



# **Biomimicry Design for Sustainability Skills in VET**

**KA220-VET-00620D4B**

**KA220-VET - Cooperation partnerships in vocational education and training**

**WP1 Project Management**

**Quality Assurance Plan**

**Let's mimic 2023 – 1 – EL01 - KA220-VET-000158477B**



**Co-funded by  
the European Union**

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or Greek State Scholarship's Foundation - IKY. Neither the European Union nor Greek State Scholarship's Foundation - IKY can be held responsible for them.

<b>Document Info</b>	
<b>Project reference</b>	2023-1-EL01-KA220-VET-000158477
<b>Deliverable</b>	Quality Assurance Plan
<b>Dissemination level</b>	Public
<b>Date</b>	15/3/2024
<b>Document version</b>	1
<b>Status</b>	Final
<b>Sharing</b>	CC-BY-NC-ND
<b>Authors</b>	Carlos Vaz de Carvalho, Virtual Campus
<b>Reviewers</b>	Hariklia Tsalapatas, University of Thessaly Ioanna Stefan, ATS

**Let's mimic 2023 – 1 – EL01 - KA220-VET-000158477B**



**Co-funded by  
the European Union**

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or Greek State Scholarship's Foundation - IKY. Neither the European Union nor Greek State Scholarship's Foundation - IKY can be held responsible for them.

## Contributors

Konstantina Vlachoutsou, University of Thessaly

Christina Taka, University of Thessaly

Dimitris Ziogas, University of Thessaly

Konstantinos Katsimentes, University of Thessaly

Sotiris Evaggelou, University of Thessaly

Apostolos Fotopoulos, University of Thessaly

Ioanna Steffan, ATS

Antony Steffan, ATS

Anca Georghe, ATS

Ahu Sismek, Yakacik Mesleki Ve Teknik Anadolu Lisesi

Laura Trevisan, Infodef

Regoli Stella, Etudes Et Chantiers Corsica



**Co-funded by  
the European Union**

**Let's mimic 2023 – 1 – EL01 - KA220-VET-000158477B**

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or Greek State Scholarship's Foundation - IKY. Neither the European Union nor Greek State Scholarship's Foundation - IKY can be held responsible for them.

## Contents

Contributors .....	3
1 Introduction .....	5
1.1 Project summary.....	5
1.2 Objectives .....	7
1.3 Target groups.....	7
1.4 Consortium .....	8
1.5 Work plan .....	8
2 Quality assurance methodology .....	1
2.1 Structure, roles, and responsibilities.....	1
2.2 Organisation, focus and tools.....	3
2.3 Criteria and indicators .....	1
2.4 Administrative support.....	1
2.4.1 Reports.....	1
2.4.2 Document control.....	1
2.4.3 Communication.....	2
Annexes .....	3
Annex I: Internal Evaluation Questionnaire .....	3
Annex II: Meeting evaluation .....	5
Annex III: Event evaluation.....	7

Let's mimic 2023 – 1 – EL01 - KA220-VET-000158477B



Co-funded by  
the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or Greek State Scholarship's Foundation - IKY. Neither the European Union nor Greek State Scholarship's Foundation - IKY can be held responsible for them.

# 1 Introduction

The objective of a Quality Assurance process is to support the management entities in producing concrete, high-quality results in line with the project objectives and work plan. In this context, the main purpose of the Quality Assurance Plan is to organise this process by establishing a coherent set of guidelines by which all aspects of the project are measured and assessed.

Using these guidelines will ensure better collaboration among the consortium members and ensure that the entire consortium is responsible for and engaged in the project activities. As such, the plan defines:

- The roles and responsibilities of the consortium members.
- The guidelines for adequate implementation and assessment of the tasks.
- The content, format, review and approval process of the project results.
- The different quality criteria, indicators and tools to be applied throughout the project duration.
- Generally, the quality requirements must be respected throughout the project lifecycle, and the deliverables, actions and results must conform to.

## 1.1 Project summary

Human activities, as well as occupations in the workplace, need to be carried out in a way that is sustainable and environmentally friendly. Since many human activities in the past have not achieved this, there is a need to adapt the processes in personal consumption as well as in occupations that are carried over from the past and to develop new sectors of activity to replace environmentally unfriendly alternatives. They are essential to create a more sustainable society: for instance, developing skills and promoting the study of technologies that lead to avoiding as far as possible the use of irreplaceable raw materials, recycling waste, minimising energy use, and avoiding pollution of the environment. The opportunity to develop

Let's mimic 2023 – 1 – EL01 - KA220-VET-000158477B



Co-funded by  
the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or Greek State Scholarship's Foundation - IKY. Neither the European Union nor Greek State Scholarship's Foundation - IKY can be held responsible for them.

entrepreneurial learning through vocational education and training could also lead to the creation of society.

There are a large number of VET graduates working throughout the economy. Many employment sectors are regulated by standards covering their operations, and many jobs have defined skills standards. Individuals typically undertake VET with the aim of obtaining the skills level or qualifications needed for regulated occupations or jobs for which standards of competence levels of skills required are clearly established. As well as regulations covering personnel qualifications, much economic activity is governed by regulations covering operations more widely (although to a degree that varies between countries and sectors). Unfortunately, many existing regulations and standards date from an era before the need for sustainability was fully appreciated and have not yet been fully updated to meet the requirements for a transition to a green economy. They may even help to maintain a 'business-as-usual' mode of operations, work processes and methods when this is patently not sustainable, using raw materials, creating waste and emissions to a degree that causes unnecessary harm to the environment.

VET can equip youth with the skills required to access the world of work, including skills for self-employment. VET can also improve responsiveness to changing skill demands by companies and communities, increasing productivity and wage levels. Implementing ESD in VET can serve as an enabler of transformation in TVET institutions by enhancing the sustainability scope of an institutional vision and increasing opportunities to build the capacities of the community and stakeholders in it. In effect, ESD in VET provides an enhanced tool to equip youth and adults with the skills needed in the changing world of work, including the knowledge and competency requirements to make the transition to green economies and societies. ESD is, therefore, essential for institutions to educate and train individuals on these requirements.

In this sense, **the Let's Mimic project aims to enable VET systems to be more sustainable and relevant by supporting young people in obtaining** the skills they need to participate and prosper in achieving sustainability goals.

Let's mimic 2023 – 1 – EL01 - KA220-VET-000158477B



Co-funded by  
the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or Greek State Scholarship's Foundation - IKY. Neither the European Union nor Greek State Scholarship's Foundation - IKY can be held responsible for them.

## 1.2 Objectives

The project aims to meet the following specific objectives:

- To promote high-quality VET with a strong work-based learning component.
- To increase the labour market relevance of VET.
- To promote ESD in secondary-level VET schools.
- To introduce the Biomimicry design process in secondary-level VET schools for sustainability skills.
- To improve access to and retention in quality education through ESD.
- To increase VET teacher and trainer understanding and awareness of sustainability.
- To apply the microlearning strategy and collaborative learning principles to develop a flexible, gamified self-regulated learning path (SRL-P) for VET learners.
- To facilitate the twin transition in VET and train VET learners for "Future-Proof Jobs".
- To encourage better use of information and communications technology (ICT) in learning, teaching and training.
- Promote the development of skills and competencies of teachers and trainers.

## 1.3 Target groups

**Let's mimic** project is aimed at:

- VET learners and students at the secondary level.
- VET teachers and trainers working with VET learners at the secondary level.
- Company trainers and VET practitioners.
- Community leaders, civic initiatives and NGOs are active in the field of education and training.



**Co-funded by  
the European Union**

**Let's mimic 2023 – 1 – EL01 - KA220-VET-000158477B**

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or Greek State Scholarship's Foundation - IKY. Neither the European Union nor Greek State Scholarship's Foundation - IKY can be held responsible for them.

## 1.4 Consortium

The partnership has been formed considering the added value that each partner will bring to the project, each partner organisation's scope relevant to the project objectives and idea, and the previous collaborations in Erasmus+.

In addition, the partnership covers a wide geographical area in Europe, in the north, south, east, and west, ensuring that project activities consider diverse educational, cultural, and economic contexts, engage the target VET sector widely, and produce results that are relevant and effective at the European level.

More specifically, the project relies on the experience of 6 partners: PANEPISTIMIO THESSALIAS (Greece), ATS (Romania), Yakacik Mesleki Ve Teknik Anadolu Lisesi (Turkey), Etudes Et Chantiers Corsica (France), INFODEF (Spain), and Virtual Campus (Portugal).

## 1.5 Work plan

The duration of the project is 36 months and comprises 5 Work Packages (Project Management and Quality Assurance, Biomimicry Process Design for Sustainability Skills, Training Modules on Biomimicry Process Design, Biomimicry Platform Development, Dissemination and Exploitation).

Each work package contains a detailed description of the project activities and a list of tasks as detailed next:

### **WP1. Project management and quality assurance**

- T1.1 Project management.
- T1.2 Financial reporting.
- T1.3 Quality management and ethics.

### **WP2. Biomimicry process design for sustainability skills**

- T2.1 Learning outcomes matrix for sustainability skills in VET learners.
- T2.2 Project-based learning framework through biomimicry process design.

Let's mimic 2023 – 1 – EL01 - KA220-VET-000158477B



Co-funded by  
the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or Greek State Scholarship's Foundation - IKY. Neither the European Union nor Greek State Scholarship's Foundation - IKY can be held responsible for them.



- T2.3 Biomimicry platform design.

### **WP3. Training Modules on Biomimicry Process Design**

- T3.1 Self-regulated learning kit.
- T3.2 Biomimicry handbook for VET teachers.
- T3.3 Biomimicry training modules.

### **WP4. Biomimicry Platform Development**

- Biomimicry platform development and maintenance.
- Biomimicry platform testing.
- Use cases and pilot setup.
- Biomimicry pilot implementation, deployment, and evaluation.

### **WP5. Dissemination and Exploitation**

- Dissemination plan and visual identity.
- Dissemination activities.
- Biomimicry exploitation.
- Multiplier events.

The work plan implementation will be supported through 4 consortium in-person meetings. The meetings will provide partners with the opportunity to closely collaborate on project deliverables, making concrete progress. Partners will review interim and final versions of project deliverables and set short-term implementation goals. Furthermore, partners will use the consortium meetings to perform internal evaluation activities, ensuring that project outcomes are implemented according to the proposal description and timeline and are of high quality. Specifically, the following consortium meetings are foreseen:

- Kick-off meeting in Targoviste, Romania, month 5.
- 2nd consortium meeting in Sorio, France, month 11.

**Let's mimic 2023 – 1 – EL01 - KA220-VET-000158477B**



**Co-funded by  
the European Union**

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or Greek State Scholarship's Foundation - IKY. Neither the European Union nor Greek State Scholarship's Foundation - IKY can be held responsible for them.

- 3<sup>rd</sup> consortium meeting in Volos, Greece, month 18.
- Final consortium meeting in Istanbul, Turkey, month 36.

In addition, partners will meet virtually on a monthly basis. Virtual meetings will foster collaboration and continuity of project implementation in between in-person consortium meetings.

Following is the GANNT chart of the proposal workplan, indicating start and end dates of project work packages and tasks.

**Let's mimic 2023 – 1 – EL01 - KA220-VET-000158477B**



**Co-funded by  
the European Union**

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or Greek State Scholarship's Foundation - IKY. Neither the European Union nor Greek State Scholarship's Foundation - IKY can be held responsible for them.

Lead Partner	WP/T/D Nbr	WP / T Titles	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5	M6	M7	M8	M9	M10	M11	M12	M13	M14	M15	M16	M17	M18	M19	M20	M21	M22	M23	M24	M25	M26	M27	M28	M29	M30	M31	M32	M33	M34	M35	M36	
UTH	WP1	Project Management and Quality Assurance																																					
UTH	TL.1	Project Management																																					
UTH	TL.2	Financial Reporting																																					
ATS	TL.3	Quality Management and Ethics																																					
UTH	DL.1	Project Handbook																																					
UTH	DL.2	Financial Reports (M6; M18; M24; M236)																																					
INFODEF	WP2	Biomimicry Process Design for Sustainability Skills																																					
ECC	T2.1	Learning Outcomes Matrix for Sustainability Skills in VET																																					
INFODEF	T2.2	Project-Based Learning Framework through Biomimicry Process Design																																					
ATS	T2.3	Biomimicry Platform Design																																					
INFODEF	D2.1	Biomimicry Process Design for Sustainability Skills																																					
ATS	D2.2	Platform design specifications																																					
UTH		Transnational Project Meeting	GR				RO																																
UTH	WP3	Training Modules on Biomimicry Process Design																																					
ATS	T3.1	Self-regulated Learning Kit																																					
YAKAOK	T3.2	Biomimicry Handbook for VET teachers																																					
UTH	T3.3	Biomimicry Training Modules																																					
UTH	D3.1	Biomimicry Training Modules																																					
ATS	D3.2	Self-regulated Learning Kit																																					
ECC	D3.3	Biomimicry Handbook for teachers																																					
ECC		Transnational Project Meeting									FR		FR																										
ATS	WP4	Biomimicry Platform Development																																					
ATS	T4.1	Biomimicry Platform Development and maintenance																																					
UTH	T4.2	Biomimicry Platform Testing																																					
UTH	T4.3	Use Cases and Pilot set up																																					
VC	T4.4	Biomimicry Pilot Implementation, Deployment and Evaluation																																					
ATS	D4.1	Instructors' Technical Guide																																					
UTH	D4.2	Pilot Model and Use Case Definition																																					
VC	D4.3	Recommended Practices and Final Public Report on Pilots																																					
ATS		Transnational Project Meeting															RO				GR																		
VC		Capacity Building Activity																						PT			PT												
YAKAOK	WP5	Dissemination and Exploitation																																					
UTH	T5.1	Dissemination Plan and Visual Identity																																					
YAKAOK	T5.2	Dissemination activities																																					
ATS	T5.3	Biomimicry Exploitation																																					
YAKAOK	T5.4	Multiplier Events																																					
YAKAOK	D5.1	Dissemination and Exploitation Strategy																																					
YAKAOK	D5.2	Dissemination report																																					
YAKAOK		Transnational Project Meeting																																					TR

**Let's mimic 2023 – 1 – EL01 - KA220-VET-000158477B**



**Co-funded by  
the European Union**

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or Greek State Scholarship's Foundation - IKY. Neither the European Union nor Greek State Scholarship's Foundation - IKY can be held responsible for them.

## 2 Quality assurance methodology

The quality assurance methodology ensures a proper implementation of the activities and results of the project. It also ensures that all partners are fully involved in the different monitoring and evaluation mechanisms along the various project phases and report, on a periodic basis, about the activities they are leading and participating in.

In general, the methodology focuses on the objectives, outcomes, milestones, effectiveness of the approach and used tools, resource usage, control procedures, partner's roles and responsibilities, etc. Detailed quantitative and qualitative indicators are established:

- Indicators of realisation, based on the actual realization of deliverables and number of target users reached vs. expected for the different activities, such as piloting, dissemination, and exploitation. These indicators are measured through the monitoring activities in correspondence with project milestones and delivery dates. Success corresponds to the delivery of all the expected outcomes with at least the number of users indicated in the quality assurance plan.
- Indicators of result, that will be mainly based on a qualitative assessment of project tangible and intangible outcomes as evaluated internally, by the end-users and by external experts. The indicators concern the quality, relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the outcomes, as far as perceived by the end-users and peer-reviewers. Success corresponds to positive feedback from the users. An average rate of 4 out of 5 on a Likert scale will be pursued.
- Impact indicators, measuring the capacity of the project to make any external positive change towards the main project goal. The indicators concern mainly the impact and sustainability of project results.

### 2.1 Structure, roles, and responsibilities

The Quality Assurance structure is directly connected to the management structure and reflects the consortium's determination to maintain focused goals and balanced activities

Let's mimic 2023 – 1 – EL01 - KA220-VET-000158477B



Co-funded by  
the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or Greek State Scholarship's Foundation - IKY. Neither the European Union nor Greek State Scholarship's Foundation - IKY can be held responsible for them.

among its members. The structure and responsibilities for the different participants in the QA process are:

The **Project Coordinator (PC)** is responsible for the overall operation of the project and its smooth running, timeliness and accomplishment. He oversees financial and administrative management including the preparation of reports. The PC is the final responsible to ensure that all partners' contributions meet the expectations. The coordinator's main responsibilities are the following:

- To manage the project's decision-making process.
- To ensure the implementation of the agreed action plan to the agreed standards and deadlines.
- To work with work package leaders in the coordination of the corresponding activities.
- To assure the quality of the project's deliverables and of the required processes.
- To ensure the effective flow of information between partners.
- To report on project progress to the EACEA.
- To serve as the representative of the consortium to the EACEA.
- To act as the Financial Officer within the Consortium and manage the preparation of financial statements for the EACEA.

The **Steering Committee (SC)** supervises the implementation of the whole project. It is chaired by the PC and it is composed by one member of each partner. The SC is the arbitration body which implements the provisions of the Grant Agreement and decides on the following matters:

- To define the strategic orientation of the project.
- To take all decisions required for the successful progress of the project.
- To take consequential decisions on dissemination and exploitation activities.

Let's mimic 2023 – 1 – EL01 - KA220-VET-000158477B



Co-funded by  
the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or Greek State Scholarship's Foundation - IKY. Neither the European Union nor Greek State Scholarship's Foundation - IKY can be held responsible for them.

- To implement the scientific decisions and orientations, taken by the coordinator, by redefining the work plan and schedule and/or re-defining partner roles, contributions and budget.
- To approve progress reports on the state of advancement of each work package; monitor any significant difference between planned and actual advancement of participants' work, particularly with respect of project results and deliverables.
- In case of default by a partner, to review participants' roles and budget as well as any new entity to replace the defaulting contractor.

During the consortium meetings the SC members review interim results and set interim implementation goals. Evaluation results will be made public at the end of the project implementation period in a corresponding report. In total 3 annual reports will be produced until the end of the project (M12, M24 and M36).

**The Quality Manager (QM)** is responsible for the achievement of the quality objectives of the project. The duty of the QM is to monitor and evaluate the progress of the project and to ensure that all its activities are carried out properly according to European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance and ensure proper execution of the project to achieve its objective. The QM designs a monitoring and evaluation process and is responsible for selecting criteria, indicators and data collection tools.

**The Work Package Leaders (WPL)** are responsible for the detailed coordination and reporting of the specific Output. If needed, meetings of the partners involved in the Output will be organized and chaired by the WPL. For each deliverable, within the WP, the WPL will assign direct responsibility either to himself/herself or to an associate individual. The WPL is the person that will be contacted by the PC as part of the monitoring of progress towards completion of the deliverables.

## 2.2 Organisation, focus and tools

The project quality is assured through the monitoring and evaluation of the quality of two main aspects: the project processes and the project deliverables.

Let's mimic 2023 – 1 – EL01 - KA220-VET-000158477B



Co-funded by  
the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or Greek State Scholarship's Foundation - IKY. Neither the European Union nor Greek State Scholarship's Foundation - IKY can be held responsible for them.

### **Quality of the project processes (indicators of realization and impact indicators)**

The quality of the key project processes will be monitored and assessed through periodic internal self-evaluation of the consortium by the project partners. The evaluation will be done by each partner through a questionnaire (Annex 1) with an assessment of the performance of the consortium and of the current state of the project activities. This internal evaluation will be performed three times during the lifecycle of the project, in months 12, 24, and 36. The QM will collect all the answers from the partners and integrate them into a report which will reflect the views of the consortium on its progress. The project evaluation is considered positive if the percentage of agreement is more than 70% of weighted answers with score  $\geq 3$ . Lower scores will require corrective actions by the SC, led by the Project Coordinator.

Each project meeting (including online meetings) will include a specific session dedicated to Quality Assurance to analyse the Internal Evaluation evidence and other monitoring data. Furthermore, after each meeting, a section of the meeting evaluation questionnaire will be dedicated to the assessment of the current state of the partnership and the project progress. Quality assurance processes will be facilitated by the following documents:

- The **Detailed Work Plan**, a detailed list of activities for the next period with definition of deadlines and responsible partner(s) produced by the coordinator after each meeting.
- The **Quality Assurance Plan**, a referential for monitoring and evaluation, including mechanisms and quality indicators.
- The **Dissemination Plan**, a detailed list of planned dissemination activities and expected impact. The accompanying Dissemination Activities Table provides a list of activities already organized and the achieved impact.

### **Quality of project deliverables (indicators of result)**

The deliverables of the project are classified into tangible and intangible.



Co-funded by  
the European Union

Let's mimic 2023 – 1 – EL01 - KA220-VET-000158477B

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or Greek State Scholarship's Foundation - IKY. Neither the European Union nor Greek State Scholarship's Foundation - IKY can be held responsible for them.

**Tangible deliverables** refer printed and/or electronic publications, software, manuals, reports, digital learning services, digital learning content, guidelines, plans, minutes, handbooks, promotional material, etc.

**Intangible deliverables** can be in the form of meetings among partners or with stakeholders, organised events, such as multipliers, trainings, and conferences, established social media presence, communication, dissemination, file-sharing, competitions, challenges, etc.

A common quality expectation for all deliverables is their relevance to the project objectives, their timely delivery according to the time-schedule agreed in the project work plan and their general adequacy to the quality criteria.

Tangible deliverables undergo a peer review process of evaluation by the QM, who can assign that task to a different partner. In any case, the reviewer(s) is/are person(s) not directly associated with the work carried out for the relevant task of the tangible deliverable in question. The review process is the following:

- When a deliverable is finished, the author sends the “draft version” of the relevant document to the WPL for an initial evaluation.
- The WPL examines the deliverable for its compliance with the Document Template and the general objectives of the project.
- After the document is approved by the WPL, it is sent to the reviewer(s) who check(s) it for its completeness, clarity, and comprehensiveness, using the Deliverable Evaluation document. The reviewer(s) must verify whether the deliverable satisfies the requirements, description, or objective, identify problems and/or deviations from requirements and suggest improvements to the author. Peer review evaluations should include the following information:
  - General comments:
    - Thoroughness of contents.
    - Correspondence to project objectives.
  - Specific comments:

Let's mimic 2023 – 1 – EL01 - KA220-VET-000158477B



Co-funded by  
the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or Greek State Scholarship's Foundation - IKY. Neither the European Union nor Greek State Scholarship's Foundation - IKY can be held responsible for them.



- Relevance.
- Format, including layout, spelling, and more.
- Suggested actions:
  - Changes that should be implemented.
  - Missing information.
  - Further improvements.

The reviewer(s) then send(s) back the evaluation to the WPL and the author who is then responsible for amending the document according to the review results, if needed. The time for this amendment is set according to the time schedule already agreed upon by the partners.

Once the document is amended (if needed) its revised version is sent by the WPL to all members of the consortium. The document that is finally approved takes the status of “final version/version 1” and is included by the PC in the formal work plan and/or progress report of the project.

Event evaluation will be done by all participants. At the end of each event (SC meeting or other) organized by and/or for the partnership, a relevant questionnaire will be completed by the participants. Standard questionnaires will be used, one for partner meetings (Meeting Evaluation Questionnaire – Annex II) and one for events (Event Evaluation Questionnaire – Annex III). The event is considered approved if the percentage of satisfaction is more than 70% of weighted answers with score  $\geq 3$ .

The questionnaires will normally be delivered using an online digital survey tool that allows respondents to remain anonymous in order to collect quantitative and qualitative data. The event evaluations will be done on the spot using hardcopies of the standard document.

The meeting/event is considered positive if the percentage of agreement is more than 70% of weighted answers with score  $\geq 3$ . Scores less than this will require an analysis by the partnership, led by the Project Coordinator.

Let's mimic 2023 – 1 – EL01 - KA220-VET-000158477B



Co-funded by  
the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or Greek State Scholarship's Foundation - IKY. Neither the European Union nor Greek State Scholarship's Foundation - IKY can be held responsible for them.

Other project deliverables, such as the website, or the internal communication platform, will be evaluated according to the criteria with a focus on the overall quality of the deliverable and the usability and the added value to the final users.

The external evaluator will also conduct a qualitative assessment process of all the deliverables produced.

**Let's mimic 2023 – 1 – EL01 - KA220-VET-000158477B**



**Co-funded by  
the European Union**

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or Greek State Scholarship's Foundation - IKY. Neither the European Union nor Greek State Scholarship's Foundation - IKY can be held responsible for them.

## 2.3 Criteria and indicators

	Criteria	Indicators	Quantified objectives (min.)
WP1	Compliance in the implementation of the planned tasks and in the releasing of project deliverables	A. % of tasks completed on time B. % of deliverables released on time	A. 75% B. 80%
	Value of the communication and workflow process among partners	A. Number of partners not attending meetings (maximum) B. Number of message exchanges (e-mail)	A.1 (max) B. 450
	Quality of the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan	A. Ratio of instruments proposed/applied for indicators of realisation B. Ratio of instruments proposed/applied for indicators of result	A. 90% B. 90%

Let's mimic 2023 – 1 – EL01 - KA220-VET-000158477B

	Evidences of the Monitoring and Evaluation process	<p>A. Number of quality indicators below threshold</p> <p>B. Number of end-users involved in evaluation activities</p>	<p>A. 4 (max)</p> <p>B. To be defined</p>
	Biomimicry Process Design for Sustainability Skills	<p>A. Number of participants in the KoM</p> <p>B. Number of questionnaires filled in (for VET teachers)</p> <p>C. Number of questionnaires filled in (for VET students)</p> <p>D. Number of desk researches carried out</p> <p>E. Number of reports on the conclusions from desk researches and questionnaires</p> <p>F. Number of comparative analysis of reports</p> <p>G. Level of satisfaction of the consortium</p>	<p>A. 12 (2 per partner)</p> <p>B. 120 (20 per partner)</p> <p>C. 180 (30 per partner)</p> <p>D. 6 (1 per country)</p> <p>E. 6 (1 per country)</p> <p>F. 1</p> <p>G. 75%</p>
WP3	Self-regulated Learning Kit	<p>A. Number of solutions by nature in the resource bank</p> <p>B. Number of challenges defined for VET learners</p> <p>C. Number of case studies defined for VET learners</p>	<p>A. 60 (10 per partner)</p> <p>B. 60 (10 per partner)</p> <p>C. 60 (10 per partner)</p>

Let's mimic 2023 – 1 – EL01 - KA220-VET-000158477B

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or Greek State Scholarship's Foundation - IKY. Neither the European Union nor Greek State Scholarship's Foundation - IKY can be held responsible for them.

	Biomimicry Handbook for VET teachers	A. Number of case solutions by nature to be briefly summarised and visualised	A. D. 60 (10 per partner)
	Biomimicry Training Modules	A. Number of learning units in training content	A. At least 7
WP4	Biomimicry Platform Development and Maintenance	<p>A. Number of instructor accounts created on the platform</p> <p>B. Number of student accounts created on the platform</p> <p>C. Number of microlearning units</p> <p>D. Number of recommended practices</p>	<p>A. 60 (10 per partner)</p> <p>B. 180 (30 per partner)</p> <p>C. 120 (20 per partner)</p> <p>D. 6 (1 per partner)</p>
	Use Cases and Pilot set up	<p>A. Number of questionnaires for teachers and students</p> <p>B. Number of case studies</p>	<p>A. 12 (2 per partner)</p> <p>B. 6 (1 per partner)</p>

Let's mimic 2023 – 1 – EL01 - KA220-VET-000158477B

	Biomimicry Pilot Implementation, Deployment and Evaluation	<p>A. Level of satisfaction of the participants</p> <p>B. Number of evaluation reports</p>	<p>A. 75%</p> <p>B. 1</p>
	Capacity Building Activity	<p>A. Number of participants involved</p> <p>B. Level of satisfaction of the consortium</p>	<p>A. 13 (2 per partner, 3 per YAKACIK)</p> <p>B. 75%</p>
WP5	Dissemination tools produced and released	<p>A. Number of unique visitors to the project website</p> <p>B. Number of likes/followers in social media</p> <p>C. Number of project's newsletters produced</p> <p>D. Number of flyers</p>	<p>A. To be defined</p> <p>B. To be defined</p> <p>C. 6</p> <p>D. 1</p>
	Exposure in events	<p>A. Number International Events</p> <p>B. Number of national MEs</p> <p>C. Number of participants at the international event</p>	<p>A. 1 (to be organised by YAKACIK)</p> <p>B. 5 (1 per country)</p>

Let's mimic 2023 – 1 – EL01 - KA220-VET-000158477B

		D. Number of participants at the national MEs	C. 50 D. 150 (30 per partner)
	Extent of the project dissemination efforts	A. Number of dissemination activities carried out B. Number of individuals reached	A. To be defined B. To be defined

Let's mimic 2023 – 1 – EL01 - KA220-VET-000158477B

## 2.4 Administrative support

### 2.4.1 Reports

At the end of each year, the QM is responsible for producing a Quality Report, based on the results of the scheduled evaluations. The Quality Report will be the basis for any corrective or adaptive measures, should there be a need. The Quality Report will be submitted to the Steering Committee for approval.

### 2.4.2 Document control

All documents will be stored in the internal communication platform for visibility and use for all partners when needed.

All documents essential to the progress of the project must be named using the project title, version number, status (draft or final) and the relevant code of the deliverable.

Example: Lets Mimic WP1. Quality Assurance Plan v1 final.docx

Example: Lets Mimic WP5. Newsletter R1 v0.5 draft.docx

In communication, the documents can simply be referred to with their title and their sequential reference number (if any), for example “Quality Plan” or “Newsletter R1”.

All documents will be saved in MS Word, MS Excel or MS PowerPoint compatible file types. A template (including font, built-in header, footer, page numbers, etc.) to be used for the creation of Word documents will be available to all partners, posted as a separate document in the Quality Management folder. Templates of the documents to be used for the peer evaluation of deliverables, meeting evaluations, event evaluations shall also be placed in the Quality Management folder.

Final versions of documents should be marked as final and uploaded in read-only format.

Documents or other material addressed to the external public (informative material, brochures, leaflets, posters, presentations, DVDs, etc) must bear appropriate logos and disclaimers, according to EACEA projects visual identity requirements. All produced





documents will be assigned a distribution/access level: Partnership (Confidential), Public, or restricted to certain recipients.

### 2.4.3 Communication

Communication between the members of the consortium, between the PC and the EACEA is very crucial for the successful implementation of the project. Day by day communication will be conducted through the internal communication platform forums, by e-mail, telephone conversations and skype meetings. For the avoidance of any confusion, special attention is paid to the clear drafting of the subject of the e-mail.

In general, all information relevant to the project is sent to the PC, who then forwards it to the partners involved in the specific action(s). Direct partner/partner communications flows will be set up in those cases where an increase in efficiency can be achieved.

External communication with the European Agency for ERASMUS+ and with the European Commission is the responsibility of the PC. This communication takes place mainly by e-mail, telephone conversations and face-to-face discussions when it is needed.



# Annexes

## Annex I: Internal Evaluation Questionnaire

The Internal Evaluation Questionnaire will have a set of 16 Likert-scale questions. Each question will be assigned a grade, on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest (fully agree) and 1 the lowest (fully disagree). Respondents will also be asked for open comments and suggestions. They will help for the synthesis of the results and for the project management.

How do you evaluate....

1. The professional competence and commitment displayed by the Project Coordinator.
2. The effectiveness of the project management process.
3. The effectiveness and clarity of the communication between the partners and the PC.
4. The commitment and proportionate involvement of all partners.
5. The quality of the relationship among the partners.
6. The sharing of resources/expertise amongst partners.
7. The extent to which the consortium commits time and resources as required by the work plan.
8. The arrangements for the implementation of the work packages and the administration of budget.
9. The adherence to the work plan by all partners.
10. The link between project workplan and cost-effective use of resources.
11. The quality of the project monitoring and evaluation processes.
12. The quality of materials/guides/reports/products already produced.
13. The quality of the project information/results dissemination arrangements.
14. The quality of the project in terms of its short, medium, and long term impact at local/regional/national/European level.



15. The support from within your partner organization, in terms of managerial support, specialized support or peer support.
16. The sufficiency, range and suitability of project resources, including, where appropriate, technology resources.



## Annex II: Meeting evaluation

The Meeting Evaluation Questionnaire will have a set of 20 Likert-scale questions. Each question will be assigned a grade, on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest (fully agree) and 1 the lowest (fully disagree). Respondents will also be asked for open comments and suggestions. They will help for the synthesis of the results and for the project management.

### A. Meeting Organization

- The participants received all information about the meeting on time.
- The access to the meeting virtual environment was easy.
- The online conference system and its facilities facilitated the work during the meeting.
- The timetable was respected.
- The presentations by the partners were clear and understandable.
- The meeting was well planned and managed.

### B. Partnership and Collaboration

- Partners had the chance and the possibility to meet and interact with the other project partners.
- The communication amongst the partners was effective and clear.
- The meeting helped with the development of trust and positive attitudes among partners.
- I feel the project is built on a strong partnership with an efficient administrative and financial coordination.
- This meeting was useful to comprehend better the responsibilities and tasks on your organization in this project.

### C. Open Comments

Let's mimic 2023 – 1 – EL01 - KA220-VET-000158477B



Co-funded by  
the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or Greek State Scholarship's Foundation - IKY. Neither the European Union nor Greek State Scholarship's Foundation - IKY can be held responsible for them.

Project partners are asked to provide their opinions and concerns on the following project aspects (open questions):

- The meeting enabled me to clear up questions I previously had on:
- The following aspects are still a major concern to me:
- The major obstacle/barrier in this project for the near future will be:
- What will be the most important outcomes of the project for your organization?
- Other suggestions.



## Annex III: Event evaluation

The Event Evaluation Questionnaire will have a set of 20 Likert-scale questions. Each question will be assigned a grade, on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest (fully agree) and 1 the lowest (fully disagree). Respondents will also be asked for open comments and suggestions. They will help for the synthesis of the results and for the project management.

- What is your opinion of the general organization and facilities of the event?
- To which extent did the event live up to your expectations?
- What is your opinion of the presenters/facilitators?
- What is your opinion of the material that was distributed before or during the event?
- How do you evaluate the agenda of the event?
- How do you evaluate the technical resources used?
- How effective do you think was the methodologies used?
- How useful was the event?
- How valuable was the event for your professional growth?
- How satisfied are you from the level of participation to the event proceedings?
- Do you feel that the targets of the event have been fulfilled?

