaires, suggestions, comments, etc

Conclusion:

- The quality of questionnaires is high
- The quality of deliverables using outputs from questionnaires is high
- The workflow and timing between partners is on high level
- Content of developed deliverables is appropriate



- set up questionnaires is the way how to get information and ideas from many partners involved in the project to have tangible results published in project deliverables.

All answers analyse was published in the Deliverable D5.2 HiEdTec Evaluation of Questionnaires (D1.1 and D1.3) and Deliverables 1.2 and 1.4. final

4 QUALITY EVALUATION OF THE MEETINGS USING QUESTIONERS

Since the first meeting in Ruse P18 set up an Evaluation Form for Project Events which was also published in a similar form in Annex 3 of Deliverable D5.1 Internal Evaluation System, Quality Assurance plan.

There were tree (3) project meetings (Ruse - Bulgaria, Almaty – Kazakhstan and Tashkent – Uzbekistan) and each meeting was evaluated separately with this structure of questions. The meetings questionnaire was evaluated in the deliverable D5.2 HiEdTec Evaluation of Questionnaires (D1.1 and D1.3) and Deliverables 1.2 and 1.4. final and D5.11 Evaluation of questionnaires published on the HiEdTec website.

Productivity of the meeting	Score (1–5) ¹	Comments
1. Which country are you from?	N/A	Reference HiEdTec D5.10 Report from the project meeting
2. How productive was the meeting?	5(55%) 4(44%) 3(1%)	
3. Please tell us why you feel that way about how productive the meeting was.		
Meeting content and its organization	Score (1–5) ²	Comments
1. The meeting objectives were clearly communicated in advance of the meeting	5(82%) 4(17%) 3(1%)	Reference HiEdTec D5.10 Report from the project meeting

¹ 1 – Not at all productive to 5- Extremely productive

² 1- strongly Disagree, 2- Disagree, 3- Neutral, 4- Agree, 5-Strongly Agree



2. The meeting objectives were met	5(80%) 4(15%) 3(5%)	
3. Follow-up actions resulted from the meeting	5(75%) 4(20%) 3(5%)	
4. Owners of follow-up actions were assigned	5(81%) 4(18%) 3(1%)	
5. The meeting leader(s) effectively moderated the meeting	5(86%) 4(13%) 3(1%)	
6. Meeting attendees had an opportunity to participate	5(82%) 4(17%) 3(1%)	
7. The right people were invited to the meeting	5(55%) 4(44%) 3(1%)	
8. Participants know what is expected of them in advanced and are ready to contribute.	5(85%) 4(10%) 3(5%)	
9. Meeting technology (computers, projectors, screens, phones) are working and prompted and ready to go. Remote attendees included.	5(82%) 4(17%) 3(1%)	
10. Rooms are selected to fit the meeting. Furniture, supplies, space, outlets, etc. encourage creative & productive assembly.	5(82%) 4(17%) 3(1%)	
11. Flip charts, markers, supplies or technology for group memory are ample for any length meeting.	5(79%)	



	4(20%) 3(1%)	
12. Meetings are practical, dynamic and interactive. Participants are involved, excited, empowered and informed.	5(80%) 4(19%) 3(1%)	
13. There is a sense of accomplishment and a feeling of progress. People look forward to meetings that assist their work.	5(82%) 4(17%) 3(1%)	
14. The tone of meetings is positive regardless of topic. Discussions are professional, respectful, all opinions valued.	5(79%) 4(20%) 3(1%)	
Environment, materials, resources and equipment	Score (1–5)	Comments
15. The meeting was the appropriate length of time	5(55%) 4(44%) 3(1%)	
16. The meeting location fit all of the attendees comfortably	5(60%) 4(39%) 3(1%)	
17. The speakers were easily heard	5(75%) 4(20%) 3(5%)	
18. The presentation was easily seen	5(82%) 4(17%) 3(1%)	
19. What did you find most effective about the meeting?		Reference HiEdTec D5.10 Report from the project meeting
20. What did you find least effective about the		Reference HiEdTec D5.10



meeting?		Report from the project meeting
21. Ideas for future meetings, suggestions, comments, etc.		Reference HiEdTec D5.10 Report from the project meeting

4.1 Conclusion

The results have been published in deliverable D5.11 Evaluation of questionnaires. The summary from mentioned deliverable:

Overall, there is very positive feedback from meeting participants, with a high satisfactory score. Anyway, there are some valid suggestions to enhance next project meetings such:

This is high priority for the project and it repeats from the very first meeting in Ruse:

- Presentations in English language!
- Using language - more English in consortium!
- Better organisation of social events
- Better Wi-Fi connection

The detailed view of questionnaires outputs from meeting have been published.

5 EVALUATION OF THE SYLLABUS

The purpose of evaluation of the Syllabus was to gather feedback on the knowledge and experience of EU partner country Universities and their teaching staff on the implementation of innovative educational technologies and didactic models in the process of teaching and learning in higher education.

To validate the Syllabus, we used an online questionnaire asking project partners and users of the Syllabus for their opinion.

Structure of the questions:



General Information	Score (1–5) ³	Comments
1. Which country are you from?	N/A	11 answers
2. Structure of the Syllabus	5(72%) 4(28%)	
3. The quality of the Syllabus	5(72%) 4(28%)	
Contents questions	Score (1–5) ⁴	Comments
4. The Syllabus objectives were clearly communicated	5 (88%) 4 (12%)	11 answers
5. The objectives were met	5 (55%) 4 (45%)	
6. Follow-up actions resulted from the Syllabus	5 (44%) 4 (65%) 3 (1%)	
7. The Syllabus were well understandable	5 (77%) 4 (22%) 3 (1%)	
8. The right people were addressed by the Syllabus	5 (88%) 4 (12%)	
9. The technical instruments (Word Form and paper version) used for the Syllabus were easy to access	5 (44%) 4 (65%) 3 (1%)	
10. The document is practical and dynamic	5 (33%) 4 (66%) 3 (1%)	

³ 1- Strongly Disagree, 2- Disagree, 3- Neutral, 4- Agree, 5-Strongly Agree

⁴ 1- strongly Disagree, 2- Disagree, 3- Neutral, 4- Agree, 5-Strongly Agree



11. The Syllabus add a sense of accomplishment and a feeling of progress for the project	5 (77%) 4 (22%) 3 (1%)	
12. The language used was appropriate	5 (44%) 4 (65%) 3 (1%)	
13. The document had the appropriate length	5 (55%) 4 (44%) 3 (1%)	
14. The document was well structured	5 (50%) 4 (49%) 3 (1%)	
15. The document was well understandable	5 (44%) 4 (65%) 3 (1%)	
Feedback on the outcomes of the Syllabus	Score (1–5)	Comments
16. The document will have an impact	5 (77%) 4 (22%) 3 (1%)	
17. The document was useful for the training	5 (77%) 4 (22%) 3 (1%)	
18. The literature recommended in the Syllabus was understandable	5 (50%) 4 (49%) 3 (1%)	
19. The literature recommended in the Syllabus was useful	5 (44%) 4 (65%) 3 (1%)	



20. The Syllabus helped me understand the aims of the training	5 (98%) 4 (2%)	
21. The training met the objective described in the Syllabus	5 (66%) 4 (34%)	
22. The training given was what I expected after having read the Syllabus	5 (77%) 4 (23%)	
23. The Syllabus were distributed early enough to make myself familiar with the training and the recommended material	5 (55%) 4 (45%)	
Appropriate length of Deliverables	Score (1–5)	Comments
24. The Syllabus was not appropriate in length, what would you have added or deleted?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nothing • In general, the program was created at the highest level. • Personally in my experience so far the syllabus is quite appropriate in length and content • Nothing to add, everything is clear
25. Disagree with any of the point above in No.5, please comment here mentioning the reasons and the concerned document.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comment • - • There are no any disagreements in the point No.5.
Workflow	Score (1–5)	Comments
26. Was the Syllabus sent on time?	5 (100%)	
27. Did you get the chance for comments and criticism?	5 (100%)	
28. Was the final document produced and sent in an	5 (100%)	



appropriate time after the draft was circulated?		
29. If the answer to question 9 was no, what comments would you have on the document?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • - • The answer is YES. Therefore, only positive comments. • No comment
30. Any Other comments		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comment • Thank you very much for very interesting and useful training • No comments, everything is clear, understandable and meets the requirements and objectives. • Want to mention that HiTech Projects is the first project in my experience that everything is planned in advance and strictly goes by plan. That really makes pleasure. Good luck for all of us!

Establishing a centre of innovative educational technologies and active learning classrooms - most of the equipment was delivered and IET centres and classroom were created in all countries except TM.

The full evaluation report of the syllabus is published in HiEdTec Deliverable D5.6 Evaluation of the syllabus of the course for the acquisition of digital skills and innovative teaching and learning methods.



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

**Modernisation of Higher Education
in Central Asia through New
Technologies (HiEdTec)**



6 EVALUATION OF THE DEVELOPED CONCEPT OF ADAPTING THE HIGHER AND POSTGRADUATE EDUCATION SYSTEM TO THE DIGITAL GENERATION

Each partner from Asia evaluated The Concept of Adapting the Higher and Postgraduate Education System to the Digital Generation. The questionnaires were set up by University of Luxembourg with English and Russian version. Partners from Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan produced separate deliverables D5.3. This was the structure of the questions:

D 5.3_Evaluation of the developed Concepts of adapting the education system to the digital Generation considering the specific conditions of each of the PCs.

Анкета для оценки разработанных концепций адаптации системы образования к цифровому поколению с учетом специфических условий работы каждой страны-партнера

These Concepts should define the adaptation of the new education system in the different PCs to the new digital learning and teaching generation.

Please fill in the questions based on the corresponding document (WP2.3. CONCEPT for adapting the education system to the digital generation). The document is stored on the project website in Outcomes WP 2.3 CONCEPT for adapting the education system to the digital generation under each country.

This survey will take you about 10-15 minutes. It consists of 14 questions.

Эти концепции должны определять адаптацию новой системы образования в различных странах-партнерах к новому поколению цифрового обучения и преподавания. Пожалуйста, заполните вопросы, приведенные в документе (WP2. 3. Концепция адаптации системы образования к цифровому поколению). Документ размещен на веб-сайте проекта в разделе итоговые документы WP 2.3 концепция адаптации системы образования к цифровому поколению в каждой стране.

Этот опрос займет у вас около 10-15 минут. Он состоит из 14 вопросов.



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

Modernisation of Higher Education in Central Asia through New Technologies (HiEdTec)



1. Which country are you from? Из какой страны Вы?

- Luxembourg Люксембург
- Italy Италия
- Portugal Португалия
- Bulgaria Болгария
- Turkmenistan Туркменистан
- Uzbekistan Узбекистан
- Kyrgyzstan Кыргызстан
- Tajikistan Таджикистан
- Kazakhstan Казахстан

2. Overall, please tell us how well structured the Concept is 1 means not at all well structured and 5 means extremely well structured. 2. Пожалуйста, расскажите нам, в целом, насколько хорошо структурирована концепция: 1 означает, что она не очень хорошо структурирована, а 5 означает, что она очень хорошо структурирована.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not at all well structured Совсем не хорошо структурирована	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Extremely well structures Отличная структура

3. Please tell us how you rate the quality using a 1 to 5 scale where 1 means very bad and 5 means extremely good.
Пожалуйста, расскажите нам, как вы оцениваете систему шкалы от 1 до 5, где 1 означает - очень плохо, а 5-очень хорошо

	1	2	3	4	5	
very bad очень плохо	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	extremely good очень хорошо



4. Now we have a few questions about the layout and content. Please tell us your level of agreement with the following statements about the Concept, using a 1 to 5 scale, where 1 means you strongly disagree and 5 means you strongly agree. If a statement does not apply to you, please select "NA." 4. Теперь у нас есть несколько вопросов о макете и содержании. Пожалуйста, сообщите нам ваш уровень согласия со следующими утверждениями о концепции, используя шкалу от 1 до 5, где 1 означает, что вы категорически не согласны, а 5 означает, что вы полностью согласны. Если заявление не относится к вам, пожалуйста, выберите "NA" Отметьте только один овал на ряд.

	Strongly Dis...	Disagree He ...	Neutral Нейт...	Agree Согла...	Strongly Agr...	N/A
The Concept'	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The objectiv...	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Follow-up ac...	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The Concept...	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The right peo...	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The technica...	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The docume...	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The Concept...	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The languag...	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The docume...	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The docume...	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The docume...	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

**Modernisation of Higher Education
in Central Asia through New
Technologies (HiEdTec)**



5. We would also like your feedback on the outcome of the Concept. Please tell us your level of agreement with the following statements using a 1 to 5 scale, where 1 means you strongly disagree and 5 means you strongly agree. 5. Мы также хотели бы получить ваши отзывы о результатах концепции. Пожалуйста, сообщите нам ваш уровень согласия со следующими утверждениями, используя шкалу от 1 до 5, где 1- означает, что вы категорически не согласны, а 5 - означает, что вы полностью согласны.

	Strongly Dis...	Disagree He ...	Neutral Нейт...	Agree Согла...	Strongly Agr...	N/A
The docume...	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The docume...	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The literatur...	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The literatur...	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The Concept...	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The adapted ...	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The docume...	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The docume...	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

6. If the Concept document was not appropriate in length, what would you have added or deleted? 6. Если бы Концепция была неподходящей по объему, что бы вы добавили или удалили?

Long answer text

7. If you disagree with any of the points above in No.5, please comment here mentioning the reasons. 7. Если вы не согласны с любым из пунктов, приведенных выше в пункте 5, пожалуйста, прокомментируйте здесь, указав причины.

Long answer text



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

**Modernisation of Higher Education
in Central Asia through New
Technologies (HiEdTec)**



8. Were the Concept documents sent on time? 8. Была ли Концепция отправлена в срок?

Yes Да

No Нет

9. Did you get the chance for comments and criticism? 9. У вас была возможность для комментариев и критики?

Yes Да

No Нет

10. Did you have appropriate time to revise and give comments on the document draft? 10. Было ли у вас достаточно времени, чтобы пересмотреть и прокомментировать проект документа?

Yes Да

No Нет

11. Was the final documents produced and sent in an appropriate time after the draft was circulated? 11. Были ли окончательные документы подготовлены и направлены в надлежащее время после распространения проекта?

Yes Да

No Нет

12. If the answer to question 9 was no, what comments would you have on the document? 12. Если бы ответ на вопрос 9 был отрицательным, какие замечания вы бы высказали по этому документу?

Short answer text
.....



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

**Modernisation of Higher Education
in Central Asia through New
Technologies (HiEdTec)**



13. Any other comments: 13. Любые иные замечания

Long answer text

14. Which country's document are you referring to? 14. На документ какого региона вы ссылались?

- Kyrgyzstan Кыргызстан
- Uzbekistan Узбекистан
- Kazakhstan Казахстан
- Turkmenistan Туркменистан
- Tajikistan Таджикистан

We strongly advise to read each Deliverable from partners involved in evaluation mainly:

- D 5.3_Evaluation of the developed Concepts of adapting the education system to the digital Generation considering the specific conditions of Uzbekistan,
- D 5.3_Evaluation of the developed Concepts of adapting the education system to the digital Generation considering the specific conditions of Turkmenistan
- D 5.3_Evaluation of the developed Concepts of adapting the education system to the digital Generation considering the specific conditions of Kyrgyzstan
- D 5.3_Evaluation of the developed Concepts of adapting the education system to the digital Generation considering the specific conditions of Tajikistan
- D 5.3_Evaluation of the developed Concepts of adapting the education system to the digital Generation considering the specific conditions of Kazakhstan



7 RISK REGISTER

The HiEdTec RISK Register serves the purpose of monitoring identified risks and to ensure that proper mitigation actions are timely implemented. It is the responsibility of the HiEdTec partners to raise all risks with the Project Coordinator, and Evaluation Board, and to update the HiEdTec Risk Register accordingly. Risks should be brought to the attention of the Coordination team as soon as they are identified, this is to allow for mitigation plans to be raised and carried out.

7.1 Risk Register by partners

7.1.1 University of Ruse P1

Risk nr.	Related WP	Risk category and description	Probability (High/Medium/Low)	Impact (High/Medium/Low)	Avoidance / mitigation strategy or contingency plan
ORG-1	WP6	Organizational: Not all partners periodically publish information in the media and participate in activities that increase the awareness of the project and its outputs at a local, national and/or international level.	Medium	Medium	More frequent communication with partners, who do not perform this task
ORG-2	WP6	Organizational: Low participation level of partners with respect to activities related to the dissemination and distribution of project results and products to target group end users and key stakeholders at a local, national and/or international level	Medium	Medium	More frequent communication with partners, who do not perform this task
ORG-3	WP7	Organizational: Partners may delay signing and sending their agreements and declarations	Medium	Low	Communicate with partner and send them guidelines and samples of these documents.



ORG-4	WP7	Organizational: Partners may delay the execution of activities due to various reasons (personal, institutional, political, etc.)	Medium	Medium	Appoint WP leaders at each country responsible for task implementation at a local level. Communicate more often with partners delaying their tasks.
ORG-5	WP7	Organizational: Communication problems and conflict management situations might occur	Low	Medium	Involve PC university management (rectors, vice rectors) in the project and seek their support.
ORG-6	WP7	Organizational: Personal changes in the consortium structure (e.g. Contact person leaving the project etc.)	High	Low	Complete necessary modification documents and ask for permission from the EACEA, so that the transition is as smooth as possible.
POL-1	WP7	Political: Political or financial instability in the Partners Countries	Low	Medium	Seek support in the corresponding Ministry of Education. All ministries are project partners.

7.1.2 University Eurasian national university P3

Risk nr.	Related WP	Risk category and description	Probability (High/Medium/Low)	Impact (High/Medium/Low)	Avoidance / mitigation strategy or contingency plan
LEG-1	WP 1	Legal: Necessary normative legal acts on higher and postgraduate education can be taken with a delay	Medium	Medium	The early consultations with foreign experts and public authorities.
ORG-1	WP7	Organizational: there is probability of time conflicts for personal meetings.	Medium	Medium	The consultation with project coordinator, sending presentations and trying to set up



					teleconference with consortium
ORG-2	WP2	Organizational: Collaboration problems between the partners as result of lack of mutual understanding of tasks and activities to be performed	Medium	Medium	Close cooperation with project coordinator, reminders of partners Tasks and deadlines.

7.1.3 Innovative University of Eurasia P4

Risk nr.	Related WP	Risk category and description	Probability (High/Medium/Low)	Impact (High/Medium/Low)	Avoidance / mitigation strategy or contingency plan
LEG-1	WP 1	Legal: The legislation for Higher Education may vary from country to country	Medium	Medium	The early consultations with foreign experts and public authorities.
ORG-1	WP2	Organizational: The creation of the IPC may be delayed due to delays in the procurement and delivery of equipment	High	High	Conducting a timely tender commission for the purchase of equipment and constant monitoring of equipment delivery on time
ORG-3	WP4	Organizational: Untimely Filling of Cloud Virtual Library with Digital Educational Resources	Low	Low	Involving more professionals in the development of digital educational resources
ORG-4	WP6	Organizational: failure to implement the distribution and operation plan of the project	Medium	Medium	Monitoring the implementation of the project distribution and



					operation plan
--	--	--	--	--	----------------

7.1.4 Ala-Too International University P5

Risk nr.	Related WP	Risk category and description	Probability (High/Medium/Low)	Impact (High/Medium/Low)	Avoidance / mitigation strategy or contingency plan
LEG-1	WP 1	Legal: Necessary normative legal acts on higher and postgraduate education can be taken with a delay	Medium	Medium	The early consultations with foreign experts and public authorities.
ORG-1	WP7	Organizational: there is probability of time conflicts for personal meetings.	Medium	Medium	The consultation with project coordinator, sending presentations and trying to set up teleconference with consortium
ORG-2	WP7	Organizational: Probability of weak coordination between AIU involved staff and researchers	Medium	Medium	Close cooperation should be established with the institutional project coordinator in order to have a proper consultation to send the required information on time and as well as to join the team in the teleconference with consortium.
ORG-3	WP2	Implementation: Implementation of the Concepts among other HEIs	Medium	Medium	There should be established close cooperation between project partner universities and other universities in each region in order to provide assistance in the implementation of the Concepts.



ORG-4	WP2	Organizational: Collaboration problems between the partners as result of lack of mutual understanding of tasks and activities to be performed	Medium	Medium	Close cooperation with project coordinator, reminders of partners Tasks and deadlines.
-------	-----	---	--------	--------	--

7.1.5 K. Tynystanov Issyk-Kul State University P6

Risk nr.	Related WP	Risk category and description	Probability (High/Medium/Low)	Impact (High/Medium/Low)	Avoidance / mitigation strategy or contingency plan
ORG-1	WP 1	Organizational: Collaboration problems between the partners as result of lack of mutual understanding of tasks and activities to be performed.	Medium	Medium	Close cooperation with the project coordinators from Kyrgyzstan and Europe, reminders of the tasks and deadlines.
ORG-2	WP2	Organizational: Lack of mutual understanding between universities and the relevant Ministries of Education and Science	Medium	Medium	The early consultations with foreign experts and universities with partners from Kyrgyzstan, as well as with state authorities (MoES KR).
ORG-3	WP3	Organizational: Disregard to the deadlines from equipment suppliers	Medium	Medium	The early consultations with foreign experts and university partners from Kyrgyzstan, as well as equipment suppliers.



7.1.6 Kyrgyz State Technical University P7

Risk nr.	Related WP	Risk category and description	Probability (High/Medium/Low)	Impact (High/Medium/Low)	Avoidance / mitigation strategy or contingency plan
LEG-1	WP 1	Legal: Difficulty in approving the concept through the Ministry of Education and Science due to bureaucracy.	Medium	Medium	Organization of regular meetings of partner universities from the Kyrgyz Republic with the participation of representatives of the Ministry of Education and Science to discuss current tasks and project implementation in the Kyrgyz Republic
ORG-1	WP7	Organizational: - frequent change of representatives of partner universities from the Kyrgyz Republic at working meetings - Sometimes not all university representatives at work meetings	Medium	Medium	Remote communication through whatsapp group and organizing Skype meetings
ORG-2	WP1	Organizational: Collaboration problems between the partners as result of lack of	Medium	Medium	Close cooperation with project coordinator, reminders of partners Tasks



		mutual understanding of tasks and activities to be performed			and deadlines.
ORG-3	WP1	Organizational: Not enough respondents to complete Google forms survey	Medium	Medium	Attracting personal contacts from other universities, a written appeal to the rectors of universities with a request to participate in the survey.
ORG-4	WP1	Organizational: Delay of creating WP1 outputs	Medium	Medium	Awareness of partners involved in WP1 with incoming Tasks, current status, responsibilities and deadlines
ORG-5	WP5	Organizational: Partners may delay completing evaluation forms for the various deliverables	Low	Low	Close cooperation with WP leader and project coordinator, in justified cases prolongation of deadlines.



7.1.7 Technological University of Tajikistan P10

Risk nr.	Related WP	Risk category and description	Probability (High/Medium/Low)	Impact (High/Medium/Low)	Avoidance / mitigation strategy or contingency plan
ORG-1	WP 1	Organizational: Lack of experience in exchange of innovative educational technologies and didactic models	Low	Low	The staff of the Academic Department should be trained according and the effectiveness of the use of innovative educational technologies and didactic models, trained staff should share with other staff through organization of series of trainings.
ORG-2	WP7	Organizational: Most of TUT involved staff and researchers have their own main job work plans that may cause the problem of missing the project meetings and teleconference meetings	Medium	Medium	Close cooperation should be established with the institutional project coordinator in order to have a proper consultation to send the required information on time and as well as to join the team in the teleconference with consortium.



ORG-3	WP2	Implementation: Implementation of the Concepts among other HEIs	Low	Low	There should be established close cooperation between project partner universities and other universities in each region in order to provide assistance in the implementation of the Concepts.
ORG-4	WP3	Organizational: Assurance of the Sustainability of the Centers for innovative educational technologies	Medium	Medium	The Department of Innovative Educational Technologies should further organize regular trainings in order to continue activities of the center beyond the project lifecycle.
ORG-5	WP4	Organizational: Interchangeability of the trained staff	Medium	Medium	The university administration and Academic Department should take measures to build the capacity of teaching staff on provision of digital skills and innovative teaching and learning methods in order to substitute the trainers who leave their jobs at this university.



7.1.8 International University for the Humanities and Development P11

Risk nr.	Related WP	Risk category and description	Probability (High/Medium/Low)	Impact (High/Medium/Low)	Avoidance / mitigation strategy or contingency plan
ORG-1	WP1	Organizational: Difficulties in establishing close contacts at the initial stage. Distribution of specific tasks according to the established action plan.	Low	Low	Close cooperation with project coordinators. A specific allocation of responsibilities according to the established plan.
ORG-2	WP2	Implementation: Possible difficulties and delays in the implementation of the Concept taking into account specific situations in all higher educational institutions of the partner country.	Low	Low	Close contacts/collaboration with all higher educational institutions of the country in terms of the adaptation of the education system to the digital Generation considering the specific conditions of each of the country.
LEG-1	WP2	Legal: Necessary normative legal acts on higher and postgraduate education can be taken with a delay.	Medium	Medium	Early consultation and exchange of views with local authorities, experts.
ORG-3	WP3	Organizational: Collaboration problems between the partners as result of lack of mutual understanding of tasks and activities to be performed.	Medium	Medium	Close cooperation with project coordinator, reminders of partners Tasks and deadlines.



ORG-4	WP4	Organizational: Possible limited amount of the trained staff.	Medium	Medium	Coordinated actions with the project coordinator, with partners, as well as with the managerial authorities of HEIs of every partner with a view to possible replacement or back up of the trained staff.
ORG-5	WP5	Organizational: Possible delays in accomplishing the Quality Plan.	Low	Low	Close cooperation with the project coordinator and partners,
ORG-6	WP6	Organizational: Difficulty with finding experts experienced in dissemination procedure.	Low	Low	Organization of establishment the process in advance.
ORG-7	WP7	Organizational: Probable conflicts in proper time and task distribution by setting priorities between the main work and project workloads.	Medium	Medium	Establishment of the close cooperation and collaboration with the project coordinator in order to have a proper consultation on the required tasks on time and as well as to join the team discussions.



7.1.9 Tashkent State University of Economics P15

Risk nr.	Related WP	Risk category and description	Probability (High/Medium/Low)	Impact (High/Medium/Low)	Avoidance / mitigation strategy or contingency plan
ORG-1	WP1	Organizational: The Ministry of Secondary and Higher Education of Uzbekistan might not provide the necessary support	Medium	Medium	Partners should work closely with Ministry and get them involved in the project implementation process.
ORG-2	All work packages	Organizational: Imbalance of implementation of project work packages	Medium	Medium	CA partners should cooperate on implementation and performance of the project tasks. Sharing experience should be initiated. Involvement of European partners to inspect problems hindering the process will help to provide balance.
ORG-3	WP2	Implementation: Implementation of the Concepts among other HEIs	Medium	Low	Ministries of Higher education's support is important. Under their responsibility project can reach better implementation of concept among other HEIs



ORG-4	WP3	Organizational: Assurance of the Sustainability of the Centers for innovative educational technologies	Medium	Medium	Roadmap of activities should be developed and activities for providing sustainability should start earliest stage.
ORG-5	WP4	Organizational: Sharing the experience of trained staff to other staff at Universities.	Medium	Medium	Trained trainers should understand importance of diffusion of the experience and by involving university administration certain method for training of other trainers should be developed. All the activities regarding the ToT should start possible earlier stage.
ORG-6	WP7	Organizational: Team work and involvement of focal points and responsible project team members in the meetings	low	Medium	Organization of team work and their involvement in the different packages is crucial in implantation of the project as a whole. Therefore, chemistry of team and responsible staff for certain packages should take part at project meetings and discussions.



7.1.10 University of Pavia P17

Risk nr.	Related WP	Risk category and description	Probability (High/Medium/Low)	Impact (High/Medium/Low)	Avoidance / mitigation strategy or contingency plan
ORG-1	WP7	Organizational: Since the University of Pavia has three researchers working on the project, time conflicts may arise when arranging internal meetings.	Low	Medium	Early planning of meetings, arranging Skype discussions when in-person meetings are not possible.
ORG-2	WP2	Organizational: Delays on the part of Partner Countries in producing the draft versions of the Concepts of adapting the education system to the digital generation with regard to their specific conditions.	Medium	Medium	Clear definition of deadlines, sending frequent email reminders to partners, fast reply to their possible questions.
ORG-3	WP2	Organizational: Delays on the part of Partner Countries in producing the final versions of the Concepts of adapting the education system to the digital generation with regard to their specific conditions.	Low	Low	Clear definition of deadlines, sending frequent email reminders to partners, fast reply to their possible questions.



ORG-4	WP2	<p>Organizational: Resistance to the adoption of the final versions of the Concepts in Partner Countries by their university governances.</p> <p>Organizational: Delays in translating into English and Russian, printing and publishing on universities' websites the Concepts of adapting the education system to the digital generation.</p>	Medium	Medium	Raising awareness about the importance of the developed Concepts in the university governances of Partner Countries. Clear definition of deadlines, sending frequent email reminders to partners, fast reply to their possible questions.
ORG-5	WP2		Low	Low	
ORG-6	WP3	<p>Organizational: Delays in the development of Centres for innovative educational technologies and active learning classrooms.</p>	Medium	Medium	Clear definition of deadlines, sending frequent email reminders to partners, fast reply to their possible questions; within each university of each Partner Country, sending frequent requests to equipment and software suppliers in case they disregard deadlines.



ORG-7	WP3	Organizational: Delays in the development of the Handbook of Innovative Educational Technologies.	Low	Low	Clear definition of deadlines, sending frequent email reminders to partners, fast reply to their possible questions. Raising awareness about the importance of the developed Centres in the university governances of Partner Countries.
ORG-8	WP3	Organizational: Inefficient use of the created Centres.	Medium	Medium	

7.1.11 University of Luxembourg P18

Risk nr.	Related WP	Risk category and description	Probability (High/Medium/Low)	Impact (High/Medium/Low)	Avoidance / mitigation strategy or contingency plan
LEG-1	WP 1	Legal: The legislation for Higher Education may vary from country to country	Medium	Medium	The early consultations with foreign experts and public authorities.
ORG-1	WP7	Organizational: UL involved 3 researchers and there is probability of time conflicts for personal meetings.	Medium	Medium	The consultation with project coordinator, sending presentations and trying to set up teleconference with consortium



ORG-2	WP1	Organizational: Collaboration problems between the partners as result of lack of mutual understanding of tasks and activities to be performed	Medium	Medium	Close cooperation with project coordinator, reminders of partners Tasks and deadlines.
ORG-3	WP1	Organizational: The Ministries of Education and Science of the Partner Countries might not provide the necessary support	Low	Medium	Each project partners report, problems to WP leader. Project coordinator helping to contact Ministries with explanations.
ORG-4	WP1	Organizational: Delay of creating WP1 outputs	Medium	Medium	Awareness of partners involved in WP1 with incoming Tasks, current status, responsibilities and deadlines
ORG-5	WP5	Organizational: Partners may delay completing evaluation forms for the various deliverables	Low	Low	Close cooperation with WP leader and project coordinator, in justified cases prolongation of deadlines.
ORG-6	WP5	Organizational: Difficulty with finding experts experienced in evaluation procedures	Medium	Medium	Report to project coordinator, finding experts before actual deadlines,



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

**Modernisation of Higher Education
in Central Asia through New
Technologies (HiEdTec)**



8 CONCLUSION

This report is following up measurements set in Deliverable D5.1 Internal Evaluation System Quality Assurance Plan. We strongly advice to see Internal meetings reports published in the Deliverable D5.10 Report from the project meeting, produced after every meeting and Deliverable D5.5 Evaluation of the syllabus of the course for the acquisition of digital skills and innovative teaching and learning methods for more detailed answers and D 5.3_Evaluation of the developed Concepts of adapting the education system to the digital Generation considering the specific conditions of each country.