



ElevateTM

Elevating
the internationalisation
of higher education
in Moldova

MONITORING AND EVALUATION
MANUAL



Monitoring and Evaluation Manual

Project Acronym:	ELEVATE
Project full title:	ELEVATING THE INTERNATIONALISATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN MOLDOVA
Project No:	573921-EPP-1-2016-1-MD-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP
Funding Scheme:	ERASMUS+
Coordinator:	ASEM – Academy of Economic Studies of Moldova
Project start date:	October 15, 2016
Project duration:	36 months

The European Commission's support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents, which reflect 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.

DOCUMENT CONTROL SHEET

Title of Document:	Monitoring and Evaluation manual
Work Package:	WP5 Quality Plan
Last version date:	25/07/2017
Status :	Draft
Document Version:	v.01
File Name	ELEVATE_M&E manual_v.01.doc
Number of Pages	26 (without Annexes)
Dissemination Level	Internal (project`s consortium) - RESTRICTED

VERSIONING AND CONTRIBUTION HISTORY

Version	Date	Revision Description	Responsible Partner
v.01	25/01/2017	Creation of document	EPDRI
v.02	15/03/2017	Completed draft version / The document presented in the template	EPDRI
v.03	25/07/2017	Consolidated version of the document	EPDRI

TABLE OF CONTENT

1. Introduction	6
2. Quality Expectations.....	7
2.1. Quality of the project implementation	7
2.2. Quality of project deliverables	7
2.2.1. <i>Visual identity requirements</i>	8
2.2.2. <i>Quality of meetings/ workshops, trainings, conferences and seminars</i>	8
2.2.3. <i>Quality of promotional materials</i>	10
2.2.4. <i>Quality of websites and other electronic tools</i>	10
2.2.5. <i>Quality of methodologies</i>	11
2.3. Quality of Project Management.....	11
2.4. General Project Guidelines	12
2.5. Amendments to the manual	12
3. Internal monitoring	13
3.1. Project Quality Assurance Strategy	13
3.2. Quality responsibilities.....	15
3.2.1. <i>Task Leader (main author of the deliverable).....</i>	15
3.2.2. <i>Other partners involved in the activity, co-authors</i>	16
3.2.3. <i>WP Leader</i>	16
3.2.4. <i>Quality Assurance Project Team (QAPT).....</i>	17
3.2.5. <i>Project Coordinator</i>	17
3.2.6. <i>Steering Committee (SC)</i>	18
3.3. Common templates and formats.....	18
3.4. Quality feedback by the target groups.....	18
3.5. Project Risk Management.....	19
3.5.1. <i>Practical approach of risk identification</i>	20
3.5.2. <i>Risks / Uncertainties monitoring procedure.....</i>	20
4. External Monitoring	22
5. Partners' technical and financial reporting.....	25

ANNEXES	27
Annex A Quality Assurance Check List for deliverables / activities	28
Annex B Word Template for project document deliverables	30
Annex C PowerPoint Template for project presentations	37
Annex D Attendance Sheet Template for different meetings / events	39
Annex E Word Template for Minutes of different meetings / events	41
Annex F Participant Feedback Form Template for different meetings /events	48
Annex G External Monitoring Report.....	51
Annex H Event Report Template for different meetings / events	57
Annex I Risk Management: Monitoring Sheet.....	63

1. Introduction

The Monitoring and Evaluation manual formalizes the approach that will be followed by the partners of the ELEVATE project to ensure the highest possible quality of the project activities, outputs and outcomes and project management.

The deliverable itself is produced based on clear responsibilities: the task / deliverable leader (EPDRI) drafts the manual, involves the coordinator ASEM and then the QAPT (Quality Assurance Project Team) of the project and obtains feedback from all partners. The task leader then finalizes the manual which will be approved and adopted by the Strategic Steering Committee. The Manual will be made available on the ELEVATE web-page www.elevate-project.md. During the project implementation, EPDRI as WP leader will also monitor the implementation and acceptance of the quality procedures along with QAPT team and support the coordinator in its reinforcement. This manual is defining procedures for:

- Internal monitoring, quality and risk management,
- External monitoring, and
- Partners' technical and financial reporting.

The manual defines also the quality expectations regarding the project deliverables, i.e. reports and documents, events/workshops/meetings as well as procedures for internal and external monitoring.

The structure of the deliverable is as follows:

Chapter 2 defines the quality expectations of the consortium regarding the project as a whole, its deliverables, i.e. the documents, workshops, meetings and other activities and the project management as well as the general guidelines to be followed. Chapter 3 defines the internal monitoring strategy and outlines the responsibilities of the project partners as well as the core principles of the risk management strategy. Chapter 4 describes the external monitoring strategy. Chapter 5 focuses on the financial and technical reporting duties of the partners and finally, the Annexes to the document provide templates (which are also available separately) to be used by the project partners.

2. Quality Expectations

The present chapter presents the expectations of the project consortium with reference to the ELEVATE deliverables and activities as well as the expectations relevant to the project management.

2.1. Quality of the project implementation

ELEVATE is following the overarching aim to ***Strengthening the role of Moldovan Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) within the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) and European Research Area (ERA) through building up of comprehensive internationalisation of higher education (IoHE) in Moldova in order to enhance the quality of education and research, mobility and services, and to make meaningful contribution to society.*** The partners agree that this overall objective shall always be in the forefront of all decisions to be taken. The partners therefore might decide to prioritise certain activities over others which have a higher impact in relation to the achievement of the objectives. Quality in the project means that the achievement of the objectives might be more important even if it means e.g. postponing a deadline or changing some aspects of an activity.

To remind all partners, the three specific objectives of the project are:

- 1. To develop and advance national legislative** which will elevate the process of internationalisation (I-tion) of Moldovan higher education and research.
- 2. Building the university integrative function** through institutional policies for the I-tion of education, research, mobility and services.
- 3. Enhancing institutional capacities** for effective participation in large-scale international collaborations.

2.2. Quality of project deliverables

The deliverables of ELEVATE project may be classified into reports, events (such as trainings, seminars and conferences), methodologies which include for example the strategies, guidelines, action plans and recommendations, and “other products” (online benchmarking platform of higher education and research).

A common quality expectation for all deliverables is their relevance to reach the overall objective and the specific objectives, with a further focus on their development

in an efficient and effective manner. Timely delivery following the project work plan as identified in the ELEVATE project's timeline (modified and agreed by the Strategic Steering Committee (SSC) on six-month basis) is expected.

2.2.1. Visual identity requirements

All reports and documents will respect the visual identity of the ELEVATE project (e.g. logo, title and Erasmus+ project number).

A consistent and common format for all document deliverables is to be followed which includes a common front page and common styles (fonts, headers, tables of content, etc.). The template for document deliverables is provided in [Annex B](#) and separately for the project partners on the project platform. In all documents, the partners will use references, page numbering, and figures as well as table numbering.

2.2.2. Quality of meetings/ workshops, trainings, conferences and seminars

All events organized by the project will be implemented professionally. The organizers provide in due time a full information package to the participants including the draft agenda, letter of invitation and a note on the logistics (informing about travel arrangements, venue, suggested hotels, etc.). Time for preparation activities depends on the type of event e.g. several months for conferences and several weeks for trainings. This will be defined in separate action plans by WP leaders.

The meeting organizers ensure smooth registration processes (including list of attendees for signatures) and the implementation of the meetings respecting appropriate time for coffee and lunch breaks as well as the availability of all necessary materials (e.g. pens and paper, beamer, etc.). The organizers will also ensure the recording of minutes of the meetings in a concise style including a list of action points. Material associated with the meetings will reflect the visual project identity. Where appropriate (e.g. for trainings, seminars) also feedback forms will be distributed among participants (**Annex F**) and event reports related to feedback forms will be prepared by organisers (**Annex H**). Each event will be documented by various materials as described in the table below.

Table 1 Documentation of ELEVATE event

*Name and affiliation will be visible; all personal data will be hidden.

** Upon the approval of the presenter.

Type of event	Materials	Available at	
		ELEVATE web-site	Partners web page
Info-days, workshops and seminars	News	x	x
	Agenda	x	x
	List of participants*	x	
	Minutes	x	
	Gallery	x	x
	Presentations**	x	
	All presentations		
	Report on feedback forms		
SSC meetings and Conferences	News	x	x
	Agenda	x	x
	List of participants*	x	
	Minutes	x	
	Gallery	x	x
	Presentations**	x	
Study visits/Trainings	News	x	x
	List of trainees*	x	
	Training materials	x	x
	Report on feedback forms		
	Minutes	x	x
	Gallery	x	x
Open Door Days	News	x	x
	List of participants*	x	
	Gallery	x	
	Minutes	x	
	Report on feedback forms		
Mass-media appearance	News	x	x
	List of participants*	x	
	Gallery/link URL	x	x
	Minutes	x	
	Report on feedback forms		

2.2.3. Quality of promotional materials

Communication and dissemination activities of the project will adhere to the Communication and Dissemination strategy of the ELEVATE project (WP6). All promotional materials will reflect the visual identity of the project and Erasmus+ programme. The project coordinator (P1-ASEM) is responsible for design of all promotional material. The draft version will be sent to all partners for comments and suggestions, before printing, publishing and distribution. The promo materials will be disseminated by all project partners at events which are relevant to reach the project's target group (i.e. not only events organized by the project itself, but also general events with a focus on university internationalisation, innovation and research).

2.2.4. Quality of websites and other electronic tools

The project envisages setting up the public ELEVATE web-site (<http://elevate-project.md/>), ELEVATE Facebook and Online Interactive Benchmarking platform. All representation tools will be continuously updated by the project's partners and are intended to effectively communicate the results of the project.

P1- ASEM will be responsible for setting up and maintaining the ELEVATE web-site, and each partner will be responsible for their own web-site and HTML catalogues. ***All partners are asked to include a short ELEVATE description with a link to the official website on their homepages.***

The ELEVATE webpage can be accessed by all partners depending on their assigned tasks and roles. The project's webpage will be the single point of reference for the project documentation under CONSORTIUM SPACE tag.

The Online Interactive Benchmarking platform will be set up and maintained by P1-ASEM and it will remain after the project has ended.

All tools will be implemented with high performance, good functionality and stability.

2.2.5. Quality of methodologies

The methodologies (e.g. National strategy of internationalisation of higher education and research; National strategy of academic mobility and recognition of degrees; University Action plan for participation in the European Research Area and other) developed by ELEVATE will always be tailored to the defined target groups, they will be tested and refined and particular emphasis will be put on their usability. The methodologies will always be well understandable, readable and developed with a strong focus on the future practical and sustainable implementation in order to reach the desired project impact.

2.3. Quality of Project Management

The project management structure has been established at the beginning of the project phase to ensure effectiveness, decisiveness, flexibility and quality of work. It involves the Contractor, the Coordinator, a Strategic Steering Committee (SSC), a Project Support Team (PST-ASEM) and Quality Assurance Project Team (QAPT). The SSC will review the activities and decide on any necessary contingency measures in reorganisation tasks and resources – as usual with a strong focus on the project impact. The project management will be transparent and flexible but also strict enough to ensure the implementation of the project activities in order to achieve the project's objectives. P13-EPDRI supports the coordinator P1-ASEM on the EU project management level with e.g. monitoring, evaluations and reports.

Each partner is equally and independently responsible for assigned activities, money use and reporting. Site Managers (contact persons) have the responsibility for the local management.

2.4. General Project Guidelines

ELEVATE will follow different project guidelines and respects the requirements of the programme. Apart from the Monitoring and Evaluation Manual at hand, the reference documents include:

- ✚ EACEA – ELEVATE project Grant Agreement
- ✚ ELEVATE project Partnership Agreements
- ✚ ELEVATE Communication and Dissemination Strategy
- ✚ ELEVATE Handbook
- ✚ EACEA - Guidelines for the Use of Grants
- ✚ EACEA - Frequently Asked Questions

2.5. Amendments to the manual

The procedures in this manual can be amended by agreement of all partners or by a decision taken by the project's Strategic Steering Committee (SSC). Any new version is communicated to all the partners and takes effect 15 calendar days after this communication.

3. Internal monitoring

Internal monitoring will be carried out by all partners, including self-evaluation by using the LFM, Timeline, budget and cash flow tables, SSC meetings, monitoring visits of the QAPT and questionnaires / satisfaction surveys of target groups (e.g. participants of dissemination and training events; see also Annex F and Annex H). The ELEVATE project and partners' webpage will also be used for monitoring of project activities.

For the development of the national and university IoHE strategies, guidelines on internationalisation, training programmes and project's publications four-stage control procedures will be applied: from team member to WP leader, then to the coordinator and after that to the SSC for final approval.

3.1. Project Quality Assurance Strategy

The Quality Assurance in ELEVATE project includes four levels of quality control: (1) Deliverable authors, Task and WP leaders; (2) Deliverable reviewers; (3) Coordinator level; and (4) Steering Committee level and final approval.

1. Deliverable authors, task and WP leaders:

The 1st level corresponds to the activity level. The presentation of deliverables and activities of the project are a joint responsibility of the associated Task Leader and his/her team, further partners involved in the activity and of the corresponding WP leader. It shall guarantee the quality and timeliness of the deliverable as identified in Application Form and WP action plans (modified and agreed by the SSC on six-month basis). They present a "final draft deliverable" to the QAPT (i.e. the deliverable reviewers).

2. Deliverable reviewers (QAPT and Advisory Team):

The 2nd level of control is elaborated by at least two assigned reviewers of the QAPT who are not leaders of Task/WP within which the deliverable is produced. The reviewers have 5 working days to respond by sending comments using the template

for the quality assurance check list (**Annex A**). The deliverable authors have 5 more working days to conform to the reviewer comments or send their written objections. In this case the reviewers will have another 5 days to send back their final comments.

In case profound disagreements between reviewers and Task leaders arise, the 3rd level control of the deliverables will allow the coordinator to have a final say – while he/she may also involve the rest of the consortium if deemed necessary.

3. Coordinator level:

The 3rd level control is carried out by the Coordinator. If a draft deliverable has not passed the 2nd level control and there are disagreements between the deliverable authors and the reviewers, the Coordinator will take the necessary corrective actions in order to come up with acceptable deliverables. If necessary the Coordinator may involve the rest of the consortium. A draft deliverable that has passed the 2nd level of control will still be checked by the Coordinator for final comments and when accepted it will be forwarded to the Strategic Steering Committee for formal approval.

4. Steering Committee level and final approval:

The 4th level control is elaborated at the Steering Committee level. The Steering Committee is the highest decision making body of the partnership that takes the final decision for the approval of major deliverables.

It shall be possible to include a deliverable in the project reports even if its formal approval is still pending, if it has passed the 2nd and 3rd level of control without profound disagreements as then no major alterations are to be expected.

It is expected that the partners will also establish internal quality control mechanisms, i.e. the site manager will always check the output of his co-workers before sending documents to the ELEVATE team or before uploading them on the project communication tools.

3.2. Quality responsibilities

Different roles are identified with reference to the development of the project activities and in particular the project quality assurance procedures. Different responsibilities are associated with the different roles.

3.2.1. *Task Leader (main author of the deliverable)*

- Is responsible for coordinating the development of the deliverable(s) according to the deliverable template.
- Is responsible for assigning parts of the work leading to the deliverable to the other partners involved in the activity.
- Is responsible for coordinating the work of the other partners involved in the task, providing guidance when necessary.
- Is responsible for aligning the contributions of the other partners involved in the task, in order to produce the deliverable.
- Is responsible for the submission of the draft deliverable via ELEVATE webpage to the WP leader (1st level control), the QAPT (2nd level control) and the coordinator (3rd level control).
- Is responsible for implementing the suggestions of the QAPT team, assigning certain amendments to the other partners contributing to the task as appropriate.
- Is responsible for sending the amended draft deliverable.
- Reports to the WP Leader for any problems occurring during the implementation of the activity.
- Cooperates with the WP Leader and the other partners in the same WP in order to ensure the activity's progress in conformity with other activities and that any cross-task inputs and outputs are being delivered as foreseen by the WP description (respecting any changes approved by the Strategic Steering Committee as recorded in the respective minutes).

3.2.2. *Other partners involved in the activity, co-authors*

- Are responsible for the production of their part in the deliverable according to the Task Leader's instructions.
- Make sure that their written contributions comply with the Deliverables' Document Template so that to ensure that the Task Leader will be able to put all contributions together in the desirable format.
- Are responsible for providing to the Task Leader all the complementary information regarding their work (i.e. references, bibliography, methodologies used, contact details of people interviewed etc.)
- Are responsible to implement amendments to their contribution as a result of the amendments requested by the QAPT team, after consulting with the Task Leader.

3.2.3. *WP Leader*

- Is responsible for preparing and updating of WP Action plan, making sure that all activities are in the time frame defined
- Is responsible for coordinating the Work Package and ensuring that all the activities are contributing to the WP's objectives.
- Cooperates with the Task Leaders and the coordinator in ensuring that all of the contributing partners are smoothly cooperating with a view to accomplish the WP's objectives and that any cross-WP inputs and outputs are being delivered as foreseen by the project description.
- Sends alerts in time to remind about submission deadlines and the procedures to be followed and provides input and suggestions to the Task Leaders of the WP during the development of the relevant deliverables.
- Provides to the Task Leaders comments and suggestions on the draft deliverables (1st level control).
- Cooperates with the Task Leaders in ensuring the implementation of the suggestions of the QAPT team (2nd and 3rd level control).
- Verifies the satisfactory implementation of the recommendations.

3.2.4. Quality Assurance Project Team (QAPT)

- Is coordinated by the QAPT manager, as agreed by the Steering Committee at the 1st Consortium meeting.
- Is responsible for the Quality Assurance exercise of deliverables.
- Receives each draft deliverable from the Task Leader and provides feedback using the Quality Assurance Check List.
- Sends the Quality Assurance Check List to the Task Leader and the Coordinator.
- Verifies the satisfactory implementation of the recommendations included in the Quality Assurance Check List, in co-operation with the WP Leader.
- Cooperates with the Project Coordinator on general issues related to the level of quality of the project's deliverables as appropriate.

3.2.5. Project Coordinator

- Cooperates with the QAPT and the Task Leaders on all matters arising relevant to ensuring the quality of the project's deliverables.
- Accepts the deliverable or provides final comments to the Task Leaders and WP Leaders (3rd level control).
- Cooperates with the WP Leaders in order to ensure that all WPs are progressing in conformity with each other and that any cross-WP inputs and outputs are being delivered as foreseen by the WP description.
- Informs the QAPT, the WP Leaders and the Task Leaders of any changes in the Partnership Agreement and the related Timeline or any implicit changes in the implementation of the project that may affect the timing or the content of the relevant deliverables.
- Officially submits all approved deliverables after their approval (4th level control).

3.2.6. *Steering Committee (SC)*

- Officially approves and finally accepts the deliverables for their submission.

P13-EPDRI, as WP5 Leader, is responsible for the elaboration of the Monitoring and Evaluation Manual along with the Project Coordinator (P1-ASEM) and QAPT team as well as for its application in the different project activities.

3.3. **Common templates and formats**

All document based deliverables are being drafted based on a common MS Word format. This format is adopted by the SSC in order to ensure a common appearance of deliverables as well as ensuring that a minimum amount of information will appear consistently in all documents produced by the project. This is not relevant to deliverables that by their nature need to have a different format (i.e. project brochures, newsletters).

The document template is given in **Annex B** of this manual as a separate document which is also available on the ELEVATE webpage (CONSORTIUM SPACE tag).

All presentations shall be based on a common MS PowerPoint template. The template is provided in **Annex C** as a separate document which is also available on the ELEVATE web page.

For the professional execution of meetings also some other templates have been developed to record the attendance and minutes of the meeting (provided in **Annex D** und **Annex E** as separate documents for download).

3.4. **Quality feedback by the target groups**

The satisfaction of stakeholders, beneficiaries and end users will also be investigated. It will take into account a variety of information from different sources using visits, interviews, questionnaires to target groups and consultation with the project beneficiaries.

In order to allow the impact assessment of the project activities, a template for feedback for different meetings / events has been developed. It needs to be adapted to the specific needs but the main items shall not be deleted. This form is provided in **Annex F** as a separate document which is also available on the ELEVATE web page. Furthermore, a specific event report template (minutes) has been developed which is to be filled by project partners (organisers) for all ELEVATE events (open door events, workshops, info days etc. – except SC meetings). Furthermore, this template can be used to inform colleagues and partners about other events attended (promoting ELEVATE). In the second case just the first page of the template should be prepared. This form is provided in **Annex H** as a separate document which is also available from the ELEVATE web page.

3.5. Project Risk Management

As part of the internal quality management, a regular risk assessment will be carried and reviewed out during the Strategic Steering Committee meetings (Risk brainstorming) which shall lead to corrective actions and potential adaptations of the WorkPlan/ Timeline based on a sound process.

The risk management strategy addresses issues that could potentially endanger the achievement of the overall goal of the project and its objectives considering potential financial risks (overspending and under spending), timing (postponing and preponing of activities/deliverables), performance risks (project management), and sustainability of the project developments. The main aim will be to provide a sound assessment, to anticipate challenges in a systematic way and to minimize the potentially negative overall impact.

The identification and assessment of new risks is a joint responsibility of all project partners who have to communicate them to the Coordinator and the rest of the partnership, eventually suggesting also possible interventions and solutions, as soon as they get aware of those risks. In particular, partners may think of preventive actions (avoiding that the risk occurs) and corrective actions (decreasing the severity and impact), specifying also the resources that would be needed.

The Strategic Steering Committee (SSC) may react in several ways, ranging from the simple acceptance of the situation in the case of negligible risks, to the enforcement of a mitigation plan including alternatives, workarounds and the proposed corrective actions that will make the risk consequences acceptable for the consortium.

Also the external reviewer will be involved in the risk management, who will be tasked to assess if there is a risk that the project will fail to meet its key indicators and if there is a risk that project partners will not be able to spend all the money according to the Partner budget table.

The proper allocation of resources to the project by the individual project partners is of outmost importance. There are several possible risks connected: the delay of the project implementation as defined in the project work plan; the rushed implementation of the work plan with low quality; an under spending during the project implementation (also causing a shift in the headings' ratio), meaning that the project timetable is followed with reference to technical deliverables, yet the relevant expenditures are not timely invoiced or validated; etc.

The project partners all have to ensure that they allocate the needed resources to the project, both human and financial.

3.5.1. Practical approach of risk identification

The first step in project risk management is to identify the risks that are present in a project. The risks should furthermore be identified as early as possible in order to deal with them properly and to think about corrective and/or preventive actions.

In order to identify and monitor the risks within ELEVATE project, a monitoring sheet for risks has been developed including the information on corrective and/or preventive actions (**Annex I**).

3.5.2. Risks / Uncertainties monitoring procedure

- WP leaders (or Task leaders) **identify possible risks/uncertainties** in their WP and fill in the template (Annex I).

- The **risks monitoring templates (Annex I) are communicated** to QAPT Team + WP5 Leader (EPDRI) + Project coordinator (ASEM)
- QAPT Team + WP5 Leader (EPDRI) + Project Coordinator (ASEM) **register, analyses and priorities risks/uncertainties**
- QAPT Team + WP5 Leader (EPDRI) + Project Coordinator (ASEM) **plans and implements risk responses.**

Strategic Steering Committee meetings will be used also to organize a risk brainstorming sessions basing on the Annex I template. After each Strategic Steering Committee meeting this template will be updated by QAPT Team.

4. External Monitoring

The purpose of the monitoring process is to provide support and guidance to individual site managers and project management teams. It is designed to assist them in areas where they require support. The QAPT (Quality Assurance Project Team) will be able to offer an objective point of view and be „a fresh pair of eyes“ in assessing progress to date.

For external monitoring purposes an experienced quality control expert from outside the consortium will be engaged.

For this purpose, specific Terms of Reference¹ will be developed by P1-ASEM as Task Leader for Act.5.2, in cooperation with QAPT team. The ToRs for Monitoring and Evaluation usually roughly follow the structure below, however P1-ASEM in cooperation with P13-EPDRI and QAPT team will decide on the form and structure of ToR following the specific needs in ELEVATE:

1. **Background and rationale:** *The opening section of the ToR typically provides an orientation about the overall programme, project, or another intervention to be evaluated.*
2. **Specific Objectives of the Evaluation and Evaluation Questions:** *The framing and presentation of the objectives of the evaluation is usually a brief but important section in any ToR. Common understanding of, and consensus around, the stated objectives and evaluation questions will be important throughout the negotiation and implementation of the assigned tasks. Evaluation objectives might relate to predetermined criteria, such as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact or sustainability or other – often more horizontal - features, such as gender issues.*
3. **Scope of the Evaluation:** *This section presents the scope and limits of the evaluation. The scope should be realistic given the time and resources available for implementing the evaluation study.*
4. **Approach and Methodology:** *Specifying the approach for the evaluation can be the most challenging part of developing the ToR. This section should*

¹The components of the ToR are following definitions and structure provided in: The World Bank (2011): Writing Terms of Reference for an evaluation: a how to guide. p. 2.

outline how the evaluation will be conducted. However, many ToRs leave room for the evaluator(s) to define a more detailed methodology in line with the prescribed scope and objectives, which is recommended.

5. **Governance and Accountability:** *This section of the ToR specifies the governance and management arrangements for carrying out the evaluation. Any decision-making arrangements (such as a steering committee or an advisory group) should be described here in terms of their organization and function(s). Participation of other stakeholders (for example, beneficiary representatives in validating the results) and the lines of accountability should also be noted with, at minimum, clear guidance on who will review and approve the evaluation plan and subsequent products of the evaluation (e.g. inception report, draft report and final report).*
6. **Guiding Principles and Values:** *ToR specifies research ethics or procedures that the evaluators should follow. These might include fundamental principles of the organisation commissioning the task(s), basic tenets that should guide the study (for example, transparency, cost-effectiveness, collaboration with beneficiaries, hiring of local consultants, involvement of local agencies, etc.) or practices expected to be taken into account by the evaluators (for example, confidentiality of data, anonymity of responses, making data publicly available in a usable format, and so on).*
7. **Professional Qualifications:** *The mix of requested knowledge, skills, and experience will depend on the scope and methodology of the evaluation. The ToR should specify as clearly as possible what the profile of the evaluator should be to attract the strongest candidates for conducting the study.*
8. **Deliverables and Schedule:** *The outputs and reporting requirements expected for the evaluation should be specified, along with the required or proposed timeline for the study. Clear guidance in this section will help ensuring that the outputs from the evaluation meet expectations.*
9. **Budget and Payment:** *The commissioner of an evaluation should consider what funds are available to support the tasks envisioned for the evaluators. In cases where a limited budget will likely constrain the scope and methodology of the study, an effective practice is to state the available budget and ask*

proposers to describe what they expect to achieve. This allows for value-for-money assessments.

- 10. Structure of the Proposal and Submission Guidelines:** *ToRs can be used to request proposals from potential evaluators as part of a competitive bidding process. If this is the case, the ToR should provide instructions regarding the proposal format, content, and submission process.*
- 11. Additional References or Resources:** *A high-quality evaluation will draw on existing knowledge regarding relevant previous and ongoing studies and programme experiences. To the extent possible, the ToR should identify useful information sources for the evaluator to better ensure that this body of knowledge is taken up in planning and conducting the evaluation.*

It is envisaged that the external expert will perform monitoring online (through ELEVATE web page) and on-site (by some of relevant meetings). Monitoring results will be presented in the form of External Monitoring Report (as provided in **Annex G**). This will include any corrective measures recommended.

5. Partners' technical and financial reporting

The main guidelines for the reporting are laid out in the Manual for contractual and financial management, which was distributed among the partners during the 1st Consortium meeting. Project Supporting Team (PST) team and Coordinator will continuously monitor the partners' reporting and check the supporting documents uploaded on the ELEVATE webpage in section Reporting, not only at the end of the reporting period but continuously during the whole year.

As it is defined in Partnership Agreement and Manual for Contractual and Financial Management, there will be three annual reports of the partners. They will be reviewed by PST team and approved by the Coordinator, taking into consideration following assessment criteria:

- ✚ Conformity of the expenditures with the budget of the project;
- ✚ Eligibility of the expenditures;
- ✚ Correct use of the procurement procedures, whenever required;
- ✚ Correctness and completeness of all supporting documents;
- ✚ Correctness of the calculations and applied exchange rates;
- ✚ That any changes which occurred between budget categories are eligible and justified;
- ✚ All copies of the annual reports must be signed in original by the appointed contact person of partner institution;
- ✚ Expenditures must be in conformity, including full eligibility, with the allocated Budget in the Partnership Agreement.

In case that information in Annual Report are not complete or justified, the PST team will help and make recommendations on how this situation can be rectified prior to the final approval of the Annual report by the Coordinator. The Report approved in this way is the basis for the transfer of next instalment to the partner institution.

ANNEXES

Different supporting documents have been elaborated for the overall enhancement of the project Monitoring and Evaluation manual.

Annex A

Quality Assurance Check List for deliverables / activities

Annex A to Monitoring and Evaluation Manual: Quality Assurance Check List for deliverables				
Author(s) responsible for Deliverable: _____ WP leader: _____ QAPT reviewer: _____				
Assurance point	Issues to be addressed	Assessment	Comments	Recommendations
1. Compliance with the objectives of ELEVATE	Does the deliverable comply with the overall objectives of the project?	YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> PARTIALLY <input type="checkbox"/>		
2. Compliance with the specific objectives of the work package	Does the deliverable comply with the WP Objectives as specified in the WP description?	YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> PARTIALLY <input type="checkbox"/>		
3. Correspondence with the description of work of the relevant activity	Does the deliverable correspond with the activity description as specified in the Application Form?	YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> PARTIALLY <input type="checkbox"/>		
4. Compliance with the deliverables format	Is the deliverable presented using the Project's deliverable format – Annex B?	YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		
5. Adequacy of complementary information	Examples of complementary info: - External sources used - Bibliography - List of contacts - Methodology used	YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		

Annex B

Word Template for project document Deliverables



TITLE OF DELIVERABLE: Subtitle

Project Acronym:	ELEVATE
Project full title:	ELEVATING THE INTERNATIONALISATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN MOLDOVA
Project No:	573921-EPP-1-2016-1-MD-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP
Funding Scheme:	ERASMUS+
Coordinator:	ASEM – Academy of Economic Studies of Moldova
Project start date:	October 15, 2016
Project duration:	36 months

DOCUMENT CONTROL SHEET (Use Style ELEVATE_Header)

Title of Document:	Title of Deliverable/Report/Document
Work Package:	WPx – Title of WP
Last version date:	Day/Month/Year
Status :	Draft/Final
Document Version:	v.04
File Name	Title of Deliverable_ELEVATE_v.0.4.doc
Number of Pages	??
Dissemination Level	Institutional/National/International (select one option)I

VERSIONING AND CONTRIBUTION HISTORY

Version	Date	Revision Description	Partner responsible
v.01	xx/xx/xxxx	First draft version	Org. abbrev. (Name 1; Name 2, etc)
v.02			
v.03			
v.04			
v.			
v.			

TABLE OF CONTENT

DOCUMENT CONTROL SHEET (USE STYLE ELEVATE_HEADER)	2
VERSIONING AND CONTRIBUTION HISTORY	2
TABLE OF CONTENT	3
TABLES	4
FIGURES	4
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	4
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
1. ELEVATE HEADER 1_New	5
2. ELEVATE HEADER 1_New	5
2.1. ELEVATE Header 2 New	5
2.2. ELEVATE Header 2 New	5
2.2.1. <i>ELEVATE Header 3_New</i>	5
2.2.2. <i>ELEVATE Header 3_New</i>	5
2.3. ELEVATE Table	5
3. ELEVATE FIGURES	6
4. CONCLUSION	6
REFERENCES	6
ANNEXES	6
Annex A Use style Annexes	6
Annex B Use style Annexes	6
Annex C Use style Annexes	6

TABLES

Table 1: ELEVATE Overview	5
--	----------

FIGURES

Figure 1: ELEVATE Logo	6
-------------------------------------	----------

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Text, text, text, text, Text, text, text, text, Text, text, text, text, Text, text, text, text,
Text, text, text, text, Text, text, text, text, Text, text, text, text (**USE Style ELEVATE
Body Text – Arial, 12; 1,5; Block**)
Ps. British English!

ELEVATE Header 1_New

Text, text, text, text, Text, text, text, text, Text, text, text, text, Text, text, text, text,
Text, text, text, text, Text, text, text, text, Text, text, text, text (USE Style ELEVATE
Body Text – Arial, 12; 1,5; Block)
Ps. British English!

1. ELEVATE Header 1_New

1.1. ELEVATE Header 2 New

1.2. ELEVATE Header 2 New

Text, text, text, text, Text, text, text, text, Text, text, text, text, Text, text, text, text,
Text, text, text, text, Text, text, text, text, Text, text, text, text (USE Style ELEVATE
Body Text – Arial, 12; 1,5; Block)

1.2.1. *ELEVATE Header 3_New*

1.2.2. *ELEVATE Header 3_New*

1.3. ELEVATE Table

Table 1: ELEVATE Overview

Version	Date	Author/Editor	Description/Comments
v.01	xx/xx/xxxx		
v.02			
v.03			
v.04			

Source 1: Ministry of Education

2. ELEVATE Figures

Figure 1: ELEVATE Logo

Source 2: ELEVATE

3. Conclusion

REFERENCES

ANNEXES

Annex A **Use style Annexes**
Annex B **Use style Annexes**
Annex C **Use style Annexes**

Annex C

PowerPoint Template for project presentations



The template can be download from the project`s web page www.elevate-project.md (CONSORTIUM SPACE tag).

Annex D

Attendance Sheet Template for different meetings / events



ATTENDANCE LIST

Project Acronym:	ELEVATE
Project full title:	ELEVATING THE INTERNATIONALISATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN MOLDOVA
Project No:	573921-EPP-1-2016-1-MD-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP
Funding Scheme:	ERASMUS+
Coordinator:	ASEM – Academy of Economic Studies of Moldova
Project start date:	October 15, 2016
Project duration:	36 months

Event:	
Work package:	
Period:	
Venue:	
Organiser:	

	NAME	ORGANISATION	SIGNATURE
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.			
9.			
10.			
11.			
12.			
13.			
14.			
15.			
16.			
17.			
18.			
19.			
20.			
21.			
22.			
23.			
24.			
25.			
26.			
27.			
28.			
29.			
30.			
31.			
32.			
33.			
34.			
35.			
36.			
37.			
38.			
39.			
40.			

The template can be download from the project`s web page www.elevate-project.md (CONSORTIUM SPACE tag).

Annex E

Word Template for Minutes of different meetings / events



MINUTES: Event Title – Date – Venue

Project Acronym:	ELEVATE
Project full title:	ELEVATING THE INTERNATIONALISATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN MOLDOVA
Project No:	573921-EPP-1-2016-1-MD-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP
Funding Scheme:	ERASMUS+
Coordinator:	ASEM – Academy of Economic Studies of Moldova
Project start date:	October 15, 2016
Project duration:	36 months

VERSIONING AND CONTRIBUTION HISTORY

Version	Date	Revision Description	Partner responsible
v.01	xx/xx/xxxx	First draft version	Org. abbrev. (Name 1; Name 2, etc)
v.02			
v.03			
v.04			

TABLE OF CONTENT

VERSIONING AND CONTRIBUTION HISTORY	2
TABLE OF CONTENT	3
TABLES	4
FIGURES	4
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	4
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
1. ELEVATE HEADER 1_NEW	5
1.1. ELEVATE Header 2 New	5
1.2. ELEVATE Header 2 New	5
1.2.1. <i>ELEVATE Header 3_New</i>	5
1.2.2. <i>ELEVATE Header 3_New</i>	5
1.3. ELEVATE Table	5
2. ELEVATE FIGURES	6
3. CONCLUSION	6
REFERENCES	6
ANNEXES	6
Annex A Use style Annexes	6
Annex B Use style Annexes	6
Annex C Use style Annexes	6

TABLES

Table 1: ELEVATE Overview	5
--	----------

FIGURES

Figure 1: ELEVATE Logo	6
-------------------------------------	----------

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Text, text, text, text, Text, text, text, text, Text, text, text, text, Text, text, text, text,
Text, text, text, text, Text, text, text, text, Text, text, text, text (**USE Style ELEVATE**

Body Text – Arial, 12; 1,5; Block)

Ps. British English!

ELEVATE Header 1_New

Text, text, text, text, Text, text, text, text, Text, text, text, text, Text, text, text, text,
Text, text, text, text, Text, text, text, text, Text, text, text, text (USE Style ELEVATE
Body Text – Arial, 12; 1,5; Block)
Ps. British English!

1. ELEVATE Header 1_New

1.1. ELEVATE Header 2 New

1.2. ELEVATE Header 2 New

Text, text, text, text, Text, text, text, text, Text, text, text, text, Text, text, text, text,
Text, text, text, text, Text, text, text, text, Text, text, text, text (USE Style ELEVATE
Body Text – Arial, 12; 1,5; Block)

1.2.1. *ELEVATE Header 3_New*

1.2.2. *ELEVATE Header 3_New*

1.3. ELEVATE Table

Table 1: ELEVATE Overview

Version	Date	Author/Editor	Description/Comments
v.01	xx/xx/xxxx		
v.02			
v.03			
v.04			

Source 1: Ministry of Education

2. ELEVATE Figures

Figure 1: ELEVATE Logo

Source 2: ELEVATE

3. Conclusion

REFERENCES

ANNEXES

Annex A **Use style Annexes**
Annex B **Use style Annexes**
Annex C **Use style Annexes**

The template can be download from the project`s web page www.elevate-project.md (CONSORTIUM SPACE tag).

Annex F

Participant Feedback Form Template for different meetings /events

Dear Participant,

Thank you for attending this event/workshop/infoday etc..In our effort to improve the organisation and the impact of these events we invite you to complete the following questionnaire. In most of the questions you will be asked to rate your satisfaction on a scale by ticking the appropriate answer. In some of the questions you will be asked to describe your personal opinion in a few words and to give suggestions for future improvements of the content and overall organisation of the event/workshop/infoday etc..

We appreciate your valuable contribution and we thank you in advance!

1. General information

- a) **Sex (Please tick the appropriate number):** **Female** **Male**
- b) **Your Age** _____
- c) **Country** _____
- d) **What is your present professional position?** _____

2. OVERALL FEEDBACK

- a) **Overall, how satisfied were you with:**

	Most satisfied	Satisfied	Moderately satisfied	Rather satisfied	Not at all satisfied
The event administration	1	2	3	4	5
The structure of the programme	1	2	3	4	5
The venue and facilities	1	2	3	4	5
The presentations	1	2	3	4	5
The discussions	1	2	3	4	5
The event dinner and subsistence	1	2	3	4	5

- b) **Please indicate your agreement with the following statements by ticking the appropriate number:**

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
The information I got will be of immediate use to me.	1	2	3	4	5
This event covered to a very high extent the topics I have expected.	1	2	3	4	5
I enjoyed the cooperation and interaction with the other participants.	1	2	3	4	5
My expectations about this event were met or exceeded.	1	2	3	4	5
The materials distributed are useful and informative.	1	2	3	4	5

Event: xxxxxxxx • Venue: xxxxxx • Date: xxxxxx • Partner responsible: xxxxx • Contact email adr.: xxxxxxxx

The discussions were relevant for the participants.	1	2	3	4	5
The methods of working were suitable for the topics and for the participants.	1	2	3	4	5
The overall organisation was professional.	1	2	3	4	5
The time management was always to my fullest satisfaction.	1	2	3	4	5
The style and level of communication between organisers and participants was professional.	1	2	3	4	5
I would recommend this kind of event to my colleagues.	1	2	3	4	5

3. STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE EVENT

a) **Have you participated in similar events before?** Yes No

b) **Please illustrate any strengths of the event and contributions or activities you enjoyed:** _____

c) **Please indicate how you think the event could have been improved:**

d) **Any further comments?**

In case you are interested to receive ELEVATE news – please complete and sign your consent

Name	
Email	
Date	
Signature	

WE THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION

Event: xxxxxxxx • Venue: xxxxxx • Date: xxxxxx • Partner responsible: xxxxx • Contact email adr.: xxxxxxxx

The template can be download from the project's web page www.elevate-project.md (CONSORTIUM SPACE tag).

Annex G

External Monitoring Report



ANNEX G: External Monitoring Report (no.; date)

Project Acronym:	ELEVATE
Project full title:	ELEVATING THE INTERNATIONALISATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN MOLDOVA
Project No:	573921-EPP-1-2016-1-MD-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP
Funding Scheme:	ERASMUS+
Coordinator:	ASEM – Academy of Economic Studies of Moldova
Project start date:	October 15, 2016
Project duration:	36 months

Number of project		573921-EPP-1-2016-1-MD-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP	
Visit completed by		Signature	
1. Project partner information			
1.1. Name			
2. Visit information			
2.1. Location of visit (country, street, number)			
2.2. Date of visit			
2.3. Contact person	Name	Position	
3. Summary of progress to date			
3.1. Summarize progress of activities against the implementation schedule			
3.2. Summarize progress against specific objective indicators from the logical framework matrix			
3.3. Is there a risk that the project will fail to meet its key indicators? (if yes, please describe what corrective actions can be taken)			
3.4. Is there a risk that the Project partner will not be able to spend all the money according to the Partner budget table?			

4. Description and status of the activities within project workplan

Generally, is the project proceeding in accordance with the workplan?
Specifically, which activities have not taken place which should have according to the workplan?
What is the level of risk of the project not being completed on time or to the intended standard?

5. Progress against indicators

Outputs/outcomes	Indicator	Achieved to date	Plan to achieve indicator
DEV1	1.		
	2.		
	3.		
DEV2	1.		
	2.		
	3.		
DEV3	1.		
	2.		
	3.		
DEV4	1.		
	2.		
	3.		
QPLN	1.		

DISS	1.		
	2.		
	3.		
EXP	1.		
	2.		
	3.		
MNGT	1.		
	2.		
	3.		
6. Finance			
6.1. Is the Project partner obtaining all necessary supporting documentation and storing this properly? If not, what action will the Project partner take to rectify the solution?			
6.2. Is the Project partner experiencing any problems in terms of cash flow? This includes any problems caused by delays with payment from the ASEM?			
6.3. Are any underspends or overspends anticipated? For overspends, what is the solution to keep within Partner budget table? For underspends, are there proposals for how this can be used?			
6.4. Other			

7. Main problems encountered and recommendations			
Related to	Description of problem	Project partner Solution/s and/or recommendation/s	
Procurement/installation			
Development of strategic documents			
Implementation of strategies			
Delivery of trainings and services			
Marketing/public relations			
Technical and financial reporting			
Relations with Project coordinator, PST and QAPT team			
Other			
Report received by the Project partner			
I confirm that I have received and read the monitoring report			
Name		Date	
Scheduled date of next visit			
Personnel to be present from the Project partner			
1.			
2.			
3.			

The template can be download from the project`s web page www.elevate-project.md (CONSORTIUM SPACE tag).

Annex H

Event Report Template for different meetings / events

EVENT REPORT TEMPLATE (Annex H to Quality Control and Monitoring Manual)

Author:	
Event Title:	
Event Date:	
Event Venue:	
Type of event: (National, international, press conference, promotional event etc.)	
Short description:	
Organiser(s):	
Agenda:	Link to the agenda
Total number of participants:	
Links to further information:	ex. ELEVATE website
Other personal remarks:	
<p>Here you can include the information such:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Presentation of Elevate at the event? ▪ What was the subject of your presentation? ▪ Were you invited to present Elevate or you have registered for the event by yourself? ▪ Were Elevate promotional materials presented at this conference/event/meeting etc. ▪ Elevate Stand? ▪ Etc. 	

1. Event Organisation Details

Invitation was sent off to participants on:	
Information Material was sent off to participants on:	
Date of Initial Participant List Compilation:	
Date of Final Participant List Compilation:	
Total Number of Participants Invited	
Date of Agenda Finalisation:	
???	
???	

2. Problems encountered during the event preparation phase

(To be filled by organisers)

Organisers: *Please complete (if you have not met with any problems in that phase, please fill in "N/A". Please also include any feedback by the participants **before** the workshop)*

- 1)
- 2)

3. Event Rollout

Some general information (to be filled by organisers)

3.1. Final Event Agenda + Participant list

Please attach the final event agenda and the list of participants

3.2. Event Implementation – Commentary by Organising Partners

WP-leader
<i>Please add your comments, if any</i>
Task leader
<i>Please add your comments, if any</i>

4. Event Evaluation by Participants

4.1. Summary of the Participant Feedback Form

Results to be filled by organisers based on the questionnaire results. Please note: insert only the overall percentage of all feedback forms received (e.g. participants total number=30; 15 of them were most satisfied and 15 of them satisfied . please include 50% in the column most satisfied and 50% in the column satisfied.)

	Most satisfied	Satisfied	Moderately satisfied	Rather disatisfied	Not at all satisfied
The event administration					
The structure of the programme					
The venue and facilities					
The presentations					
The discussions					
The event dinner and subsistence					

The overall organisation was professional.					
The time management was always to my fullest satisfaction.					
The style and level of communication between organisers and participants was professional.					
I would recommend this kind of event to my colleagues.					

Prior Experience of Similar Events -- Overall %	Please fill in the overall percentage of participants with prior experience of similar events
--	---

Strengths and limitations of the event: please include comments received

Strengths of the event and contributions or activities enjoyed by participants:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • XX • XX
Suggestions for the improvement:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • XX • XX
Any further comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • XX • XX

4.2. Additional comments

to be filled by local partner

Please add the following additional information here

- ☐ *Charts of the statistical figures from the tables above (pie or bar charts);*
- ☐ *Any further comments concerning the feedback you received by the workshop participants*

5. Lessons learned

(Please fill in using bulleted text, e.g.

- ☐ *A*
- ☐ *B*
- ☐ *C etc.)*

6. Additional comments

May be filled by any of the organising partners

Please add in any other comments concerning the preparation and organisation of this event:

The template can be download from the project`s web page www.elevate-project.md (CONSORTIUM SPACE tag).

Annex I

Risk Management: Monitoring Sheet

The **Risks Monitoring sheet** in ELEVATE should also be updated after each Strategic Steering Committee Meeting organized (Risk brainstorming).

(Note: one sheet including all Risks identified by partners or during the brainstorming)

Risk title: (put here only a few key words)		
Description of Risk	Probability: (low; medium; high) Impact: (low; medium; high)	Remarks if needed
Preventive Action	Describe here what has to be taken into consideration to avoid that a risk occurs, what risks can remain and what resources will be needed if action will be started	Remarks if needed
Corrective Action	Describe what can be/has been done to decrease the severity and what resources (PM, costs) will be needed	Remarks if needed
Decisions in ELEVATE: (put here only a few words on decisions taken by project, WP leader or other to introduce preventive or corrective actions)		

The template can be download from the project`s web page www.elevate-project.md (CONSORTIUM SPACE tag).