



With the support of the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union



promoting research and innovation environment  
in the Libyan higher Education System  
(IBTIKAR)  
Erasmus+

KA 2 – Capacity Building in the field of Higher Education

**Q&E Evaluation Plan**  
**EXTERNAL EVALUATION**

AUTHOR

**Paolo Degasperi**  
External Evaluator

~ December 2021 ~

*This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This communication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.*

## DOCUMENT DETAILS

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| <b>Project title</b>   | IBTIKAR<br>promotIng research and innovaTion<br>environment in the libyAn higher Education<br>System |
| <b>Project Number</b>  | 618491-EPP-1-2020-1-IT-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP  |
| <b>Programme</b>       | Erasmus+/ KA 2 – KA 2 – Capacity Building<br>in the field of Higher Education                        |
| <b>Duration</b>        | 36 months  |
| <b>Author</b>          | Paolo Degasperi ( <i>External Evaluator</i> )  |
| <b>Deliverable</b>     | D 6.1  |
| <b>Workpackage</b>     | WP 6   |
| <b>Leading Partner</b> | UoB  |
| <b>Contributors</b>    | none   |
| <b>Visibility</b>      | Restricted to the partners   |
| <b>Version</b>         | Final  |
| <b>Date</b>            | 12/2021  |



## DOCUMENT INDEX

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>IBTIKAR IN A NUTSHELL</b>                         | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>EXTERNAL EVALUATION ACTIVITIES/DELIVERABLES</b>   | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>ATTACHMENT 1 - PROJECT MEETINGS QUESTIONNAIRE</b> | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>ATTACHMENT 2 - COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE</b>      | <b>13</b> |
| <b>ATTACHMENT 3 - PARTNERS QUESTIONNAIRE</b>         | <b>16</b> |

## IBTIKAR in a nutshell

IBTIKAR aims at increasing the production of joint high-quality research through a new class of thinkers able to cope with the local and global challenges, solving community problems and impacting on the socio-economic growth in Libya.

IBTIKAR project will deploy different research methodologies based on participative, collaborative and tailored approaches in which the knowledge is built thanks to different techniques useful to develop training and capacity building actions for the Libyan Universities:

- A vertical CB action (ToT) where EU train Libyan Partners on the basic skills required to run research on the basis of the designed model.
- A horizontal CB action, where Libyan Academic and Administrative staff from the more advanced Libyan Universities train the staff from other Libyan Universities.

Libyan administrative and academic staff will be able to share with their counterparts not only the knowledge acquired but also their experience in managing and implementing research activities in the Libyan context. In fact, by training academic and administrative staff, each University can guarantee a high level of performance and efficiency, together with a high-quality standard of teaching and learning, on a long-term basis. Libyan research centres will be equipped and properly refurbished from both technological and human resources point of view.

Finally, IBTIKAR foresees the definition of a White Paper aiming at bringing the attention of decision-makers on the definition of a Libya National Research Agenda, which will support specialization strategies within universities, enforcing existing research centres and research units, supporting universities in research management and training in specific field of knowledge, as well as setting up proper infrastructure..

|                      |   |
|----------------------|---|
| <b>DURATION</b>      | 15/01/2020– 14/01/2024 (3 years)  |
| <b>OBJECTIVES</b>    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SO1: To enhance the research capabilities of Libyan HEIs by increasing the competencies and skills of their academic and administrative staff;</li> <li>- SO 2: To develop the networking among Libyan Academic institutions and with EU HEI's and research centres, so as to maximize the synergies between them and the sharing of knowledge and experiences regarding the scientific research in a stronger connection also with the labour market;</li> <li>- SO 3: To discuss and propose the reform of the national research system</li> </ul> |
| <b>TARGET GROUPS</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least 38 Academic Professors at LY Universities</li> <li>- At least 37 Administrative staff at LY Universities</li> <li>- Up to 10 Research facilities at LY Universities premises upgraded</li> </ul>  |

|                                    |  |
|------------------------------------|--|
| <p><b>PROJECT DELIVERABLES</b></p> | <p>WP1: Synergies creation: best practices and lessons learnt</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D1.1 Update of Need Analysis</li> <li>• D1.2 Online catalogue of Inspiring Practices and lessons learnt</li> <li>• D1.3 Report of on-site visits</li> </ul> <p>WP2 Definition of an Action Plan and institutional research agenda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D2.1 Action Plan validated</li> <li>• D2.2 Institutional research agenda set per each Libyan partner</li> <li>• D2.3 White Paper</li> </ul> <p>WP3 Vertical capacity building action: from Europe to Libya</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D3.1 Horizontal skills training for all performed</li> <li>• D3.2 Advanced Thematic skills training for Academic staff report</li> <li>• D3.3 Advanced Thematic skills training for Academic staff report</li> </ul> <p>WP4 Implementation and monitoring of specific research actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D4.1 Horizontal capacity building action: from Libya to Libya</li> <li>• D4.2 Administrative training from Libyan to Libyan report</li> </ul> <p>WP5: Research activities piloting phase</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D5.1: Libyan universities start their research activities</li> <li>• D5.2: Title Report on Libya renovated research activities</li> </ul> <p>WP6 Quality plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D6.1 Quality and Evaluation Plan</li> <li>• D6.2 Mid-Term evaluation report</li> <li>• D6.3: Final evaluation report</li> </ul> <p>WP7 Dissemination and exploitation of results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D7.1 Dissemination Plan</li> <li>• D7.2 IBTIKAR WEB Site</li> <li>• D7.3 IBTIKAR dissemination materials</li> <li>• D7.4 Exploitation and sustainability plan</li> <li>• D7.5. Report on the Final conference</li> </ul> <p>WP8 Project management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D8.1 Project Management Handbook</li> <li>• D8.2 1st management report</li> <li>• D8.3 2nd management report</li> <li>• D8.4 3rd management report</li> <li>• D8.5 4th management report</li> <li>• D8.6 5th management report</li> <li>• D8.7 6th management report</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>OFFICIAL PARTNERS</b></p>    | <p>UNIMED, Unione delle Università del Mediterraneo (Lead Contractor)</p>  |



|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
|                   | I BOUN, Boğaziçi University<br>UNILE, Università del Salento<br>UTAD, University of Trás-os-Montes and Alto Douro<br>UoT, University of Tripoli<br>UoB, University of Benghazi<br>MU, Misurata University<br>SeU, Sebha University<br>SU, Sirte University<br>ZU, University of Zawia<br>EMU, University of El Merghib<br>AIU, Al Asmariya Islamic University<br>BWU, Bani Waleed University<br>UoA, The University of Ajdabiya |
| <b>ASSOCIATED</b> | LIMU, Libyan International Medical University   |

## EXTERNAL EVALUATION activities/deliverables

Aim of the external evaluation activity will be performed in order to raise the quality of the project management process and project results.

The external evaluator main activities are concerning with:

| OBJECT OF THE EVALUATION   | ACTIVITIES/DELIVERABLES   | TOOLS  |
|--|---|--|
| <p>Monitoring and evaluating the Project Meetings</p> <p><i>Seven (in presence) project meetings are planned:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Kick off meeting Rome</b> Leading Organisation: <b>UNIMED</b> (Starting Period 01-2021).</li> <li>2. <b>2nd International Project Meeting Tripoli.</b> Leading Organisation: <b>UoT</b> (Starting Period 06-2021).</li> <li>3. <b>3rd International Project Meeting Lecce.</b> Leading Organisation: <b>UNISAL</b> (Starting Period 01-2022).</li> <li>4. <b>4th International Project Meeting Misurata.</b> Leading Organisation: <b>MU</b> (Starting Period 05-2022).</li> <li>5. <b>5th International Project Meeting Istanbul.</b> Leading Organisation: <b>BU</b> (Starting Period 12-2022).</li> <li>6. <b>6th International Project Meeting Zawia</b> Leading Organisation: <b>ZU</b> (Starting Period 06-2023).</li> <li>7. <b>Final International Project Meeting Brussel</b> Leading Organisation: <b>UNIMED</b> (Starting Period 12-2023)</li> </ol> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Drafting the questionnaires (<i>Attachment 1</i>)</li> <li>- Analyzing the results</li> <li>- Producing a report, for each meeting, with suggestions for improvement.</li> </ul> <p>DELIVERABLES PLANNED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Seven report</li> <li>- Deliverables date: 02/21; 07/21; 02/22; 06/22; 01/23; 07/23; 01/24. Scheduled delivery dates may vary due to possible changes in meeting dates.</li> </ul> | <p>Online questionnaires</p>   |
| <p>Monitoring and evaluating the Project Management process including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• quality of the management, intellectual output leaderships, effectiveness of communication</li> <li>• coherence between work plan/timeline and activities carried out</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Drafting questionnaires (<i>Attachment 2 and 3</i>) for the coordinator and for the partners</li> <li>- Analyzing the results</li> <li>- Producing a report, every 6 months, with suggestions for improvement.</li> </ul> <p>DELIVERABLES PLANNED</p>  | <p>Online questionnaires</p> <p>Phone calls or emails may also be used with the aim of investigating certain aspects</p> |

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>effectiveness and impact of dissemination/exploitation activities</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Five report planned</li> <li>Deliverables date: 10/21; 04/22; 10/22; 06/23; 01/24. Scheduled delivery dates may vary due to possible delays in data collections</li> </ul>  | <p>Regular online meetings with the internal Q&amp;E team</p> |
| <p>Contributing for evaluating the IOs quality made by Q&amp;E Team</p>   | <p>Participation/contribution in the Q&amp;E team meeting's devoted to define quality indicators dealing with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Training of Trainers; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Effectiveness of trainers training</i></li> <li><i>Perceived relevance</i></li> <li><i>Perceived learning</i></li> <li><i>Perceived usefulness</i></li> <li><i>Active participation</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>Field Visits <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Perceived relevance</i></li> <li><i>Perceived usefulness</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>Workshops and Seminars <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Perceived relevance</i></li> <li><i>Perceived learning</i></li> <li><i>Perceived usefulness</i></li> <li><i>Active participation</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>Impact in the overall objectives addressed by the project, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Changes in involved higher education institutions;</i></li> <li><i>Changes in higher education system (improved procedures and processes to deal with new learning offer and increased relationships with other educational institutions);</i></li> <li><i>Changes at regional/national level (improved dialogue between university and enterprises, and other public and private stakeholders).</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <p>Not applicable</p>   |



## Attachment 1 - Project Meetings questionnaire

### Meeting Questionnaire

The following 18 questions and related requests for further details, comments and suggestions, aim at collecting feedback from the attendees of the meeting and verifying attendee satisfaction concerning organization of the meeting, communication among the partnership, networking and achievements of results at three different stages: pre-meeting, during the meeting, and post-meeting.

In order to pursue this aim, the questions are subdivided into 6 groups:

1. Organization of the meeting;
2. Agenda of the meeting;
3. Meeting implementation;
4. Meeting building partnership activities;
5. Post-meeting feedback;
6. Overall communication.

Almost all questions are closed, but some were left open to let the attendees express suggestions and comments.

### Legend

**C**-> Closed Questions    **A**-> Open Questions    **O**-> Mandatory

The scale adopted to measure and analyze the closed question is:

- 1 = "Not at all";
- 2 = "To a small degree";
- 3 = "To a large degree";
- 4 = "Completely".

### Questions

#### 1. Organization of the meeting

|  |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| <b>CO</b> - Did you encounter any problems with the scheduling of the meeting? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| <b>A</b> - If yes, please, detail:   |   |   |   |   |

|  |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| <b>CO</b> – If you are a WP leader - did you consider the pre-meeting useful for the KO meeting preparation?   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| A - Please, detail:  |   |   |   |   |
| <b>CO</b> - Did you receive all the documents (application form, agenda, etc.) in advance, in order to be informed for and be ready to take part to the meeting? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| A - Please, detail:  |   |   |   |   |

## 2. Agenda of the meeting

|  |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| <b>CO</b> - Do you deem the meeting agenda to be consistent with the project activities?     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| A - Please, detail:  |   |   |   |   |
| <b>CO</b> – Was the agenda shared in advance?  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| <b>CO</b> – Did you contribute to the preparation of the agenda?                             | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| A – If you would have been more active in this phase, please, detail:                        |   |   |   |   |
| A - Please, add any further details, comments, suggestions or any changes you would propose. |   |   |   |   |

## 3. Meeting implementation

|   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| <b>CO</b> - Do you think the meeting activities (interactive sessions and project WPs discussion) were well-balanced? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| A - If not, please, detail:   |   |   |   |   |
| <b>CO</b> – Did the meeting adhere to the agenda?   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| A - If not, please, detail:   |   |   |   |   |

|   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| <b>CO</b> - Are you satisfied with the meeting contents?  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| <b>A</b> - If not, please, detail:  |   |   |   |   |
| <b>CO</b> - Have the different projects activities and WPs been clearly detailed and discussed? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| <b>A</b> - If not, please, detail:  |   |   |   |   |

#### 4. Building partnership /networking activities

|   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| <b>CO</b> - Was the online platform easy to use?  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| <b>A</b> - If not, please, detail ...   |   |   |   |   |
| <b>CO</b> - Are you satisfied with the networking sessions? (Do you consider them useful?)          | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| <b>A</b> - If not, please, detail:  |   |   |   |   |
| <b>CO</b> - To what extent have participants contributed to the discussion and decision making?     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| <b>A</b> - Please, add any further details, comments, suggestions or any changes you would propose. |   |   |   |   |
| <b>A</b> - Please, add any further details, comments, suggestions or any changes you would propose. |   |   |   |   |

#### 5. Post-meeting feedback

|  |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| <b>CO</b> - Do you think the goals of the meeting have been met?           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| <b>A</b> - If not, please, detail ...                                      |   |   |   |   |
| <b>CO</b> - Are you satisfied with the meeting outcomes and further plans? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| <b>A</b> - If not, please, detail ...                                      |   |   |   |   |
| <b>CO</b> - Do you suggest any changes for the future activities?          | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

|  |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|
|  |   |   |   |   |
| A - If not, please, detail ...   |   |   |   |   |
| CO – Is the meeting minute well detailed ?   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| A - If not, please, detail ...   |   |   |   |   |
| A - Please, add any further details, comments, suggestions or any changes you would propose. |   |   |   |   |

## 6. Overall communication

|  |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| CO - Was the communication with the coordinator and the partners easy?                       | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| A - If not, please, detail ...   |   |   |   |   |
| A - Please, add any further details, comments, suggestions or any changes you would propose. |   |   |   |   |

## Attachment 2 - Coordinator questionnaire

Almost all questions are closed, but some were left open to let the attendees express suggestions and comments.

Legend:

C= Closed

A= Open

O= Mandatory

The scale adopted to measure and analyze some answers is:

1 = "Not at all"

2 = "To a small degree"

3 = "To a large degree"

4 = "Completely"

### QUESTIONS:

1. **CO** Are the project activities in line with the scheduled timeframe?

1 = "Not at all"

2 = "To a small degree"

3 = "To a large degree"

4 = "Completely"

A - Please explain...

2. **CO** According to the project timeframe, are there any deliverables (Update of Need Analysis/Online Catalogue of Inspiring Practices and lessons learnt/Report of on site visits) that have not been produced/achieved yet?

1 = "Not at all"

2 = "To a small degree"

3 = "To a large degree"

4 = "Completely"

A - Please explain...

3. **CO** Were the deadlines provided for the implementation of the activities and production of the deliverables respected by all partners?

1 = "Not at all"

2 = "To a small degree"

3 = "To a large degree"

4 = "Completely"

A - Please explain...

4. **CO** Are you satisfied with the quality of project activities implemented and deliverables produced so far?

- 1 = "Not at all"
- 2 = "To a small degree"
- 3 = "To a large degree"
- 4 = "Completely"
- A - Please explain...

5.CO Do you deem the project activities workload to have been correctly distributed amongst partners?

- 1 = "Not at all"
- 2 = "To a small degree"
- 3 = "To a large degree"
- 4 = "Completely"
- A - Please explain...

6.CO Are you satisfied with the engagement of each partner in the implementation of the project activities?

- 1 = "Not at all"
- 2 = "To a small degree"
- 3 = "To a large degree"
- 4 = "Completely"
- A - Please explain...

7.CO Was it necessary to rectify any project activity?

- 1 = "Not at all"
- 2 = "To a small degree"
- 3 = "To a large degree"
- 4 = "Completely"
- A - If so, please, detail your answer.

8.CO Would you change/substitute any of the main project activities so far?

- 1 = "Not at all"
- 2 = "To a small degree"
- 3 = "To a large degree"
- 4 = "Completely"
- A - Please explain...

9.CO Is the IBTIKAR website developing according to the project schedule?

- 1 = "Not at all"
- 2 = "To a small degree"
- 3 = "To a large degree"
- 4 = "Completely"
- A - Please explain...

10.CO Is the IBTIKAR Dissemination Plan developing according to the project schedule?

- 1 = "Not at all"
- 2 = "To a small degree"
- 3 = "To a large degree"
- 4 = "Completely"
- A - Please explain...

11.CO Are the IBTIKAR Dissemination Materials developing according to the project schedule?

1 = “Not at all”

2 = “To a small degree”

3 = “To a large degree”

4 = “Completely”

A - Please explain...

12.CO Is the IBTIKAR Exploitation and Sustainability Plan developing according to the project schedule?

1 = “Not at all”

2 = “To a small degree”

3 = “To a large degree”

4 = “Completely”

A - Please explain...

13.AO Did you implement any project dissemination activity so far (on your institutional website, social networks, presentations during conferences, meetings, workshops, distribution of project documents, etc.)?

14.CO Are you satisfied with the dissemination activities carried out so far?

1 = “Not at all”

2 = “To a small degree”

3 = “To a large degree”

4 = “Completely”

A - Please explain...

15.AO Are you planning any specific dissemination activity during the next six months?

16.CO Are you satisfied with the partners’ engagement in the dissemination of the project contents and outcomes/intellectual output?

1 = “Not at all”

2 = “To a small degree”

3 = “To a large degree”

4 = “Completely”

A - Please explain...

17.CO Do you deem the internal monitoring activities carried out so far useful?

1 = “Not at all”

2 = “To a small degree”

3 = “To a large degree”

4 = “Completely”

A - Please explain...

18.AO Do you have any suggestions to improve the partners’ contribution to project activities?

## Attachment 3 - Partners questionnaire

Almost all questions are closed, but some were left open to let the attendees express suggestions and comments.

Legend:

C= Closed

A= Open

O= Mandatory

The scale adopted to measure and analyze the answers is:

1 = "Not at all"

2 = "To a small degree"

3 = "To a large degree"

4 = "Completely"

QUESTIONS:

1. Have you met any difficulties in respecting the project activity deadlines?

1 = "Not at all"

2 = "To a small degree"

3 = "To a large degree"

4 = "Completely"

- Please explain...

2. According to the project timeline, are there any deliverables you were in charge of that you have not produced/achieved yet?

1 = "Not at all"

2 = "To a small degree"

3 = "To a large degree"

4 = "Completely"

- Please explain...

3. Do you deem the project activity deadlines reasonable in terms of the workload?

1 = "Not at all"

2 = "To a small degree"

3 = "To a large degree"

4 = "Completely"

- Please explain...

4. Are you satisfied with the quality of project activities implemented and deliverables produced so far?

1 = "Not at all"

2 = "To a small degree"



3 = “To a large degree”

4 = “Completely”

A - Please explain...

5. CO Is the overall support provided so far by the Project Coordinator adequate to the successful implementation of project activities?

1 = “Not at all”

2 = “To a small degree”

3 = “To a large degree”

4 = “Completely”

A - Please explain...

6.CO Are there any project activities that you would suggest should be reviewed/modified?

(Yes/No)

A - If yes, please, detail...

7. CO Are you satisfied with the IBTIKAR website (IF IS ONLINE) design and contents?

1 = “Not at all”

2 = “To a small degree”

3 = “To a large degree”

4 = “Completely”

A - Please explain...

8. AO Did you implement any project dissemination activities so far (on your institutional website, social networks, presentations during conferences, meetings, workshops, distribution of project documents, etc.)?

A - If yes, please, detail...

9.CO Are you satisfied with the dissemination activities carried out so far?

1 = “Not at all”

2 = “To a small degree”

3 = “To a large degree”

4 = “Completely”

A - Please explain...

10.AO Are you planning any specific dissemination activity during the next six months?

11.CO Are you satisfied with the Project Coordinator’s engagement in the dissemination of the project contents and outcomes?

1 = “Not at all”

2 = “To a small degree”

3 = “To a large degree”

4 = “Completely”

A - Please explain...

12.CO Do you deem the internal monitoring activities carried out so far useful?

1 = “Not at all”

2 = “To a small degree”



With the support of the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union



3 = “To a large degree”

4 = “Completely”

A - Please explain...

13.AO Do you have any suggestions to improve the partners’ contribution to the project activities?