



Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency

Erasmus+ : Higher Education - International Capacity Building

Brussels, 10.09.2019
Appfin (2019) 012616
File code: 2017-2926

Floros Christos
Technological Educational Institute of
Crete
Stavromenos 1939
71004 Irakleio Crete
Greece

Email: rector@staff.teicrete.gr
Cc: c.petridischania@gmail.com

**Subject: 586165-EPP-1-2017-1-EL-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP
Technical Implementation Report of the project
Statement on the use of the previous pre-financing instalment**

Dear Mr Christos,

We would like to inform you and your project partners that we have carried out the assessment of your Technical Implementation Report submitted on 26 May, 2019 and we are pleased to inform you that it has been approved.

Our assessment looks at the partnership's performance as regards the efficient implementation of the project. It takes into account the Technical Implementation Report but also the desk monitoring conducted by the EACEA since the start of the eligibility period and the field monitoring visits carried out so far. The project implementation should not only respect the CBHE requirements but it should also be in line with the original proposal included under Annex I of the Grant Agreement.

In this context and in accordance with the Grant Agreement and with the Guidelines for the Use of the Grant, your project implementation has been qualified as 'FAIR' (please refer to the Categories of qualification below). The Comments and recommendations sheet in Annex of the letter provides more detailed feedback.

We would like to draw your attention on the fact that we have requested some additional information/clarifications to be provided by 30 September 2019.

If the information requested by the Agency is not received by the deadline set or lacks the quality and details required, the Agency may invite the project coordinator for a meeting at the Agency's premises in Brussels. The meeting's objective will be to discuss the project's weaknesses and challenges and to agree on the areas that require improvements and a close follow-up by the project coordinator.

Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA)
Office: J-59 04/ 033- BE-1049 Brussels - Belgium
Phone: (32-2) 299.49.15 - Fax: (32-2) 299.45.30

http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus-plus_en
E-mail: EACEA-EPLUS-CBHE-PROJECTS@ec.europa.eu

In addition, we remind you that your project is now online on the Erasmus+ Project Results Platform, so as to ensure transparency and visibility of EU funding. We invite you to update your project data and to upload your project results. Please note though that these results will become publicly available only after the validation of your final report by the Agency.

Finally, we would like to thank you for your "Statement on the use of the previous pre-financing instalment and Request for Payment" received on 26 May 2019. Please note that the eligibility of the costs incurred (excel file) will only be verified at Final Report stage (art. II.24 and II.25 of the Grant Agreement). Therefore this feedback letter does not imply the approval of the costs declared in this reporting exercise.

Should you require any further information, please contact Róisín Mc Cabe (Tel: +32 2 29 86092, e-mail: roisin.mc-cabe@ec.europa.eu). We also encourage you to regularly consult our Erasmus+ website https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus-plus/beneficiaries-space_en.

Yours sincerely,



Ralf RAHDERS
Head of Unit

Copy: kathrint@che.org.il

Annex: Comments and recommendations

Categories of qualification:

Very good (at least 75 pts out of 100): the project is implemented in accordance with its original work programme and timetable; the report provides all the information and evidence needed and there are no particular concerns or areas of weakness.

Good (between 74 and 60 pts out of 100): the project progresses in accordance with its original work programme and timetable but some improvements could be made; the report gives clear information on all or nearly all of the evidence needed.

Fair (between 59 and 50 pts): there are weaknesses and concerns in the project implementation; although the report gives some relevant information, details are lacking and/or the information is unclear; there are several areas in the implementation that must be improved during the second half of the project.

Weak (less than 50 pts out of 100): the project is not respecting its original work plan/timetable and/or is not fulfilling the CBHE requirements; the report fails to address important aspects of the project implementation that cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information; in accordance with article 1.10.6 of the Grant Agreement and section 3.5.2.2 of the Guidelines for the Use of the Grant, the maximum grant will be reduced at final report stage if no substantial improvements are observed during the second half of the project.



Project Implementation Report

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Project Number: 586165-EPP-1-2017-1-EL-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

Project Title: **Photonic Processes Education in Nanotechnology**

Coordinating Institution: **Technological Educational Institute of Crete**

Relevance

The project theme remains relevant for the countries concerned. However, greater justification is needed to demonstrate that the methodology used for curriculum development is relevant for the 'Capacity-building in Higher Education' action.

Quality of the Project Design and Implementation

The main activities carried out so far are;

- Surveys
- Design/implementation of the modules. The course outlines are available on the project website, with learning outcomes and ECTS.
- An intensive course for teachers and an intensive course for students
- Dissemination actions
- Organisation of training events
- Quality evaluation (Meetings to monitor the development of the project, external experts etc.)

70% of the equipment has been purchased. It includes video-recording equipment, optical equipment to build the lab demos for assigned modules.

A report doesn't seem to have been written on the results of the survey on the tools employed in nanotechnology as there is no link in the 'Table of Achieved Outcomes' and the project web-site says to ask for it from the coordinator from GoogleDrive. Rather a ppt presentation showing the results. The same for the report on the findings of the questionnaire on what soft skills and lab skills a scientist should have and for the survey on the teaching capacity of scholars and the impact of good teaching.

Quality of the Project Team and Cooperation Arrangements

Three teams have been created; (a) a management team (b) the dissemination and exploitation team



(c) the quality assurance team. All are supported by the local administration and management staff in each partner university. Consortium meetings are held every six months.

The courses do not seem to have been created collaboratively, with only one university responsible for the development of each course and then sharing it with the others.

Impact and Dissemination

Dissemination is carried out through;

- A web-site
- FB and YouTube
- Banner and poster
- Electronic newsletter
- Participation in other events

The report mentions that all the implemented actions have been uploaded in the VALOR page. Please note that VALOR is no longer used and the project results should be uploaded here at the end of the project, when they will be approved by the Project Officer in conjunction with your final report:

<https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/projects/>

Please also note that the items mentioned (surveys, dissemination material, quality evaluations) are not project results. Results are not internal project documents as part of project management processes. They are the tangible outcomes of project activities, in your case the modules, learning outcomes from the 5 intensive seminars, the laboratory experiments etc.

Recommendations

1. Given that the grant given is based on what is written in your proposal, which forms annex 1 of your grant agreement, all changes which have a budgetary impact need prior authorization.
2. We would insist that the learning outcomes of each workshop also appear on the webpage of each workshop and examples of how what was learned was used back home in the partner university.
3. Please make all the reports from project meetings available on the project web-site by 30 September, 2019.
4. In your final report, for the reviews of each module, please provide the names of the reviewers and the feedback given with each module in your final report and how it was incorporated into the module.
5. The link to the surveys on the web-site does not go to a page of questions but the actual first page of the survey, which is not of interest to the general public using the web-site. Please put a link to the list of questions asked in the survey, so that the general public can see them.



6. We would need to know in your final report how the modules have been accredited.
7. We would need to know in your final report in which degrees each module have been used and for what other purposes.
8. Please send the dissemination plan by 30 September 2019. There should be a clear strategy behind the dissemination – who are you trying to inform/persuade/get to participate and why. Otherwise, how can all the dissemination activities be justified. We need to know why exactly we are funding all these activities.

Conclusion

In conclusion, based on the evaluation, we have decided to grade this 'fair' as the report is ok but some issues such as the website, workshop reports, dissemination plan and accreditation need to be followed up on.

