



# PACTUM

---

*Projecting Academic Capacities with Tunisian Universities  
through Master courses*

## Quality Final Report

**Erasmus+ Programme Key Action 2 “Capacity Building for Higher Education”**

**Grant agreement: 618888-EPP-1-2020-1-IT-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP**

Disclaimer: The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents which reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

## DOCUMENT INFORMATION

<b>Project title</b>	Projecting Academic Capacities with Tunisian Universities through Master courses
<b>Project n.</b>	618888-EPP-1-2020-1-IT-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP
<b>Deliverable</b>	Quality Final Report
<b>Work package</b>	WP5 Quality Plan
<b>Date of delivery</b>	12/1/2024
<b>Confidentiality status</b>	Public
<b>Partner institution</b>	University of Granada
<b>Responsible authors</b>	García Guindo, Miguel Martínez Fuentes, Guadalupe Ojeda García, Raquel
<b>Abstract (for dissemination)</b>	The Quality Final Report observes four quality dimensions of the project development: scope, product, impact and implementation of the Improvement Plan.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Presentation</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Goals, tasks, evaluation objects and calendar</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Evaluation Instruments</b>	<b>9</b>
▪ Scope	
▪ Product	
▪ Impact	
▪ Implementation of Improvement Plan	
<b>Quality Assessment</b>	<b>17</b>
▪ Scope	
▪ Product	
▪ Impact	
▪ Implementation of Improvement Plan	

## PRESENTATION

This document presents the Quality Final Report for Erasmus + KA2 Project n. 618888-EPP-1-2020-1-IT-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP: PACTUM.

PACTUM is a capacity-building project aiming to develop a high-quality, multi-disciplinary and stimulating program in social, political and behavioral sciences. The target country of this project is Tunisia, a key partner for European Union Higher Education Institutions. Tunisian universities have recently undergone a remarkable transformation, which is bound to, and complements, the processes of modernization and democratization of the political system. Academic cooperation in a delicate and rapidly evolving field like that of social sciences – and in particular those disciplines which are central to the formation of future ruling classes and higher civil servants – is a crucial test for prospective cooperation among Tunisian HEIs and European HEIs engaging with capacity building activities.

The PACTUM project aims at sharing best practices and knowledge in the field of social sciences, with a special focus on modernization, sustainability, and Internationalization of the Higher Education system in Tunisia. The goals of the project converge on the crucial need to boost positive impact on students and mutual enrichment between European and Tunisian academics.

The specific objectives of PACTUM are the following:

- 1) The organization of a series of Summer Schools in synergy with the Master Course in order to set up teaching activities for students, public employees, institutions personnel, and the general public.
- 2) The creation of a post-lauream master course in Social Political and behavioral sciences.
- 3) Implement capacity building actions for teachers, researchers, technicians and administrative staff of HEIs Partners from Tunisia.
- 4) Engage stakeholders for the enlargement of target groups and the improvement of employability opportunities for master students.

The partner organizations involved in the project and in the evaluation activities are:

- P1 - University of Siena – USIENA (Italy)
- P2 - University of CARTHAGE – UCAR (Tunisia)
- P3 - University of SFAX – USF (Tunisia)
- P4 - University of SOUSSE – US (Tunisia)
- P5 - University of Tunis El Manar – UTM (Tunisia)
- P6 - University of Kairouan – UNIK (Tunisia)
- P7 - University of Granada – UGR (Spain)
- P8 – UNIMED (Italy)
- P9 – University of Montpellier – UMON (France)

The present report is developed in the scope of the WP 5 (Quality Plan) of the Project, led by UGR. The report is in compliance with the Project description and all applicable rules and guidelines contained in the Quality Plan and the Quality Handbook.

The evaluation observes four quality dimensions: scope, product, impact and implementation of the Improvement Plan. The scope refers to the level of correspondence between the expected results and those finally obtained, and it is carried out by measuring development indicators included in the Quality Handbook. The product dimension refers to the quality of the deliverables' content and it is based on content analysis as well as on content approval. The impact dimension refers to the satisfaction of the beneficiaries of the project's activities, and it is carried out by measuring development indicators included in the Quality Handbook as well as the results of meetings between those responsible of the WP. Finally, this report assesses the extent to which the Improvement Plan agreed at the end of the first stage of the project development has been implemented in the second stage.

This report is structured in three main sections. The section that follows is dedicated to clarify the project objectives, the distribution of tasks among the partners, and the respective activities/deliverables, which are the objects subjected to evaluation in this report. Then the document identifies the assessment instruments, distinguishing its use for the measurement of the dimensions

scope, product, impact and implementation of the Improvement Plan. The third section offers the results of the evaluation.

The WP 5 has counted on the support of the other partner universities, as well as the collaboration of the project's quality assurance committee, for the preparation of this report. Those responsible for the WP5 would like to explicitly express their gratitude for the support received to carry out their tasks.

## GOALS, TASKS, EVALUATION OBJECTS AND CALENDAR

The report focuses on the evaluation of the quality of part of the tasks carried out by the WP 1 (Preparation), the W2 (Development- Summer School), the WP 3 (Summer Schools), the WP 6 (Dissemination) and WP 7 (Management). The selection of tasks to be evaluated is in accordance with the agreement reached between those responsible for the WP 7 (Project Management), the external evaluation agency (PIXEL), and the WP5.

Table 1 shows the goals to be achieved in the project. These objectives are distributed between the partners and associated with specific tasks that involve activities and/or deliverables to be fulfilled within a deadline according to the data registered in the Quality Handbook. The evaluation objects assessed in this report are the respective activities/deliverables.

Table 1				
Institution	Goal	Tasks	Product/activities	Completion
USIENA	Ensuring the highest collaboration and coordination between partners and stakeholders.	WP7: Management, problem resolution and coordination.	Handbook of Managing Structure and Procedures	June, 2021
UNIMED	Identifying good practices, tools and needs in the partner country HEIs	WP1: Needs Analysis	Report	September, 2021
		WP1: Catalogue of Good Practices in the	Report	September, 2021



		field of Social Political and Behavioral Sciences		
		WP1 : Position paper on policy reform in Social, Political and Behavioral Sciences at the academic level	Report	June, 2021 (Postponed to December 2023)
UMON	Preparing the work for the promotion of multiple Summer Schools on Politics and Policies as collateral activities to the post-lauream - Master Course on social political and Behavioral sciences	WP2: Preparation of the Summer Courses	Informative material for the summer schools.	September, 2021 (Minutes of the scientific committee - internal document) December, 2022 (posted in web page)
			Guideline for the students' recruitment strategy.	September, 2021 (Minutes of the scientific committee - internal document) December, 2022 (posted in web page)
			Professor Working Package.	September, 2021 (Minutes of the scientific committee - internal document) December, 2022 (posted in web page)
UCAR USF	Promoting multiple Summer Schools on Politics and Policies as collateral activities to the post-lauream - Master Course on social political and Behavioral sciences	WP3: Summer Courses (1st edition)	Result of the questionnaires on the students' satisfaction.	October, 2021
			Result of the questionnaires on the teachers' satisfaction.	October, 2021
			Result of the questionnaires on the administrative staff' satisfaction.	October, 2021
			Percentage of places demanded with respect	October, 2021



			to the number of places offered	
			Percentage of students who complete the course	October, 2021
			Result of the questionnaires on the students' satisfaction.	October, 2022
			Result of the questionnaires on the teachers' satisfaction	October, 2022
		WP3: Summer Courses (2nd edition)	Result of the questionnaires on the administrative staff' satisfaction.	October, 2022
			Percentage of places demanded with respect to the number of places offered	October, 2022
			Percentage of students who complete the course	October, 2022
			Result of the questionnaires on the students' satisfaction.	November , 2023
			Result of the questionnaires on the teachers' satisfaction	November , 2023
		WP3: Summer Courses (3rd edition)	Result of the questionnaires on the administrative staff' satisfaction.	November , 2023
			Percentage of places demanded with respect to the number of places offered	November , 2023
			Percentage of students who complete the course	November , 2023
UNIK	Ensuring the highest visibility of the project and its activities	WP6 : Dissemination	Strategic Plan to disseminate the project and its outcomes	June, 2021



## EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

### Scope Assessment

The qualitative instruments to monitor the scope of the quality of the WP 1 activity/deliverables are the following development indicators: WP 1.3. Publication of the needs analysis report; WP 1.6. Publication of the report of the catalog of good practices in social, political and behavioral sciences; and WP 1.11. Publication of Position Paper on policy reform in Social, Political and Behavioral Sciences at the academic level.

The qualitative instruments to assess and monitor the scope of the quality of the WP 2 activity/deliverables are the following development indicators: WP 2.4. Preparation and evaluation of the summer courses information package, WP 2.5. Preparation and evaluation of the summer courses recruitment strategic guideline, and WP 2.6. Preparation and evaluation of the summer courses professor work package.

The quantitative instruments to assess and monitor the scope of the quality of the WP 3 activity/deliverables are the following development indicators: WP 3.2. Percentage of places demanded with respect to the number of places offered, and WP 3.4. Percentage of students who complete the course.

The quantitative instrument to assess and monitor the scope of the quality of the WP 6 activity/deliverables is the following development indicator: WP 6.10. Report on the Strategic Plan to disseminate the project and its outcomes.

The quantitative instrument to assess and monitor the scope of the quality of the WP 7 activity/deliverables is the following development indicator: WP 7.3. Handbook of Managing Structure and Procedures.

The observation of the indicators' behavior is made through the analysis of the contents published on the project's website (public and team areas) and the data registered in the project's Quality Handbook.

The range of scores is the following:

- Totally fulfilled  
The deliverable/result was submitted within the stipulated period.
- Partially fulfilled  
The deliverable/result was submitted after the stipulated deadline.
- Not fulfilled  
The deliverable/result was not submitted.

### **Product Assessment**

The product assessment takes into account whether the content of the deliverables i) has been reviewed and accepted by all partners; ii) is complete; iii) is clear; and iv) has the required formal format and logos.

The observation of these criteria was made through the analysis of the contents published on the project's web page (public and teams areas) and the Quality Handbook.

The range of scores is the following:

- Very Good  
All relevant aspects of the criteria identified for the assessment of the quality of the deliverable/result are convincingly and successfully addressed.
- Good  
The deliverables/results address the criteria well although some small improvements can be made.
- Fair  
The deliverables/results fairly address the criteria but there are several areas where improvements are needed.
- Weak

The deliverables/results do not meet the criteria or cannot be judged due to the lack of information/materials.

## Impact Assessment

The impact assessment concerns only two work packages in which the evaluation of the satisfaction of the agents involved is required. These are the WP 1 and the WP 3.

The quantitative instruments to assess and monitor the quality of the impact of the WP 1 activities/deliverables are the following development indicators: WP 1.4. Satisfaction with the Needs Analysis Report ; WP 1.9. Satisfaction with the Catalog of good practices ; and W 1. 14 Presentation of the position paper to the Tunisian Ministry of Higher Education.

The observation of indicator WP 1.14 refers to whether or not the document has been successfully submitted to the Tunisian Ministry of Higher Education. The observation of indicators WP 1.4 and WP 1.9 is made through the analysis of the contents published on the project's web page (public and teams areas). The evaluation considers the average level of satisfaction. The range of scores is the following:

- High satisfaction
- Medium satisfaction
- Low satisfaction
- No satisfaction

The quantitative instruments to assess the quality of the impact of the WP3 activity are the following development indicators: WP 3.6. Overall student satisfaction, WP 3.7. Overall teacher satisfaction, and WP 3.8. Overall administrative staff satisfaction. The measurement of these indicators is based on the results of satisfaction questionnaires distributed among students, teachers and administrative staff who contributed to the first, second and third editions of the summer courses. Those responsible for WP 5 designed the questionnaires and submitted them for the consideration of the rest of the partners. The questionnaires were approved by all partners. The Tunisian partner universities in which the summer courses took place were responsible for distributing the questionnaires, recording the

answers, performing the statistical treatment of the data and sharing the results with those responsible for WP 5. The range of scores is the following:

- High satisfaction
- Medium satisfaction
- Low satisfaction
- No satisfaction

The qualitative assessment of the impact of the quality of the WP 3 activities is based on the reflections of those responsible for the organization of the summer courses. Such reflections are about the main strengths and difficulties found in the management of these actions, as well as the lessons learned in this past experience.

The collection of this qualitative information was done in three phases for the preparation of the Intermediate Report. First, an online meeting was held between those responsible for the WP 5 and those responsible for the organization of the summer courses at the five partner universities. Second, those responsible for the WP 5 drafted and shared a synthesis document with the main results of the meeting. Finally, the partners had the opportunity to review the document in order to express either their agreement or their constructive comments to improve the final result. For the preparation of the present Final Report, however, we followed a different procedure because it was not possible to agree on a convenient meeting date for all parties involved. Instead, and as a second attempt, we sent to those responsible for the second and third editions of the summer courses a document for self-completion. This document includes the same dimensions that were addressed in the previous evaluation.

The range of scores is the following:

- Very Good

All the issues identified for the qualitative assessment are convincingly and successfully addressed.

- Good

Just part of the issues identified for the qualitative assessment are convincingly and successfully addressed.

- Fair

Just part of the issues identified for the qualitative assessment of summer courses are addressed, but not in a convincing and successful way.

- Weak

None of the issues identified for the qualitative assessment of summer courses is addressed.

### Implementation of the Improvement Plan

The Quality Assurance Commission was created with the technical support of USIENA and UGR. This commission was approved by the project coordination team and by each coordinating university of each WP. This commission has been the body responsible for the implementation of all the procedures and actions established in this quality system for the different WPs.

One of the tasks of the commission is to identify possible deficits and propose actions in case of deviation. In order to fulfill this task, the quality assurance commission shared an online document in which to capture the continuous monitoring of the quality of the project's activities. This monitoring procedure consisted of three activities. The first was the identification of possible deficits in the procedures, resources or results of the activities. The second was the proposal of possible solutions to improve the deficits. The third was to identify concrete actions to implement those solutions.

According to the quantitative and qualitative assessment of the products and satisfaction surveys at the end of the first stage of the project, an improvement plan was designed to address problematic issues in the Summer Schools. These issues were established as "SMART" objectives for quality improvement: Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound. A particular strategy or action was proposed for each objective, identifying the actors concerned. It was assumed that the implementation of these strategies would have an effect on the quality of the project.

#### Issue to improve 1: Collection of information for the elaboration of the final Quality Report

- Objective: To obtain all the necessary data and information required for the preparation of the final Quality Report.
- Strategy/action: 1) To raise awareness among partners on the need to provide the required information in full and on time. 2) Holding regular bilateral meetings between

the project coordinators and all the partner universities to facilitate the follow-up of the actions that depend on each partner.

- Concerned actors: USI, as responsible for project management and UGR as responsible for the final Quality Report

#### Issue to improve 2: Use of online tools for sharing information

- Objective: To involve all partners in the use of online collective documents created to register the overall satisfaction of students, teachers and administrative staff.
- Strategy/action: 1. To hold an online meeting to raise awareness on the need to cooperate in the collective documents as cooperative work, and solve all the technical doubts on the collective documents.
- Concerned actors: UNISIENA, hosting the meeting as responsible for project management; all partner Tunisian Universities as providers of information.

#### Issue to improve 3: Resolution of technical problems on on-line teaching

- Objective: To improve on-line teaching by solving the technical problems envisaged in the Summer Schools and Master course.
- Strategy/action: 1) Centralization of the links provided for online teaching in the host universities to ensure that they meet the technical requirements. 2) To invest in new equipment for video conferences.
- Concerned actors: Tunisian partner Universities as organizers of the courses.

#### Issue to improve 4: Dissemination of the Summer Schools and Master program

- Objective: To progress in the dissemination channels of the Summer Schools and Master programs.
- Strategy/action: 1) Information provision about the Summer Schools and Master course to more organizations and institutions hosting potential students interested, by using mail distribution lists and social networks. 2) Hiring a service provider to boost social networks. 3) To plan mixed face-to-face and online sessions to offer both local students living far from Tunisian partner Universities and foreign students the possibility to participate in the Summer Courses.

- Concerned actors: UNIK, as responsible for dissemination; all partners, as holders of institutional networks; Tunisian partner Universities as organizers of the Summer Schools.

#### Issue to improve 5: A more plural teaching staff

- Objective: To incorporate instructors from civil society, and professionals into the teaching staff in order to offer not only a scholarly perspective but also a social one.
- Strategy/action 1: Incorporation of mixed seminars into the program of the Summer schools courses to offer and confront different perspectives from scholars, members of civil society and professionals.
- Concerned actors: UMON as responsible for the preparation of the Summer Schools; UCAR and USF as responsible for the Summer Schools; Tunisian institutions as organizers of the courses.

In order to assess the extent to which the solutions agreed have been implemented in the second stage of the project development, we observe a set of evidences, as follows:

- Issue 1. Strategy/action 1 (“To raise awareness among partners on the need to provide the required information in full and on time”): E-mails sent to the project partners referring to the need to provide an agile response (in due time and form), to the information requested from them, were considered as evidence. Such evidence was requested to the University of Siena as responsible for project management.
- Issue 1. Strategy/action 2 (“Holding regular bilateral meetings between the project coordinators and all the partner universities to facilitate the follow-up of the actions that depend on each partner”): Any document/communication related to the meetings held between the project coordinator and all partners together with the agenda of such meetings and containing information related to the actions to be developed by each project member was considered as evidence. Such evidence was requested to the University of Siena as responsible for project management.
- Issue 2. Strategy/action 1 (“To hold an online meeting to raise awareness on the need to cooperate in the collective documents as cooperative work, and solve all the technical doubts on the collective documents”): Documentary records of online meetings mentioning the

- importance of providing information on summer courses were considered as evidence. Such evidence was requested to the University of Siena as responsible for project management.
- Issue 3. Strategy/action 1 (“Centralization of the links provided for online teaching in the host universities to ensure that they meet the technical requirements”): Any technical measure adopted in relation to the centralization of the links and that guaranteed the fulfillment of the proposed objective was considered as evidence. Such evidence was requested to the University of Siena as responsible for project management as well as to the Tunisian partner Universities as organizers of the courses.
  - Issue 3. Strategy/action 2 (“To invest in new equipment for video conferences”): Any accounting document of the inventory related to the purchase of new equipment for video conferences was considered as evidence. Such evidence was requested to the University of Siena as responsible for the operational and financial management of the project.
  - Issue 4. Strategy/action 1 (“Information provision about the Summer Schools and Master course to more organizations and institutions hosting potential students interested, by using mail distribution lists and social networks”): Any publicity made of the Summer Schools and the Master's Degree through the use of mailing lists and social networks was considered as evidence. Such evidence was requested to the Tunisian partner Universities as organizers of the courses.
  - Issue 4. Strategy/action 2 (“Hiring a service provider to boost social networks”): Considered as evidence were any documents that allowed us to verify the contracting of a service provider in charge of dynamizing the social networks. Such evidence was requested to the University of Siena as responsible for the operational and financial management of the project.
  - Issue 4. Strategy/action 3 (“Plan mixed face-to-face and online sessions to offer both local students living far from Tunisian partner Universities and foreign students the possibility to participate in the Summer Courses”): Any document verifying the existence of a strategy aimed at holding mixed face-to-face and online sessions to offer both local students living far from Tunisian partner universities and foreign students the possibility of participating in the Summer Courses was considered as evidence. Such evidence was requested to the University of Siena as responsible for project management.
  - Issue 5. Strategy/action 1 (“Incorporation of mixed seminars into the program of the Summer schools courses to offer and confront different perspectives from scholars, members of civil



society and professionals”): Summer course programs that incorporated personnel from civil society and/or professionals were considered as evidence. Such evidence was requested to the Tunisian partner Universities as organizers of the courses.

The range of scores is the following:

- Fulfilled  
There exists evidence of action implementation and it was submitted.
- Not fulfilled  
There doesn't exist evidence of action implementation or it was not submitted.

## QUALITY ASSESSMENT

### Scope

The average level of quality of the scope of the product/activities was satisfactory in the first stage of the project. Most of the deliverables were delivered within the established period, with a maximum level of correspondence between the expected results and those finally obtained.

In the second stage of the project development there were only three deliverables to produce. One of them is the Position Paper. The other two are data referring to the second and third edition of the summer courses, in relation to both the percentage of places demanded with respect to the number of places offered and the percentage of students who complete the course. While the first deliverable has not been produced, the other two have been delivered for the most part<sup>1</sup>. The University of Sousse represents the only exception, which does not provide the required data.

Table 2 systematizes the records achieved in each product/activity.

---

<sup>1</sup> Please find the data record provided by the organizing partners on the following link:  
<https://docs.google.com/document/d/17eZj7JElkmSBIFBnScc07SgZBOxa7rZm/edit?usp=sharing&oid=117741618722595334338&rtpof=true&sd=true>

Table 2					
Institution	Product/Activities	Expected Completion Date	Final Completion Date	Assessment	
USIENA	Handbook of Managing Structure and Procedures	June, 2021	June, 2021	Totally fulfilled	
UNIMED	Report (Needs Analysis)	September, 2021	September, 2021	Totally fulfilled	
	Report (Catalog)	September, 2021	September, 2021	Totally fulfilled	
	Report (Position Paper)	December, 2023		Not fulfilled	
UMON	Informative material for the summer schools (First edition)	September, 2021	September, 2021	Totally fulfilled	
	Guideline for the students' recruitment strategy. (First edition)	September, 2021	September, 2021	Totally fulfilled	
	Professor Working Package (First edition)	September, 2021	September, 2021	Totally fulfilled	
UCAR USF	Percentage of places demanded with respect to the number of places offered	October, 2021	First edition		
				July, 2022	Partially fulfilled
				July, 2022	Partially fulfilled
				July, 2022	Partially fulfilled
				July, 2022	Partially fulfilled



	Sfax			<b>Not fulfilled</b>
	Percentage of students who complete the course	October, 2021	First edition	
	Sousse		July, 2022	<b>Partially fulfilled</b>
	Kairouan		July, 2022	<b>Partially fulfilled</b>
	Tunis Al Manar		July, 2022	<b>Partially fulfilled</b>
	Carthage		July, 2022	<b>Partially fulfilled</b>
	Sfax			<b>Not fulfilled</b>
	Percentage of places demanded with respect to the number of places offered	November, 2023 (The last summer course was held in October 2023)	<b>Second and third editions</b>	
	Sousse			<b>Not fulfilled</b>
	Kairouan		December 2023	<b>Totally fulfilled</b>
	Tunis Al Manar		December 2023	<b>Totally fulfilled</b>
	Carthage		December 2023	<b>Partially fulfilled</b>
	Sfax		December 2023	<b>Totally fulfilled</b>
	Percentage of students who complete the course	November, 2023 (The last summer course was held in October 2023)	<b>Second and third editions</b>	
	Sousse			<b>Not fulfilled</b>
	Kairouan		December 2023	<b>Totally fulfilled</b>
	Tunis Al Manar		December 2023	<b>Totally fulfilled</b>

	Carthage		December 2023	Partially fulfilled
	Sfax		December 2023	Totally fulfilled
UNIK	Strategic Plan to disseminate the project	June, 2021	June, 2021	Totally fulfilled

## Product

The average level of quality of the products was satisfactory in the first stage of project development. Most documents meet all the formal requirements. We found only two exceptions motivated by different causes. While WP 2 deliverables did not achieve the highest rating for a minor reason, part of the WP 3 deliverables achieved the lowest rating due to a major reason. The WP 2 documents were integrated in the minutes of the scientific committee, which lacked the logos required by the European Commission. From its part, part of the satisfaction questionnaires linked to WP 3 achieved the worst results because some Universities did not share the requested documents<sup>2</sup> despite the fact that the coordinator of this project insisted on the deadline and several extensions of the deadline were provided. Besides, the data reported were incomplete in some cases.

In the second stage of project development the results are heterogeneous. On the one hand, the quality of the products linked to WP2 increases, due to the improvement of their edition and their publication on the project website. On the other hand, with regard to the products linked to WP3, we first found an impoverishment of quality in the second edition of the summer courses (due to the lack

<sup>2</sup> **First edition** : Overall satisfaction of students: [https://docs.google.com/document/d/18yGJadbAi7axCkQDV-JDPGj51fuj2\\_VZ/edit?usp=sharing&oid=117418976962746290952&rtpof=true&sd=true](https://docs.google.com/document/d/18yGJadbAi7axCkQDV-JDPGj51fuj2_VZ/edit?usp=sharing&oid=117418976962746290952&rtpof=true&sd=true) ; Overall satisfaction of teachers: [https://docs.google.com/document/d/1QUmFXcvhVP6rnD\\_UkB2UDWHfWD3XUv3-/edit?usp=sharing&oid=117418976962746290952&rtpof=true&sd=true](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1QUmFXcvhVP6rnD_UkB2UDWHfWD3XUv3-/edit?usp=sharing&oid=117418976962746290952&rtpof=true&sd=true); Overall satisfaction of administrative staff: <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1r3fOPu-r-usgEDIGiNwhXnbnwtkRd3Oa/edit?usp=sharing&oid=117418976962746290952&rtpof=true&sd=true>

of access to data on satisfaction)<sup>3</sup>, and a subsequent marked improvement in the third edition<sup>4</sup>. Finally, the quality of product Position Paper is labeled as weak, since it has not been delivered.

Table 3 systematizes the records achieved in each activity/deliverable.

Table 3					
Product Assessment	Revision and acceptance	Completeness	Clearness	Formal format and logos required	Assessment
Handbook of Managing Structure and Procedures	√	√	√	√	Very Good
Report (Needs Analysis)	√	√	√	√	Very Good
Report (Good practices)	√	√	√	√	Very Good

<sup>3</sup> **Second edition** : 1) overall satisfaction of students : <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1eA8QYxLpRf0tXhQTq3XQju4RgytqZdae/edit?usp=sharing&oid=117741618722595334338&rtpof=true&sd=true> ; 2) Overall satisfaction of teachers : ; 3) Overall satisfaction of administrative staff : <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1LDP6Gz2ZLsovjRHJn2UpUm4FpQmd45OJ/edit?usp=sharing&oid=117741618722595334338&rtpof=true&sd=true>

<sup>4</sup> **Third edition** : 1) overall satisfaction of students : <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1g7qqbTURsBvPjNacsrVY8BJRD6LlO1Y-/edit?usp=sharing&oid=117418976962746290952&rtpof=true&sd=true> ; 2) Overall satisfaction of teachers : <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Y1W4e7aoGSBt9ZsSvYV7k3nYEgTzVtyl/edit?usp=sharing&oid=117418976962746290952&rtpof=true&sd=true> ; 3) Overall satisfaction of administrative staff : <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1drFJ5WSNqL5QR2RGKwaDtTkhzwpPdeef/edit?usp=sharing&oid=117418976962746290952&rtpof=true&sd=true>



PACTUM



	Report (Position Paper)		X	X	X	X	Weak
	Informative material for the summer schools		√	√	√	√	Very Good
	Guideline for the students' recruitment strategy		√	√	√	√	Very Good
	Professor Working Package.		√	√	√	√	Very Good
	Result of the questionnaires on the students' satisfaction						
US	1st ed	*	√	√	√	√	Very Good
	2nd ed		X	X	X	X	Weak
	3rd ed		√	√	√	√	Very Good
UNIK	1st ed	*	√	√	√	√	Very Good
	2nd ed		X	X	X	X	Weak
	3rd ed		√	√	√	√	Very Good
USF	1st ed	*	X	X	X	X	Weak



PACTUM



		2 <sup>nd</sup> ed		X	X	X	Weak
		3 <sup>rd</sup> ed		√	√	√	Very Good
	UTM	1 <sup>st</sup> ed	*	X	X	X	Weak
		2 <sup>nd</sup> ed.		X	X	X	Weak
		3 <sup>rd</sup> ed		√	√	√	Very Good
	UCAR	1 <sup>st</sup> ed	*	X	X	X	Weak
		2 <sup>nd</sup> ed		X	X	X	Weak
		3 <sup>rd</sup> ed		√	√	√	Very Good
	Result of the questionnaires on the teachers' satisfaction.						
	US	1 <sup>st</sup> ed	*	√	√	√	Very Good
		2 <sup>nd</sup> ed		X	X	X	Weak
		3 <sup>rd</sup> ed		X	X	X	Weak
	UNIK	1 <sup>st</sup> ed	*	√	√	√	Very Good
		2 <sup>nd</sup> ed		X	X	X	Weak
		3 <sup>rd</sup> ed		√	√	√	Very Good

USF	1st ed	*	X	X	X	Weak
	2nd ed		X	X	X	Weak
	3rd ed		√	√	√	Very Good
UTM	1st ed	*	√	√	√	Very Good
	2nd ed		X	X	X	Weak
	3rd ed		√	√	√	Very Good
UCAR	1st ed	*	X	X	X	Weak
	2nd ed		X	X	X	Weak
	3rd ed		√	√	√	Very Good
Result of the questionnaires on the administrative staff' satisfaction.						
US	1st ed	*	X	X	X	Weak
	2nd ed		X	X	X	Weak
	3rd ed		X	X	X	Weak
UNIK	1st ed		√	√	√	Very Good





PACTUM



		2 <sup>nd</sup> ed	*	x	x	x	Weak
		3 <sup>rd</sup> ed		√	√	√	Very Good
USF		1 <sup>st</sup> ed	*	x	x	x	Weak
		2 <sup>nd</sup> ed		x	x	x	Weak
		3 <sup>rd</sup> ed		√	√	√	Very Good
UTM		1 <sup>st</sup> ed	*	x	√	√	Fair
		2 <sup>nd</sup> ed		x	x	x	Weak
		3 <sup>rd</sup> ed		√	√	√	Very Good
UCAR		1 <sup>st</sup> ed	*	x	x	x	Weak
		2 <sup>nd</sup> ed		x	x	x	Weak
		3 <sup>rd</sup> ed		√	√	√	Very Good
(*) The item is not applicable.							

## Impact

### *Quantitative Assessment*

Firstly, the quantitative assessment of the quality impact of the WP 1 activities/deliverables is not possible. The reason is the lack of studies on the satisfaction associated with the Needs Analysis Report, the Catalog of good practices and the Paper Position.

Second, the quantitative assessment of the quality impact of the WP 3 activities/deliverables is limited. The reason is that the online collective documents created to register the overall satisfaction of students, teachers and administrative staff have been just partially completed in all three editions<sup>5</sup>.

- In the first edition just three Tunisian Universities shared data. The data of the University of Kairouan were complete, whereas the data of the University of Sousse and the University of Tunis el Manar were not. Sousse offered data just on teacher satisfaction, while Tunis El Manar offered data just on teacher and administrative staff satisfaction.
- In the second edition no university provided satisfaction data.
- In the third edition only the Universities of Sfax and Tunis al Manar shared data. The data they shared were complete on student, faculty and administrative staff satisfaction.

<sup>5</sup> **First edition** : 1) overall satisfaction of students: [https://docs.google.com/document/d/18yGJadbAi7axCkQDV-JDPGj51fuj2\\_VZ/edit?usp=sharing&oid=117418976962746290952&rtpof=true&sd=true](https://docs.google.com/document/d/18yGJadbAi7axCkQDV-JDPGj51fuj2_VZ/edit?usp=sharing&oid=117418976962746290952&rtpof=true&sd=true)

2) Overall satisfaction of teachers: [https://docs.google.com/document/d/1QUuFXcvhVP6rnD\\_UkB2UDWHfWD3XUv3-/edit?usp=sharing&oid=117418976962746290952&rtpof=true&sd=true](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1QUuFXcvhVP6rnD_UkB2UDWHfWD3XUv3-/edit?usp=sharing&oid=117418976962746290952&rtpof=true&sd=true)

3) Overall satisfaction of administrative staff: <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1r3fOPu-r-usgEDiGiNwhXnbnwtkRd3Oa/edit?usp=sharing&oid=117418976962746290952&rtpof=true&sd=true>

**Second edition** : 1) overall satisfaction of students :

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1eA8QYxLpRf0tXhQTq3XQju4RgytqZdae/edit?usp=sharing&oid=117741618722595334338&rtpof=true&sd=true> ; 2) Overall satisfaction of teachers : ; 3) Overall satisfaction of administrative staff :

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1LDP6Gz2ZLsovjRHJn2UpUm4FpQmd45OJ/edit?usp=sharing&oid=117741618722595334338&rtpof=true&sd=true> .

**Third edition** : 1) overall satisfaction of students :

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1g7qqbTURsBvPjNacsrvY8BJRD6LLO1Y-/edit?usp=sharing&oid=117418976962746290952&rtpof=true&sd=true> ; 2) Overall satisfaction of teachers :

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Y1W4e7aoGSBt9ZsSvYV7k3nYEgTzVtyl/edit?usp=sharing&oid=117418976962746290952&rtpof=true&sd=true> ; 3) Overall satisfaction of administrative staff :

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1drFJ5WSNqL5QR2RGKwaDtTkhzwpPdeef/edit?usp=sharing&oid=117418976962746290952&rtpof=true&sd=true>

Due to the lack of data, it is not possible to evaluate the evolution of satisfaction levels in any sector at any university over the three editions of the summer courses. In any case, it is worth noting that in the cases where data are available, the level of faculty and staff satisfaction is higher than the level of student satisfaction.

Table 4 systematizes the records achieved in each activity/deliverable.

Table 4					
Activity/Deliverable			Level of Satisfaction		Assessment
Need Analysis			No data		
Catalog of Good Practices			No data		
Position Paper			No data		
Summer Schools	Students	Kairouan	1st ed	Sufficient	Medium satisfaction
			2 <sup>nd</sup> ed	No data	
			3 <sup>rd</sup> ed	No data	
		Tunis el Manar	1st ed	Sufficient	Medium satisfaction
			2 <sup>nd</sup> ed	No data	
			3 <sup>rd</sup> ed	Satisfying	Medium satisfaction
		Sousse	1st ed	No data	
			2 <sup>nd</sup> ed	No data	



PACTUM



			3rd ed	No data		
		Sfax	1st ed	No data		
			2nd ed	No data		
			3rd ed	Satisfying	Medium satisfaction	
			Carthage	1st ed	No data	
		2nd ed		No data		
		3rd ed		No data		
	Teachers	Kairouan	1st ed	Very satisfying	High Satisfaction	
				2nd ed	No data	
				3rd ed	No data	
			Tunis el Manar	1st ed	Very satisfying	High Satisfaction
				2nd ed	No data	
				3rd ed	Very satisfying	High Satisfaction
			Sousse	1st ed	Very satisfying	High Satisfaction
				2nd ed	No data	
				3rd ed	No data	
			Sfax	1st ed	No data	
				2nd ed	No data	



			3rd ed	Satisfying	Medium satisfaction	
		Carthage	1st ed	No data		
			2nd ed	No data		
			3rd ed	No data		
	Adm. Staff	Kairouan	1st ed	Very Satisfying	High Satisfaction	
				2nd ed	No data	
				3rd ed	No data	
			Tunis el Manar	1st ed	Very Satisfying	High Satisfaction
				2nd ed	No data	
				3rd ed	Very Satisfying	High Satisfaction
			Sousse	1st ed	No data	
				2nd ed	No data	
				3rd ed	No data	
			Sfax	1st ed	No data	
				2nd ed	No data	
				3rd ed	Very Satisfying	High Satisfaction
		Carthage	1st ed	No data		
			2nd ed	No data		



			3rd ed	No data	
--	--	--	--------	---------	--

### Qualitative Assessment

The qualitative assessment of the quality impact of the summer courses at the end of the first stage of the project development showed the strengths and the difficulties that the Tunisian Universities had found when organizing the first edition of these events, as well as the lessons learned<sup>6</sup>. Despite the level of participation in this process being low, some conclusions were drawn.

In a very summary way, it should be noted that the difficulties in the preparation and conduction of the summer courses were related to technical questions (connection to the Internet and courses given online by European teachers), as well as problems related to the pandemic (the student mobility and recruitment). On the other hand, the highlighted strength components referred to collective work, institutional collaboration and the high motivation of students and staff. Hence the most remarkable aspect, despite the difficulties, was the generation of synergies among the different collectives involved (staff, teachers, and students).

In relation to the lessons learned, the answers basically reinforced the positive aspects such as the synergies created, the institutional collaboration reached, and the dissemination of these courses. The feedback also insisted on the importance of improving the technical aspects to keep the courses online. The last more important lesson learned referred to the strategic relevance of attracting not only academics to the courses, but also collectives from civil society, professionals, NGOs.

Table 5 systematizes the records.

<sup>6</sup>Qualitative quality assessment of the impact of summer courses, 2021 <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1cPaFIVlv-zDSSgl790u-ARH94WJ7nIV-/edit?usp=sharing&oid=117418976962746290952&rtpof=true&sd=true>

Table 5			
Dimension		Contribution	Assessment
Strengths	Kairouan		Weak
	Tunis el Manar	X	Very Good
	Sousse	X	Very Good
	Sfax		Weak
	Carthage		Weak
Difficulties	Kairouan		Weak
	Tunis el Manar	X	Very Good
	Sousse	X	Very Good
	Sfax		Weak
	Carthage		Weak
Lesson Learned	Kairouan		Weak
	Tunis el Manar	X	Very Good
	Sousse	X	Very Good
	Sfax		Weak
	Carthage		Weak

From its part, the qualitative assessment of the quality impact of the second and third editions of the summer course at the end of the second stage of the project development shows the continuity and change in the perceptions on project difficulties and strengths as well as new learned lessons<sup>7</sup>. It is important to highlight the outstanding increase in the level of the participation of the Tunisian Universities in this second process of qualitative evaluation, since all of them have responded to the questions proposed by the WP5 team.

First, the main difficulties are related to technique questions, such as internet connection. COVID19 has not been one of the biggest problems, as occurred in the first edition of summer schools, but it has occasionally caused some inconvenience for the mobility of teachers or students.

Secondly, in relation to the strengths, a notable improvement can be seen in the second and third editions with respect to the first one. The main positive changes refer to the high interest and motivation of students, the good collaboration between universities and the teaching and administrative staff, as well as the participation of agents external to the universities, the improvement of communication processes, and the consolidation of spaces and classrooms for the development of the courses.

Finally, regarding learned lessons, the organizers of the second and third editions of the summer courses have stressed the relevance of maintaining both the synergies created between the different universities and the diversity of participant profiles by involving professionals and members of parties and associations. In addition, practices such as the preparation of resources and working documents available to participants in advance and the participation of doctoral students to assist administrative staff in the organization of the courses, have been considered as elements to keep for next courses or masters. Maintaining the participatory methodology and engaging practitioners/experts in the courses have also been remarked as valuable learning achievements.

Table 6 systematizes the records.

---

<sup>7</sup>Qualitative quality assessment of the impact of summer courses, 2022 and 2023,  
<https://docs.google.com/document/d/12OtCsRxw-DBQkosm1f0a7mQB1KV7t3fj/edit>



Table 6			
Dimension		Contribution	Assessment
Strengths	Kairouan	X	Very Good
	Tunis el Manar	X	Very Good
	Sousse	X	Very Good
	Sfax	X	Very Good
	Carthage	X	Very Good
Difficulties	Kairouan	X	Very Good
	Tunis el Manar	X	Very Good
	Sousse	X	Very Good
	Sfax	X	Very Good
	Carthage	X	Very Good

Lesson Learned	Kairouan	X	Very Good
	Tunis el Manar	X	Very Good
	Sousse	X	Very Good
	Sfax	X	Very Good
	Carthage	X	Very Good

### Implementation of Improvement Plan

The present report indicates the level of achievement in the implementation of the improvement plan during the second period of the project considering whether or not evidence of compliance exists and has been submitted to WP5. Table 7 shows poor results in this respect, given that just the USIENA and the Tunis Al Manar University have contributed to the compilation of evidence of the actions taken<sup>8</sup>.

For issues 1 and 2, evidence has been requested only to the University of Siena, as responsible for project management. On these two issues, evidence provided allows us to confirm that actions have been carried out in order to give due compliance within the framework of the Implementation of the Improvement Plan.

Issue 3 envisaged two strategies/actions. Evidence for Action 1 was requested to Tunisian partner universities as organizers of the courses. Of the five universities involved, only Tunis al Manar replied to the request. For the rest, there is no data. In the case of Tunis al Manar, online courses were not

<sup>8</sup> Please, find in this link a folder which compiles evidence provided: [https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1Idsa9CA8Ow3\\_Gwmjrfq3Sd2PYnXDyhoX?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1Idsa9CA8Ow3_Gwmjrfq3Sd2PYnXDyhoX?usp=sharing)

conducted in the second and third editions, since the courses consisted of face-to-face sessions. This is why, despite having obtained a response, no evidence can be presented. The action was not needed, indeed. In the case of Action 2, information was requested to the University of Siena, as responsible for the operational and financial management of the project. In this regard, the invoices concerning the "equipment" expenditures (still not inventoried because Siena will do it for the interim report) are provided as evidence.

Issue 4 envisaged three strategies/actions. Regarding Action 1, only Tunisia el Manar (out of the 5 Tunisian partner universities consulted) has provided evidence. In the case of Action 2, the information was requested to the University of Siena. Unfortunately, the outsourcing for an external management of the social accounts and the website did not take place at all, therefore no evidence is presented. The information for Action 3 was also requested to the University of Siena. The result is that no evidence exists for a strategy aimed at holding mixed face-to-face and online sessions to offer both local students living far away from the Tunisian partner universities and foreign students the possibility to participate in the Summer Courses. What is provided in relation to the students involved in the summer schools are screenshots from the first session of the summer schools in which international students also participated. In contrast, the last two editions were designed for Tunisian students only, and EACEA clearly pointed this out, but not considering the possibility of participation of local students living far away from the Tunisian partner universities.

Issue 5 envisaged one action. Only Tunisia el Manar (out of the 5 Tunisian partner universities consulted) has provided evidence. The evidence provided is a screenshot of the programmes of the summer courses where you can find a short bio of the teaching staff. In the third edition of the summer school, they involved professionals.

Table 7			
Issue	Strategy/Action	Partner	Assessment
1	1	UNISIENA	Totally fulfilled



PACTUM



	2	UNISIENA	Totally fulfilled
2	1	UNISIENA	Totally fulfilled
3	1	Carthage	Not fulfilled
		Kairouan	Not fulfilled
		Sfax	Not fulfilled
		Sousse	Not fulfilled
		Tunis al Manar	Not fulfilled
	2	UNISIENA	Totally fulfilled
4	1	Carthage	Not fulfilled
		Kairouan	Not fulfilled
		Sfax	Not fulfilled
		Sousse	Not fulfilled
		Tunis al Manar	Totally fulfilled
	2	UNISIENA	Not fulfilled
	3	UNISIENA	Not fulfilled
5	1	Carthage	Not fulfilled
		Kairouan	Not fulfilled
		Sfax	Not fulfilled



PACTUM



		Sousse	<b>Not fulfilled</b>
		Tunis al Manar	<b>Totally fulfilled</b>