



Task 6.6

FINAL REPORT

Quality surveys are done for 9 events during the whole Project, one of which was made for education.

Total number of quality survey questionnaires is 99.

WP 6: FIRST QUALITY REPORT FOR PERIOD 14/10/2017-31/01/2018

Task leading institution: University EDUCONS Sremska Kamenica

Task person responsible: Professor Mirjana Radovanović, PhD, Ass. Bojana Vasić

Questionary	Average
Logistic preparation and organization of the meeting	4,28
Content of Agenda	4,46
Arrangements of the meeting (venue, equipment, etc.)	4,08
Communication before the meeting	4,15
Duration and timetable of the meeting	3,93
Quality of the materials provided during the meeting	4,32
Quality of presentation	4,42
Communication between the coordinator of the project and the other partners	4,40
Engagements of the participants in the activities and discussions	4,44
Objectives in the Agenda regarding the Impress project are reached	4,34
Mode of reaching the decision at the meeting	4,16



Opportunities to express your opinion and influence discussion	4,65
Achievement of the meeting and project goals	4,45
Discussion of tasks for the upcoming activities and meetings	4,48
Assignment of follow up tasks	4,40

WP 6: SECOND QUALITY REPORT FOR PERIOD 01/02/2018-30/09/2018

Task leading institution: University EDUCONS Sremska Kamenica

Task person responsible: Professor Mirjana Radovanović, PhD

Questionary	Average
Logistic preparation and organization of the meeting	4,47
Content of Agenda	4,52
Arrangements of the meeting (venue, equipment, etc.)	4,71
Communication before the meeting	4,32
Duration and timetable of the meeting	4,45
Quality of the materials provided during the meeting	4,30
Quality of presentation	4,46
Communication between the coordinator of the project and the other partners	4,71
Engagements of the participants in the activities and discussions	4,50
Objectives in the Agenda regarding the Impress project are reached	4,62
Mode of reaching the decision at the meeting	4,33
Opportunities to express your opinion and influence discussion	4,71
Achievement of the meeting and project goals	4,52



Discussion of tasks for the upcoming activities and meetings	4,56
Assignment of follow up tasks	4,50

WP 6: THIRD QUALITY REPORT FOR PERIOD 01/06/2019-31/10/2019

After the change of coordinating institution, quality survey is changed with aim to solve detected problems in Project implementation.

Task leading institution: University EDUCONS Sremska Kamenica

Task person responsible: Professor Mirjana Radovanović, PhD

Questionary	Average
The meeting/workshop objective was clear.	4,85
There was a published schedule with specified goals for each item (for information, for discussion, for action), and assigned time.	4,85
Attendance was useful. There was a valid reason for each participant to take time away from their other responsibilities to attend.	4,90
I was notified in advance of the theme, my part in the meeting/workshop, and what I may be questioned.	4,95
All of the stuff and materials required were available.	4,95
There was a moderator (chairperson) appointed to keep the meeting/workshop on track.	4,85
The meeting/workshop started on a schedule.	4,95
There was a ground rules defined for how the meeting/workshop was to flow.	4,75



The meeting/workshop kept to the schedule and the assigned time for each item and the ground rules were followed.	4,85
There was agreement accomplished.	5,00
Action items were appointed where suitable.	4,95
There was a person appointed to keep minutes.	4,90
Minute book was provided within a sensible period and adequately documented the meeting.	5,00

WP 6: FORTH QUALITY REPORT FOR PERIOD 01/11/2019-30/11/2019

Task leading institution: University EDUCONS Sremska Kamenica

Task person responsible: Professor Mirjana Radovanović, PhD

Questionary	Average
The meeting/workshop objective was clear.	5,00
There was a published schedule with specified goals for each item (for information, for discussion, for action), and assigned time.	5,00
Attendance was useful. There was a valid reason for each participant to take time away from their other responsibilities to attend.	5,00
I was notified in advance of the theme, my part in the meeting/workshop, and what I may be questioned.	5,00
All of the stuff and materials required were available.	4,90
There was a moderator (chairperson) appointed to keep the meeting/workshop on track.	4,90
The meeting/workshop started on a schedule.	4,90
There was a ground rules defined for how the meeting/workshop was to flow.	4,90



The meeting/workshop kept to the schedule and the assigned time for each item and the ground rules were followed.	5,00
There was agreement accomplished.	4,90
Action items were appointed where suitable.	5,00
There was a person appointed to keep minutes.	5,00
Minute book was provided within a sensible period and adequately documented the meeting.	4,90

WP 6: FIFTH QUALITY REPORT FOR PERIOD 01/12/2019-30/12/2019

Task leading institution: University EDUCONS Sremska Kamenica

Task person responsible: Professor Mirjana Radovanović, PhD

Questionary	Average
The meeting/workshop objective was clear.	4,25
There was a published schedule with specified goals for each item (for information, for discussion, for action), and assigned time.	4,25
Attendance was useful. There was a valid reason for each participant to take time away from their other responsibilities to attend.	4,37
I was notified in advance of the theme, my part in the meeting/workshop, and what I may be questioned.	4,12
All of the stuff and materials required were available.	3,75
There was a moderator (chairperson) appointed to keep the meeting/workshop on track.	4,50
The meeting/workshop started on a schedule.	4,37
There was a ground rules defined for how the meeting/workshop was to flow.	3,75



The meeting/workshop kept to the schedule and the assigned time for each item and the ground rules were followed.	3,75
There was agreement accomplished.	3,75
Action items were appointed where suitable.	4,25
There was a person appointed to keep minutes.	4,5
Minute book was provided within a sensible period and adequately documented the meeting.	4,28

WP 6: SIXTH QUALITY REPORT

This report was made for the needs of education of Serbian professors, which was held in Germany in January 2020. This questionnaire was filled out by 8 people - course participants.

Task leading institution: University EDUCONS Sremska Kamenica

Task person responsible: Professor Mirjana Radovanović, PhD

The following questions have been asked to the participants:

- 1. Organization:** How would you characterize the overall course organization?
- 2. Course material:** How would you characterize the course material handed over to you?
- 3. Course presentation:** How would you characterize presentation done by the lecturer?
- 4. General impression:** Please express your general impression about the course and provide comments for improvement if needed.

Criterion	1.Organization	2. Material	3.Presentation	4.Impression
Marks	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent
Percentage	100%	100%	100%	100%
Average				100% of 100%



YEARLY REPORT 2017

Questionary	Average
Logistic preparation and organization of the meeting	4,28
Content of Agenda	4,46
Arrangements of the meeting (venue, equipment, etc.)	4,08
Communication before the meeting	4,15
Duration and timetable of the meeting	3,93
Quality of the materials provided during the meeting	4,32
Quality of presentation	4,42
Communication between the coordinator of the project and the other partners	4,40
Engagements of the participants in the activities and discussions	4,44
Objectives in the Agenda regarding the Impress project are reached	4,34
Mode of reaching the decision at the meeting	4,16
Opportunities to express your opinion and influence discussion	4,65
Achievement of the meeting and project goals	4,45
Discussion of tasks for the upcoming activities and meetings	4,48
Assignment of follow up tasks	4,40



YEARLY REPORT 2018

Questionary	Average
Logistic preparation and organization of the meeting	4,47
Content of Agenda	4,52
Arrangements of the meeting (venue, equipment, etc.)	4,71
Communication before the meeting	4,32
Duration and timetable of the meeting	4,45
Quality of the materials provided during the meeting	4,30
Quality of presentation	4,46
Communication between the coordinator of the project and the other partners	4,71
Engagements of the participants in the activities and discussions	4,50
Objectives in the Agenda regarding the Impress project are reached	4,62
Mode of reaching the decision at the meeting	4,33
Opportunities to express your opinion and influence discussion	4,71
Achievement of the meeting and project goals	4,52
Discussion of tasks for the upcoming activities and meetings	4,56
Assignment of follow up tasks	4,50



YEARLY REPORT 2019

In January 2019, the partners requested a change of coordinator. Questionary have changed.

Questionary	Average
The meeting/workshop objective was clear.	4,74
There was a published schedule with specified goals for each item (for information, for discussion, for action), and assigned time.	4,74
Attendance was useful. There was a valid reason for each participant to take time away from their other responsibilities to attend.	4,79
I was notified in advance of the theme, my part in the meeting/workshop, and what I may be questioned.	4,75
All of the stuff and materials required were available.	4,64
There was a moderator (chairperson) appointed to keep the meeting/workshop on track.	4,77
The meeting/workshop started on a schedule.	4,79
There was a ground rules defined for how the meeting/workshop was to flow.	4,54
The meeting/workshop kept to the schedule and the assigned time for each item and the ground rules were followed.	4,61
There was agreement accomplished.	4,66
Action items were appointed where suitable.	4,79
There was a person appointed to keep minutes.	4,82
Minute book was provided within a sensible period and adequately documented the meeting.	4,79



YEARLY REPORT 2020

According to the project plan, during 2020, there should be teacher education as well as the implementation of courses and materials. The only training that was held was held in Germany in January, with eight participants.

The following questions have been asked to the participants:

5. **Organization:** How would you characterize the overall course organization?
6. **Course material:** How would you characterize the course material handed over to you?
7. **Course presentation:** How would you characterize presentation done by the lecturer?
8. **General impression:** Please express your general impression about the course and provide comments for improvement if needed.

Criterion	1.Organization	2. Material	3.Presentation	4.Impression
Marks	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent
Percentage	100%	100%	100%	100%
			Average	100% of 100%

SUMMARY OF AVAREGE GRADE

Average grade for meetings/workshops.

Yearly report	Average
2017	4,32
2018	4,51
2019	4,72
Average	4,52



Average grade for education.

Criterion	1.Organization	2. Material	3.Presentation	4.Impression
Marks	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent
Percentage	100%	100%	100%	100%
			Average	100% of 100%