MINUTES of MEETING

1st quality monitoring meeting in UPB, Bucharest, Romania, 18th May 2022

List of Participants	
Name	**Partner**
Ali Behravan	USI
Hamidreza Ahmadian	USI
Amin Keshavarzi (online)	PTX
Xiaojun Zeng	UMA
Mohammad Javad Rashti (online)	SCU
Seyed Enayatallah Alavi (online)	SCU
Mehri Mehrjoo (online)	USB
Shahram Mohanna (online)	USB
Reza Ghaemi	IAU
Ehsan Pouladi Borj	IAU
Hossein Ghadami	IAU
Mahdi Bohlouli	IBS
Seyed Ehsan Nedaaee Oskoee	IBS
Farideh Saadati	IBS
Ali Nasser Hilo	UWA
Manaf Kadum Hussein Al-Taleb	UWA
Salim Al-Wasity (online)	UWA
Ali Al-Sayul (online)	USU
Wael Abd Alaziz (online)	USU
Grigore Stamatescu	UPB
Elisabeth Lazarou	UPB
Mihaela Albu	UPB
Lucian Toma	UPB
Mircea Simoiu	UPB

Time: 11:00 – 13:00 CET	Description	T*)	Actionee / Date
1.	**Quality Control Deliverables:** **Year 1** D3.1: Quality control and monitoring plan – completed D3.2: 1st project annual quality monitoring meeting –This is this Romania meeting D3.3: Qualitative and progressive assessment reports – 1st version completed, need to be updated after the completion of D1.4 and D1.5 **Year 2** D3.3: Qualitative and progressive assessment report, due date: M24 D3.4: 2nd project annual quality monitoring meeting, due date: M25 **Year 3** D3.3: Qualitative and progressive assessment report, due date: M36 D3.5: External evaluation reports, due date: M36 During the meeting, the consortium concluded, although the plan for the selection of external evaluators is initially for M36, this is too late because employing the external evaluators is a time-consuming process and the evaluation itself may take some months to provide hundreds of pages report. **Action:** **we need one external evaluator from Iran and one from EU side and we have 7.000 EUR budget for that. USI and IBS will follow up the procedure of selection of external evaluators.** **A call for applications must be prepared which includes bullet-pointed criteria and profile of evaluators including qualifications and duties and expectations. UMA will prepare a draft version of this call and will share to the consortium for feedback. Also, UMA will present these specifications in the next PMB meeting on June 20th 2022.** D3.6: Final project quality assurance report, due date: M36	A	**UMA**

Time: 11:00 – 13:00 CET	Description	T*⁾	Actionee / Date
2.	**Questionnaires:** Various questionnaires have been designed for different people and different purposes to assess the project quality. • For partner self-assessment, questionnaires need to check whether the task/report is completed in time and on budget, any issue or difficulty meets, and any good and weak aspect of the delivery. • For participator (structured) assessments, all participators in the meeting need to fill in the questionnaires, which can provide their views for each completed task/delivery report. • For public session/meeting assessments, the questionnaires will be completed after the public session. The quality control and its measures must be explicitly improved and more professional. **Action:** **Google forms have been designed and used for the analysis of the quality of meetings and activities.**	A	**UMA and all partners**

Time: 11:00 – 13:00 CET	Description	T*)	Actionee / Date
3.	**Current progress and outcomes:** **WP1:** WP1 has been completed. This is an important milestones and paves the way for the smooth start for WP2. D1.5 – Course development plan is currently completed. The overall quality is good which is subject to the feedback from questionnaires. **WP2:** It is just started. **WP3:** D3.1 and 1st version D3.3 have been completed. 1st management and project progress meeting (Iran meeting, D 6.3) between 18-20 Dec 2021 was successfully organized and completed. One of the most important outcomes from the Iran meeting is that the great importance of accreditation has well recognized and great effort toward accreditation currently under the way. **WP4:** WP4 has progressed well overall. D4.1 Dissemination policy and plan has successfully completed. D4.2 Project website has been well designed with the main and available information included. Further D4.4 has completed as well as large part of the D4.5. **WP5:** It is to be started. **WP6:** WP6 has been managed well overall and the monthly meetings are well organized and recorded. D6.1 – D6.4 have well completed. Various difficulties have been overcome, and the project now has come into the shape and progressed more smoothly.	D	**All partners**

Time: 11:00 – 13:00 CET	Description	T*)	Actionee / Date
4.	**Main issues:** 1. The project has progressed behind the schedules due to various difficulties (in particular the delay for Iraq partners to join the project). This has been one of the main issues with the project, but we have been made up the lost time recently. 2. In the original project proposal, task 2 of D3.3 is "Qualitative and progressive self-assessment activities in the frame of (short) reports every six months by the WP3 leaders with the collaboration of all partners. The self-assessment questionnaire has been designed and we will collect such questionnaires in April. 3. For the social objective, the measures for involving vulnerable groups in the project activities are inadequate. Such problem can be solved by distance/blended learning for lower income people and people in the rural areas. In addition, the gender equity issues are not clearly integrated in the project plans. In this case, part-time studies for women with the family responsibilities can be done. 4. In terms of innovative (so a sub-technical objective), according to the European Union (EU) evaluation, the proposed innovative elements seem not convincingly described in the proposal. We can provide: • Innovative course structure such as right combination of research, skill, knowledge, and project management, dependent on the experiences. • Innovative (flexible) delivery of the MSc course such as part-time/professional training, distance/blended learning. • Innovative taught modules such as edge computing. • Innovative materials within a given module such as a case study or mini project to combine different course materials to solve an application problem. 5. In terms of impact and sustainability (so sub-educational objectives), there are several negative comments in EU evaluation. We may need some thinking to address in future. 6. For the cost and budget part in the project proposal, the EU have some negative evaluation feedback: The budget cannot be considered entirely cost-effective; Development WPs are over-budgeted; Staff costs should be considered; The choice to assign to Programme Countries' Institutions the largest share of dissemination budget needs to be evaluated. Therefore, some efforts are needed to prove our costing right. We can report more efforts than planned to prepare for ineligibility. The completeness of documents for reimbursements is also important.	A	**All partners**

*) A=Action, D=Decision