



Engaging SDGs for Transformative Education
and Enhanced Sustainability in Universities

Quality Assurance Report

December 2025



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

About SDG4U

SDG4U key priority is to stimulate innovative learning and teaching practices through engaging SDGs to transformative education and sustainability practices in universities. The project will support and enhance the implementation of SDGs in higher education by embedding sustainability across teaching, research, operations, and community outreach.

The project is funded by the Erasmus+ programme of the European Union and spans over 36 months (December 2022 – December 2025).

Members of the Consortium

- ETHNIKO KAI KAPODISTRIAKO PANEPISTIMIO ATHINON (EKPA)
- PANTEIO PANEPISTIMIO KOINONIKON KAI POLITIKON EPISTIMON (PANTEIO)
- THE AMERICAN COLLEGE OF GREECE RESEARCH CENTER (ACG-RC)
- UNIVERSIDAD DE MURCIA (UMU)
- UNIVERSITY COLLEGE CORK - NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF IRELAND, CORK (UCC)
- UNIMED - UNIONE DELLE UNIVERSITA DEL MEDITERRANEO (UNIMED)

More at: <https://www.sdg4uproject.eu/>

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 the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Document Information

Project Title	Engaging SDGs for Transformative Education and Enhanced Sustainability in Universities
Project n.	2022-1-EL01-KA220-HED-000088776
Deliverable	Quality Assurance Report
Work package	WP1
Status	Final
Author	ETHNIKO KAI KAPODISTRIAKO PANEPISTIMIO ATHINON
Responsible Authors*	EKPA: Athanasia Alonistioti, Georgios Demesiotis, Panagiotis Kontopoulos, Charoula Ntelopoulou, Andreas Papandreou, Xenofon Stribis
Contributors*	PANTEIO: Antonios Alevizos, Magdalini Eleftheroglou, Charalampos Meletiadis ACG-RC: Stella Apostolaki, Paraskevi Papadopoulou UMU: Clara Alvarez De Toledo Martinez, Inés López López, Longinos Marin Rives, Amelia Pérez García UNIMED: Caterina Gravina, Martina Zipoli <small>*names in alphabetical order</small>
Abstract	The deliverable presents the Quality Assurance Report (QAR) of the project in compliance with the project description and all applicable rules and guidelines. It describes guidelines and criteria for effective operational project management by underlying the set of methods, quality standards, quality assurance activities, and various tools and means used throughout the project's duration. It also includes indicators that were implemented to determine whether and to what extent the project meets its objectives and achieves its results while maintaining the required level of quality and improving the project at each stage of its execution.

Executive Summary

This Quality Assurance and Evaluation Report (QAR) presents the final assessment of the Erasmus+ project "SDG4U - Engaging SDGs for Transformative Education and Enhanced Sustainability in Universities." The report confirms that the project was highly successful in execution, delivering all milestones on time through robust, multi-level governance and quality control procedures.

Beyond procedural success, the QA evaluation demonstrates significant strategic achievement. The project implemented a coherent 'Theory of Change' linking diagnostic mapping (WP2) to targeted capacity building (WP3) and institutional action (WP4). Key outputs include a novel SDG Mapping Tool, training programmes for over 520 participants (rated 4.53/5 in satisfaction), and the implementation of 14 new campus sustainability initiatives.

The project has established a strong foundation for long-term impact and sustainability. All partner universities have developed formal Campus Sustainability Roadmaps, committing to the continued use of project tools and methodologies. The transition from a project consortium to a sustained Community of Practice is underway.

The SDG4U project has fully met its objectives, produced high-quality, relevant outputs, and achieved meaningful short- to medium-term outcomes. The primary QA recommendation is to actively manage the post-project legacy framework to ensure the long-term institutional impact envisioned by the project.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	4
1. Introduction.....	7
2. Aim of the QA Report	8
3. Project evaluation.....	9
3.1. Analysis of Strategic Coherence & Overall Impact	9
3.1.1 Evaluation of Strategic Alignment.....	9
3.1.2 Conclusion on Coherence	10
3.2 Evaluation of Methodology & Process Effectiveness.....	10
3.2.1 Governance & Management Structure: From Design to Practice.....	10
3.2.2. Quality Control Procedures: Ensuring Consistency and Standardization	11
3.2.3. Risk Management & Corrective Action: A Proactive System.....	11
3.2.4. Internal vs. External Evaluation Balance.....	11
3.3 Output & Outcome Assessment	12
3.3.1. Tangible Outputs: Quality, Usability, and Innovation.....	12
3.3.2. Intangible Outcomes: Behavioral and Institutional Shifts	13
3.3.3. Critical Synthesis and Unanswered Questions	13
3.4 Impact & Sustainability Analysis.....	14
3.4.1. Assessing Pathways to Impact	14
3.4.2. Exploitation and Sustainability Plans: A Critical Evaluation	15
3.5 Critical Synthesis, Lessons Learned & Future Recommendations	15
3.6 Verification of Deliverables Against Project Plan	17
3.6.1 WP2: Mapping Tool & Implementation – Verified Delivery	17
3.6.2. WP3: Promoting SDGs – Verified Delivery	17
3.6.3. WP4: Advancing Campus Sustainability – Verified Delivery	18
3.6.4. WP5: Impact & Dissemination – Verified Delivery	18
3.6.5 Conclusion on Deliverable Verification.....	18
3.7 Meetings and Events Quality Control	18
Table 1. Documentation of meetings/events.....	19
3.8 Promotional materials Quality Control	19
3.9 Project website and electronic media Quality Control.....	19
4. Quality Assurance Strategy and Evaluation Procedures.....	21
4.1. Work Package Leaders level.....	21
4.2. Coordinator level	21
4.3. Steering Committee level	21
4.4. Cross-Work Package Peer Review Process	21

4.5 Internal Quality Assurance	22
Table 2. Project Management Quality Assurance	24
Table 3. Project Communication Quality Assurance	24
Table 4. Project Implementation Quality Assurance	25
Table 5. Project Training Activities Quality Assurance	25
Table 6. Project Dissemination Activities Quality Assurance	26
Table 7. Project Milestones	27
Table 8. Work Package Progress Indicators.....	28
5. External Evaluator report.....	31
5.1 Introduction	31
5.2. Overall Assessment of the Quality Assurance Report	31
5.2.1 Strengths	31
5.2.2 Areas for Development.....	32
5.3 Evaluation of Key Components	32
5.3.1. QA Strategy and Governance.....	32
5.3.2. Methodology and Process Effectiveness	32
5.3.3. Output and Outcome Assessment	32
5.3.4. Impact and Sustainability Analysis.....	33
5.3.5. Critical Synthesis and Lessons Learned	33
5.4. Critical Observations and Recommendations for the QAR	33
5.5. Conclusion	33
Annex 1. Project Evaluation Questionnaire	35
Annex 2. Deliverable Quality Assessment Questionnaire.....	37
Annex 3. Table of Achieved Results	39
Annex 4. Work Package KPIs at the Application Level.....	47
Annex 5. Expected Deliverable per Work Package	50

1. Introduction

As outlined in the SDG4U project application, a Quality Assurance Report (QAR) was proposed to ensure project quality and has been developed in collaboration with the project partners and coordinator. The QAR was presented to the Consortium's project management team and all partner institutions to gather feedback, and the final version is now complete. It is designed to function as a quality assurance manual, providing clear procedures and guidelines for evaluating project management, deliverables, and outcomes.

The main aspects controlled were the following: the management of the project; the processes of the project (activities, meetings, communications); the outputs and the tangible products (learning materials, mapping tool); the project impacts on beneficiary universities, target groups, and stakeholders; and the project plans especially the plans for dissemination, exploitation, and sustainability.

2. Aim of the QA Report

The main aim of the QA report was to provide the project consortium with a set of quality assurance activities, standards, control measures, criteria, procedures, and mechanisms, which were implemented throughout the project lifecycle to ensure:

- Monitoring and documenting the progress of the project's activities.
- Flexible management, coordination, and implementation of the project's work packages, allowing for early detection of deviations and timely corrective actions.
- High-quality standards in the structure, processes, and results of the project. Processes and outputs were monitored and evaluated for relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency, in alignment with the project's schedule, objectives, and defined results.
- Efficient risk management to address emerging changes and challenges in project activities, ensuring continuous improvement through ongoing monitoring, evaluation, and feedback mechanisms.

The Quality Assurance strategy was established at the start of the project and applied consistently to all project activities, management, and monitoring efforts. Specific mechanisms were deployed throughout the three-year duration of the project to monitor and evaluate all processes and outcomes effectively.

The QA focused specifically on the internal evaluation of quality and was designed to:

- Evaluate the project's objectives, activities, and timelines.
- Assess its impact.
- Identify critical factors to address risks effectively.
- Evaluate results and achievements using defined quality indicators.

3. Project evaluation

The Consortium has developed a Quality Control (QC) procedure and monitoring tools to assess and ensure the quality of work throughout the project. Specifically, the purpose of QC is to ensure that project deliverables are completed to a high standard, and collaboration within the project partnership is adequate as described in both the project proposal and the Partnership Agreement.

An overall project evaluation questionnaire (Annex 1) was distributed to partners at the project's midpoint (M18) and conclusion (M36). Its purpose was to evaluate whether the project met initial expectations and to collect suggestions for future initiatives. The questionnaire focused on five key areas, including project management, progress and implementation, activities, partnership cooperation, and project sustainability. The findings informed both the interim and final reports.

Additionally, targeted questionnaires were developed and distributed to evaluate specific aspects such as deliverables, events, trainings, communication channels, and overall dissemination efforts.

A project management structure was established during the Kick-off meeting to ensure efficiency, decisiveness, flexibility, and high-quality outcomes. This structure included the Coordinator, the Project Management Team (PMT), the Work Package Leaders (WPLs) and the Steering Committee (SC), consisting of all Work Package Leaders.

The Work Package Leaders, in collaboration with the Coordinator, were tasked with overseeing the implementation of project activities to achieve the objectives. Each partner held equal and independent responsibility for managing assigned activities, budget allocation, and reporting to the respective Work Package Leader, who was accountable for local project management.

Representatives from all partner institutions periodically reviewed the progress of activities and determined necessary contingency measures, with a strong emphasis on maintaining the project's overall impact.

3.1. Analysis of Strategic Coherence & Overall Impact

While the individual Work Packages (WPs) were managed effectively, a critical function of the Quality Assurance and Evaluation Report is to synthesize evidence from across the project to assess the achievement of its overarching strategic goals.

To assess the achievement of the project's overarching strategic goals, the consortium's Quality Assurance (QA) process used a **'Theory of Change' framework**. This framework synthesized evidence from across all Work Packages against the project's stated priority: *“to stimulate innovative learning and teaching practices through engaging SDGs to transformative education and sustainability practices in universities”*.

3.1.1 Evaluation of Strategic Alignment

Transformative Education

- The Mapping Tool (WP2) provided a diagnostic baseline, revealing the extent and nature of SDG integration in existing modules across partner institutions.
- The Train the Trainers program and workshop materials (WP3) were then explicitly designed to address identified gaps found in the literature review, equipping faculty with pedagogical strategies (e.g., project-based learning, systems thinking) for SDG education, moving beyond content delivery to competence development.
- The project successfully created a feedback loop where research (WP2) directly informed capacity-building (WP3), ensuring activities were targeted and relevant.

Embedding Sustainability Across University Functions

- The project targeted multiple university dimensions starting with Teaching & Learning that were addressed by WP2 and WP3, as mentioned above.
- Next dimension is Operations & Community Outreach on WP4's with campus sustainability initiatives and awareness campaigns demonstrating a "living lab" approach, engaging faculty and students in practical action.
- The Literature Review and Call for Action (WP3) synthesized current research and framed a future agenda, while the mapping tool methodology itself constitutes a research output.
- The project structure inherently promoted a "whole-institution" approach. The parallel work on modules (WP3) and operations (WP4) prevented isolated thinking and modeled the integrated approach necessary for genuine sustainability transformation.

3.1.2 Conclusion on Coherence

The project's design demonstrated strong internal logic and coherence. The Work Packages were not separate tasks but interdependent components of a larger change model comprising of: Diagnosis (WP2) → Capacity Building & Innovation (WP3) + Institutional Action (WP4) → Dissemination & Legacy (WP5).

3.2 Evaluation of Methodology & Process Effectiveness

This section evaluates the design but also the operational effectiveness, adaptability, and impact of project processes and outcomes.

3.2.1 Governance & Management Structure: From Design to Practice

The three-tiered management structure (WP Leaders, Coordinator, Steering Committee) proved to be a success factor.

- This structure enabled clear accountability and rapid decision-making. For example, when a technical challenge delayed the beta version of the Mapping Tool (WP2) by two weeks in Month 16, the issue was escalated from the WP Leader to the Steering Committee, implementing a contingency plan that prevented downstream delays in WP3 training material development.
- The final project evaluation (Annex 1, M36) showed partners rated the effectiveness of the management structure at an average of **3.5 out of 4**, with specific praise for the "clarity of reporting lines" and "transparency in decision-making."
- The predefined meeting rhythm (regular online meetings, ad-hoc calls) was essential. However, we learned that dedicating some minutes of each meeting where each WP

leader or partner could flag emerging issues proved more effective than relying solely on written reports for early problem detection.

3.2.2. Quality Control Procedures: Ensuring Consistency and Standardization

The standardized templates, documentation requirements (Table 1), and reviewed questionnaires (Annex 2) were carefully implemented.

- Analysis of deliverable submissions shows that after the initial four project meetings, the rate of submissions requiring formatting corrections dropped. The use of the Deliverable Quality Assessment Questionnaire (Annex 2) created a consistent internal review filter, raising the average quality score of draft deliverables as rated by the Coordinator from **3.2/4 at M18 to 3.8/4 at M36**.
- The QC procedures for "Meetings and Events" (Section 3.2) were successfully adapted for online format. For the Final Conference (November 2025), a hybrid participation model was used, and the QC checklist was expanded to include metrics for face-to-face engagement, ensuring quality was maintained across both participation modes.
- While the QA procedures effectively ensured the quality of tangible outputs, the evaluation of participatory processes—such as workshop facilitation, collaborative dialogue, and engagement dynamics—relied primarily on post-event satisfaction surveys. This limited the ability to assess the depth of interactive learning and collaborative quality. To address this in future cycles, we recommend the integration of a 'Process Quality Scorecard' for interactive events, including indicators for facilitation effectiveness, participant inclusivity, and collaborative output quality.

3.2.3. Risk Management & Corrective Action: A Proactive System

The QA strategy emphasized "flexible management" and "timely corrective actions." This was operationalized through the Project Management Team's (PMT) active monitoring.

- At M20, the mid-term project evaluation survey flagged a concern from two partners regarding the complexity of the draft training materials from WP3. The Coordinator, in consultation with the WP3 Leader, initiated a targeted session with the concerned partners. This led to a revised creation of the deliverable which subsequently increased alignment with the objectives of the project and ultimately the trainee's satisfaction in the pilot training.
- The questionnaire (Annex 1) served a dual purpose as both a reporting and a diagnostic instrument. For example, when scores for "partnership cooperation" dropped at M18, analysis revealed communication overload as the cause. To address this, the PMT implemented a consolidated weekly email digest following meetings, a change that led to a measurable recovery in the score by M36.

3.2.4. Internal vs. External Evaluation Balance

The QA strategy effectively balanced internal evaluation with structured cross-consortium critique to ensure objectivity and quality. The primary mechanism was a three-tier review system:

- WP-Level Self-Assessment: Initial quality control was conducted by each Work Package team, ensuring ownership and alignment with specific WP objectives.

- **Structured Cross-WP Peer Review:** To mitigate self-assessment bias and foster interdisciplinary insight, a formal Cross-Work Package Peer Review Process was implemented. Prior to Coordinator review, each major deliverable was assigned to a review team from a different WP (e.g., WP4 reviewed WP3 training materials; WP2 reviewed WP5 dissemination plans). Reviewers used a standardized checklist focusing on:
 - **Clarity & Usability:** Is the content accessible to its intended audience?
 - **Strategic Alignment:** Does the deliverable support the overall project goals?
 - **Interdisciplinary Relevance:** Does it connect meaningfully to other project dimensions?
- **Coordinator & Steering Committee Consolidation:** Feedback from the peer review was consolidated by the Coordinator, and final approval was granted by the Steering Committee, serving as the ultimate quality gate.

3.3 Output & Outcome Assessment

The measure of a project's success lies in the quality, relevance, and impact of its results, along with task completion. This section moves beyond the procedural "Quality Control" of deliverables to present a consolidated evaluation of key outputs and outcomes against the project's objectives, drawing on the evidence compiled in Annex 3.

3.3.1. Tangible Outputs: Quality, Usability, and Innovation

The project generated a suite of high-quality, tangible outputs, all delivered on time. Their value, however, is best assessed by their design, adoption, and user feedback.

- **The SDG4U Mapping Tool (WP2): A Foundational Diagnostic Output**

The tool was successfully developed and deployed, meeting 100% of its technical specifications. Its comparative analysis with the UCC model ensured it was both grounded in proven methodology and adapted for the Academic context.

The tool processed **93** submissions from **57** professors, analyzing courses that integrate SDGs. This represents significant engagement from the partner institutions, providing a robust dataset that can also act as a functional research instrument.

The analysis revealed that while SDG integration is widespread (**average of 14 SDGs per module**), depth varies. The tool successfully quantified this, identifying percentages of integration. This diagnostic insight provided the evidence base for the targeted training created in WP3.

The tool's utility was confirmed by end-users, receiving an **average usage score of 4.1/5**. Qualitative feedback highlighted its value for "course gap analysis" and "accreditation preparation."

- **Training Programme & Materials (WP3): Bridging Diagnosis to Capacity Building**

The project delivered three distinct, professionally designed training seminars. Their quality is demonstrated by a structured pedagogical approach, grounded in gaps identified from the literature review and the mapping tool's results (WP2), with a clear focus on practical application.

The materials were stress-tested through direct engagement, reaching **527 participants** across all target groups (faculty, staff, students). This covered the expected participation targets.

An overall satisfaction score of 4.53/5 demonstrates effective program delivery with particularly high scores for facilitator quality (4.7/5) and practical utility (4.5/5). One potential area for future refinement would be the inclusion of more discipline-specific case studies.

3.3.2. Intangible Outcomes: Behavioral and Institutional Shifts

Beyond tangible outputs, the project sought to create changes in awareness, practice, and institutional planning.

- **Increased Awareness & Changed Practices (WP4)**

The pre- and post-awareness survey analysis provided precise evidence of the outcomes achieved.

The response rate for the post-awareness survey was lower than that of the pre-awareness survey, primarily because the follow-up was more detailed—assessing each SDG individually. This greater level of detail attracted responses primarily from highly committed participants, a factor that signals strong potential for the sustainability of the project's outcomes.

This transition from awareness to concrete action is demonstrated by two key results:

- Immediate Implementation: Fourteen new sustainability initiatives were launched across partner campuses.
- Strategic Planning: Each institution developed a formal Campus Sustainability Roadmap, creating a structured pathway for long-term impact.

For example:

- At UMU, a clothing exchange store launched on campus following workshop discussions on circular economy.
- At ACG, the new Gender Equality Committee directly referenced SDG4U training materials in its inaugural policy draft.

These narratives complement quantitative metrics and highlight the human and institutional dimensions of change. Moving forward, we will integrate structured qualitative collection into each WP's reporting cycle.

-
- **Network and Collaboration Outcomes**

The final partnership evaluation noted improved collaboration scores. The process of jointly developing tools, materials, and campaigns cultivated a durable community of practice on SDG integration that partners intend to maintain.

The consortium itself became a functional network capable of collaborative research and development, as demonstrated by the successful co-creation of all project outputs.

3.3.3. Critical Synthesis and Unanswered Questions

While the outputs are strong and initial outcomes positive, a thorough QA assessment must also identify limitations and gaps in evidence.

The project successfully created a work cycle: Diagnose (WP2) → Train & Equip (WP3) → Act & Plan (WP4) → Disseminate (WP5). Each stage produced validated outputs that fed the next.

The project has met its short-term objectives, evidenced by participant satisfaction, awareness, and plan creation. To capture and ensure the long-term integration of new practices and roadmap realization, the framework for ongoing evaluation has been formally transitioned to each institution's Sustainability Action Plan.

3.4 Impact & Sustainability Analysis

A project's true legacy is determined by what endures and evolves after its funding concludes. This section evaluates the SDG4U project's approach to creating lasting impact, examining both the embedded results within partner institutions and the concrete plans for their exploitation and continuity.

3.4.1. Assessing Pathways to Impact

The project's impact pathway can be analyzed on three levels: individual, institutional, and systemic.

- **Individual Impact (Capacity Building)**

The training of **527 faculty, staff, and students** (WP3) has directly built human capital. The high satisfaction scores (**4,53/5**) and specific feedback on "usefulness" indicate that this capacity can be applicable rather than theoretical.

To ensure this individual impact remains, all training materials (material, guides, presentations) have been published on the project website. This allows trained individuals to reuse and adapt materials and enables new educators to access them indefinitely.

- **Institutional Impact (Embedding into Structures)**

The most significant indicator of potential sustainability is the institutionalization of project outputs. This is demonstrated by:

1. The **Mapping Tool** that has been used by university professors to map their courses and by students to become aware of SDGs value in courses and their daily life.
2. The **Campus Sustainability Initiatives** implemented in WP4 are actions that were adapted as part of the Sustainability policy for their universities along with the existing strategic planning.
3. Partner institutions have committed to **maintaining the project website** with the availability of the mapping tool, the training material and links to initiatives for a minimum of three years post-project.

- **Systemic/Network Impact (Community of Practice)**

Partners have cultivated the consortium into a genuine Community of Practice (CoP) for SDG integration, as shown by their sustained engagement in a shared MS Teams space and their use of collaboratively developed resources.

3.4.2. Exploitation and Sustainability Plans: A Critical Evaluation

The project's Dissemination and Exploitation Plan (WP5) provides a formal framework for sustainability. Its effectiveness is evaluated below.

- **Strengths of the Plan**

Each major output has a leader institution responsible for its development, updates, and user support.

All intellectual outputs are released on the project's website, removing barriers to adoption by non-partner institutions. This maximizes the potential for multiplicative impact.

The plan includes a strategy for engaging the **UNIMED network** of 150+ universities, offering a ready-made channel to scale the project's results across the Mediterranean region and beyond.

- **Gap Identified**

While financial sustainability for digital tools remains a challenge, the project has initiated integration into partner IT systems (e.g., EKPA subdomain hosting). To ensure long-term impact tracking, we have developed a **Post-Project Legacy Framework**, to be adopted by each partner institution. This includes annual reporting on:

1. Continued use of the SDG4U Mapping Tool (user logins, new course entries)
2. Progress on Campus Sustainability Roadmaps
3. New academic or operational initiatives inspired by project outputs. A rotating 'Legacy Coordinator' from the consortium will compile updates for the first three years post-project, ensuring sustained visibility and accountability.

3.5 Critical Synthesis, Lessons Learned & Future Recommendations

The final stage of the Quality Assurance process involves synthesizing evidence, reflecting on challenges, and formulating actionable insights. This section presents the consortium's integrated conclusions and recommendations derived from the project data and experiences.

3.5.1. Synthesis of Key Evidence Against Project Aims

The project's primary aim was to *stimulate innovative learning and teaching practices and embed sustainability across university functions*. The confirmed evidence from Annex 3 and previous sections demonstrates clear progress toward this aim:

- **Evidence for Stimulating Innovation**

The SDG4U Mapping Tool provides a novel, data-driven methodology for auditing SDG integration in modules/courses, moving beyond assessment. Its use by **745** users to analyze **93** courses proves its use as an innovative practice.

The training program, rated **4.53/5** for satisfaction, introduced educators to concrete methodologies for SDG-based teaching, directly addressing the "innovative learning and teaching methodology" objective. The creation of three distinct training seminars materializes this innovation into reusable resources.

- **Evidence for Embedding Sustainability**

The implementation of **14 new campus initiatives** provides proof of implementing sustainability into university operations and planning cycles.

The mapping exercise revealed that **51%** of reviewed courses demonstrate high SDG integration, establishing a baseline. The subsequent training targeted the remaining **49%**, creating a clear pathway for deeper and more systematic course embedding.

3.5.2. Critical Reflection on Challenges & Limitations

The project encountered and managed several challenges.

- The mapping tool effectively enabled the gathering of data, but transforming this into a sustained reflective practice demands long-term institutional commitment. Thus, the tool's primary role is that of a foundational catalyst.
- As noted in Sections 3.3 and 3.4, the project's monitoring framework effectively captured outputs and immediate outcomes but cannot measure the longitudinal impact on graduate competencies, institutional carbon footprints, or research agendas. This is a structural limitation of fixed-term projects.

3.5.3. Key Lessons Learned

The following lessons are offered as actionable insights for the consortium and future projects:

- The most effective aspect of the project design was the direct linkage between the diagnostic mapping (WP2) and the capacity-building training (WP3). This evidence-based approach ensured resources were targeted and relevant. Future projects should mandate a similar feedback loop where research directly informs intervention design.
- Sustainability was achieved through the creation of institutional products ready to use in similar user needs. The lesson is to always design project outputs to align with, and feed directly into, existing university governance and planning cycles.
- By involving both faculty and students, the project fostered a broad network of trust across all levels. This shared ownership provides greater resilience than depending on a single coordinator. Future consortium models should intentionally allocate resources to support and empower these multi-level champions.

3.5.4. Recommendations for Future Initiatives

- The integrated methodology (Mapping → Training → Action Planning) serves as a replicable framework. It can function as an "implementation guide," adaptable for use by other universities and networks according to their specific contexts.
- The consortium, or a subset of its members, could establish a shared digital workspace and commit to at least one collaborative activity each year—such as co-authoring a paper or hosting a joint webinar.

- Dissemination efforts were broad, yet external validation was primarily captured through analytics and downloads. In future phases, we recommend incorporating structured external review points, such as inviting non-partner stakeholders to comment on outputs or commissioning a brief external expert review at mid-term and final stages. This would strengthen credibility and provide unbiased perspectives on relevance and applicability beyond the consortium.

3.6 Verification of Deliverables Against Project Plan

This section consolidates the verification that all key deliverables, as evaluated in Sections 3.3 and 3.4, were completed in accordance with the original project plan, specifications, and quality standards defined in the Application Form. It serves as the bridge between the substantive evaluation of outputs and the detailed Quality Assurance procedures described in Chapter 4.

A universal quality expectation for all deliverables was their alignment with the project's strategic goals and specific Work Package (WP) objectives. All deliverables passed through the multi-tiered internal quality review process (WP Leader, Coordinator, Steering Committee) and, where applicable, the **Cross-WP Peer Review Process** (see Section 4.4), and the Deliverable Quality Assessment Questionnaire (Annex 2).

The timely delivery of all outputs, as confirmed by the milestone tracking in Table 7, was a foundational QA success. The following summary confirms the completion and core value proposition of each primary output, drawing from the detailed deliverable reports.

3.6.1 WP2: Mapping Tool & Implementation – Verified Delivery

The deliverable met and exceeded its planned specification, evolving from a proposed tool into a fully functional platform for SDG integration analysis.

- **Verified Against Plan:** The tool was developed using Agile methodology, underwent five iterative versions, and was successfully released and piloted as scheduled (M18). It allows for the assessment of SDGs across academic modules, research, and university operations, fulfilling all core objectives.
- **Key QA Outcome:** The tool's user-centric design and gamified elements (e.g., badge system), which were refined through pilot feedback, directly addressed the planned objective of creating an "**adaptable**" tool for diverse audiences. Its release as an **open-source** template fulfills the planned objective of serving as a standardized model for other institutions.

3.6.2. WP3: Promoting SDGs – Verified Delivery

The suite of deliverables under this WP translated diagnostic insights into actionable educational resources.

- **Verified Against Plan:** The project delivered the planned **Literature Review, Call for Action, and innovative training content** for all 17 SDGs, structured around three core pedagogical methodologies (interdisciplinary, action-based, multi-actor).
- **Key QA Outcome:** The execution of the "**Train the Trainers**" course and the Lifelong Learning Seminars directly achieved the objective of empowering faculty as change agents and engaging academic communities. The high participant satisfaction scores

(4.53/5) and the reach of **527 individuals** validate the effectiveness of these deliverables against their intended impact.

3.6.3. WP4: Advancing Campus Sustainability – Verified Delivery

The deliverables moved the project from awareness to concrete institutional action.

- Verified Against Plan: The WP successfully executed **targeted awareness campaigns**, implemented applied "living lab" initiatives on campus, and conducted the planned **pre- and post-awareness surveys** with over 1,300 total responses.
- Key QA Outcome: The development of five institutional Campus Sustainability Roadmaps and the implementation of **14 new campus initiatives** (e.g., UMU's clothing exchange, ACG's Gender Equality Committee) directly fulfill the deliverable objective of creating "guidelines and replicable examples" for advancing university sustainability. The measurable shift in survey responses provides quantitative evidence of campaign effectiveness.

3.6.4. WP5: Impact & Dissemination – Verified Delivery

The dissemination deliverables ensured project visibility and legacy planning.

- Verified Against Plan: A full Dissemination and Communication Plan was executed, supported by a complete **visual identity** and a suite of promotional materials. The project website and social media channels were maintained actively.
- Key QA Outcome: Quantitative metrics confirm reach and engagement: the website attracted **8,817 unique visitors**, and promotional events significantly exceeded target participation numbers. The Final Dissemination and Exploitation Report provides a comprehensive record, fulfilling the requirement to document and evaluate all dissemination efforts.

3.6.5 Conclusion on Deliverable Verification

All tangible and intangible deliverables defined in the project plan have been completed, published, and subjected to the project's quality control filters. Their quality and relevance are further substantiated by the outcome and impact analysis in Sections 3.3 and 3.4, confirming they were not merely produced but were effectively utilized to drive the project's strategic goals.

3.7 Meetings and Events Quality Control

The Quality Control for meetings and events use tools such as attendance lists, meeting minutes, teaching activity/event reports, and evaluation questionnaires to measure the percentage of achievements for meetings (Kick-off Meeting, project meetings, and Final Meeting) and events (Workshops / Trainings / Webinars, and Final project presentations).

All events organized by project partners included a comprehensive information package for participants, provided in advance, which included the draft agenda. The preparation time varied depending on the type of event or training. A registration process was initiated, and the event schedule allowed for appropriate breaks. When applicable (e.g., for training sessions), feedback forms were distributed to participants.

The organizers of project meetings ensured that the meetings were recorded, and minutes or transcripts were generated. Additionally, posters, roll-ups, and other promotional materials were displayed during the event.

Table 1. Documentation of meetings/events.

Type of meeting/event	Materials	Available at website	Available as shared document
Meetings (Kick-off Meeting, project meetings and work package Meeting, internal Meetings)	News	p	p
	Agenda		p
	List of participants		p
	Minutes / Transcripts		p
	Gallery	p	p
	Presentations		p
Workshops / Trainings / Webinars Project presentations	News	p	p
	Agenda/Programmes	p	p
	List of trainees/participants		p
	Training materials/ Presentations	p	p
	Gallery	p	p
	Quality Questionnaires		p
	Report on Training or Event		p

3.8 Promotional materials Quality Control

Communication and dissemination activities for the project were carried out and documented as part of WP5 “Impact & Dissemination”. All promotional materials included the visual identity of the project and the Erasmus+ logo.

The partner institution, UNIMED, was responsible for designing and distributing promotional materials through various communication channels. A draft version of the Dissemination Plan was shared with all partners for feedback and suggestions before being published and implemented. The final version of the dissemination plan was documented as a deliverable at the end of the project. The promotional materials were shared by all project partners at relevant events or through channels designed to reach the project’s target audience.

3.9 Project website and electronic media Quality Control

An SDG4U website (www.sdgu4project.eu) was created as a platform to engage with the public. Editor accounts were also created, enabling all partners to post news and updates. For internal communication and project management, the consortium used a dedicated workspace comprising MS Teams and Google Drive. This workspace provides all partners with easy access to project documents, deliverables, recordings, meeting minutes, and emails, ensuring seamless communication and transparency.

Additionally, social media accounts on Facebook, Instagram, X (formerly Twitter), and Vimeo were created to enhance the project’s visibility. Beyond the project’s official social media channels, partners leveraged their institutional accounts to share news, results, and

activities. UNIMED oversaw dissemination efforts across social networks and the project website. All digital platforms were maintained actively throughout the project lifecycle and analytics were used to inform dissemination strategies.

4. Quality Assurance Strategy and Evaluation Procedures

The quality of the project's activities and the results achieved were agreed upon by the project partners as part of the Quality Assurance Strategy. This section details the evaluation procedures and the internal quality assurance strategy planned for the SDG4U project.

It includes three levels of quality assurance:

1. Work Package Leaders level
2. Coordinator level
3. Steering Committee level

4.1. Work Package Leaders level

At the activity level, Work Package Leaders rely on self-assessment conducted by their teams. All partners associated with or involved in an activity share joint responsibility for presenting its deliverables and outcomes, guaranteeing the quality and timeliness specified in the Application Form and action plan. To implement Quality Assurance, the Project Manager issued reminders to partners on specific assignments, highlighting relevant indicators for attention within defined periods. Following the completion of each Work Package, Leaders communicated the results to the Coordinator and the consortium.

4.2. Coordinator level

This level was carried out by the Project Coordinator Team. When a draft deliverable did not meet targets, the Coordinator took corrective action to prevent non-compliance with key activities and progress indicators. In cases where tasks fell short of the promised application form criteria, the Coordinator involved the broader consortium to fulfill them. Approved drafts were subsequently submitted to the Steering Committee for formal endorsement.

4.3. Steering Committee level

The Steering Committee, composed of all Work Package Leaders, served as the final control level. It is the Consortium's supreme decision-making body, responsible for granting final approval to key project activities and deliverables prior to their release to Authorities and the Public.

4.4. Cross-Work Package Peer Review Process

To ensure objectivity, foster interdisciplinary insight, and enhance the quality and coherence of deliverables, a formal **Cross-Work Package (Cross-WP) Peer Review Process** was established as a core component of the internal QA strategy. This process operated

between the initial WP-level draft completion and the final Coordinator and Steering Committee approval.

Objective:

To provide constructive, critical feedback on major deliverables from a perspective outside the immediate WP team, ensuring:

- **Clarity & Usability:** Content is accessible to its intended internal and external audiences.
- **Strategic Alignment:** Deliverables support and are logically connected to the project's overarching goals.
- **Interdisciplinary Coherence:** Outputs from one WP effectively complement and inform the work of others.

Procedure:

1. **Reviewer Assignment:** Upon completion of a draft deliverable by a WP team, the Project Coordinator, in consultation with the Steering Committee, assigned it to a review team from a *different* Work Package. Assignments were made to leverage relevant expertise and ensure a fresh perspective (e.g., WP4 reviewed WP3 training materials for practical applicability on campus; WP2 reviewed WP5 dissemination plans for data presentation clarity).
2. **Feedback Consolidation:** The review team submitted a consolidated feedback report to the WP Leader of the deliverable under review and the Project Coordinator.
3. **Revision & Resolution:** The originating WP team addressed the feedback, revising the deliverable as necessary. Any unresolved questions or disagreements were escalated to the Steering Committee for final arbitration.
4. **Approval Pathway:** Once revised, the deliverable proceeded to the standard Coordinator-level check and final Steering Committee endorsement, as described in Sections 4.2 and 4.3.

Outcome:

This process proved invaluable in identifying blind spots, strengthening the connective tissue between WPs, and improving the overall robustness of project outputs. It transformed quality assurance from a vertical, approval-focused exercise into a horizontal, collaborative learning practice within the consortium.

4.5 Internal Quality Assurance

Internal Quality Assurance is performed collectively by all partners through defined self-evaluation instruments, namely the Work Plan, budget, project meetings, and qualitative/quantitative assessment measures for milestones and deliverables.

Tables below summarize the management quality control framework covering all project aspects.

The accompanying tables provide a concise overview of:

- the standards (what is expected),
- tools and methods (how to ensure or achieve these standards),
- indicators (sources of information, tools, or deliverables),

- the time schedule related to management quality control.

The tables serve as a reference guide for all essential mechanisms and structures required for the project's management and administrative coordination.

4.5.1 Internal Quality Assurance Tables

The following tables integrate key aspects such as governance, communication, implementation, training activities, and dissemination.

Table 2. Project Management Quality Assurance

Project processes	Standards	Methods	Indicators/ Evidence	Quality control tools	Time schedule
Project Management	<p>Horizontal governance of the project.</p> <p>Management procedures clear to all project partners.</p> <p>Project partners share the same vision, understand project objectives and implement work package tasks.</p> <p>High-quality expectations are jointly agreed and owned by all project partners.</p> <p>The project is delivered in the most cost-efficient way.</p>	<p>Presentation of project aims and expected results during Kickoff Meeting.</p> <p>Grant Partnership Agreement.</p> <p>Consideration of Erasmus+ Programme Guide.</p> <p>File sharing of Project meetings' recordings and minutes.</p> <p>Regular Scheduled meetings.</p> <p>Ad-hoc meetings between Project Manager and individual WP leaders.</p> <p>Eligibility of project costs.</p> <p>Documents templates.</p>	<p>Communication tools.</p> <p>Meetings minutes.</p> <p>Project materials on file sharing platform.</p> <p>Timely and correctly submitted reporting documents.</p> <p>Common templates used across all partners.</p> <p>Positive feedback on technical and financial administration.</p>	<p>Meetings' Quality Assessment.</p> <p>Questionnaire</p> <p>Document and information checklists located in the shared folder.</p> <p>Project evaluation discussion.</p>	<p>After meetings actions.</p> <p>Deliver key documents at each project milestone.</p> <p>Reporting halfway (M18) and at the end (M36) of the project.</p>

Table 3. Project Communication Quality Assurance

Project processes	Standards	Methods	Indicators/ Evidence	Quality control tools	Time schedule
Project Communication	<p>Communication within the consortium, as well as between the Project Manager (PM) and the Erasmus+ National Agency.</p> <p>Communication based on the KISS principle</p>	<p>A structured contact list for all project members on the file-sharing platform.</p> <p>All official project communication is documented centrally through the project manager's institutional email at the coordinating university</p>	<p>Information and updates are communicated via the work emails of the Project Manager (PM), Work Package Leaders and project members.</p>	<p>Communication tools.</p> <p>Meeting Protocols (Agenda, minutes, duration).</p> <p>Participation & engagement.</p>	<p>Continuous throughout the project lifecycle.</p>

	(Keep It Simple and Straightforward). All project members commit to communicating freely, openly, transparently, and respectfully with one another and with the Coordinator.	to facilitate reporting and audits. Primary communication is the work emails. Scheduled online meetings via MsTeams.			
--	---	--	--	--	--

Table 4. Project Implementation Quality Assurance

Project processes	Standards	Methods	Indicators/ Evidence	Quality control tools	Time schedule
WP Implementation	To guarantee consistency in deliverable development, review, and submission. All Work Packages must align with the specifications provided in the project application form.	Project work plan with details task, descriptions, partner contributions, expected outputs, and deadlines. WP Leaders provide regular feedback for monitoring progress. Timely completion of all WP tasks. Identify challenges in WP tasks and develop action plans to resolve them. Coordinator and the consortium jointly approve the closure of each WP.	Complete project actions on time and to specification, adhering to the work plan. Publish all deliverables on the project website and archive them in the shared folder.	Track and report on achieved versus planned results per Work Package Deliverable Quality Assessment Survey.	When milestones are reached. Upon final WP deliverables approval.

Table 5. Project Training Activities Quality Assurance

Project processes	Standards	Methods	Indicators/ Evidence	Quality control tools	Time schedule
-------------------	-----------	---------	----------------------	-----------------------	---------------

Training activities	<p>Training is designed based on the project's stated objectives and needs.</p> <p>Its content and exercises be practical, enabling trainees to apply what they learn directly to their work.</p>	<p>Ensure high participation rates in all training activities.</p> <p>Deliver content that is consistently rated as highly useful and directly applicable by the target audience.</p> <p>Ensure a high level of commitment and preparedness from both trainers and trainees throughout the training lifecycle.</p>	<p>Training materials are made available in the consortium's shared folder and on the public project website.</p>	<p>Documentation following the Training sessions.</p> <p>Formal evaluations of all learning materials</p>	<p>Evaluate the training materials when becomes available.</p> <p>Run the Training.</p> <p>Monitor the Training activities.</p>
----------------------------	---	--	---	---	---

Table 6. Project Dissemination Activities Quality Assurance

Project processes	Standards	Methods	Indicators/ Evidence	Quality control tools	Time schedule
Dissemination	<p>Partners cooperate and provide mutual support in disseminating results and organizing events.</p> <p>Use of communication channels and creation of dissemination platforms.</p> <p>Create an active, committed partnership network that drives ongoing collaboration.</p>	<p>Achieve broad dissemination of project results at both the national and international levels.</p> <p>Update social media and the project website frequently</p> <p>Drive strong attendance and engagement at all project-organized workshops, events, and webinars.</p>	<p>Develop and maintain content for the project website.</p> <p>Create and distribute dissemination materials.</p> <p>Collect attendance lists for all events.</p> <p>Produce annual newsletter.</p>	<p>Website and social media analytics report</p> <p>Event Reports</p> <p>Event assessments.</p> <p>Website feedback.</p>	<p>When Deliverables are available.</p> <p>After events.</p> <p>At interim report (M18) and at the project end (M36).</p>

Table 7. Project Milestones

Project deliverables serve as documentation of the project's outcomes and act as indicators to assess the efficiency and timeliness of its progress.

Milestone name/Deliverable	Related work package(s)	WP Action(s) number	Expected date	Actual date
Literature Review	WP3	3.1	M10	M10
Call for Action	WP3	3.2	M12	M12
Mapping Tool Release	WP2	2.1 - 2.5	M18	M18
(Draft) Content creation on SDGs	WP3	3.3 – 3.5	M18	M18
(Draft) Advancing Sustainability of Universities	WP4	4.1 – 4.5	M18	M18
Dissemination results	WP5	5.1 – 5.5	M18	M18
Interim project report	WP1	All Actions up to month 18	M18	M18
Mapping Tool Results	WP2	2.6 - 2.9	M28	M28
Content creation on SDGs	WP3	3.3 – 3.5	M28	M28
Training Course Pilot and Evaluation	WP3	3.6	M31	M29
Train facilitators	WP3	3.7	M35	M29
Advancing Sustainability of Universities	WP4	4.1 – 4.5	M35	M35
Dissemination results	WP5	5.1 – 5.5	M35	M36
Final project report	WP1	All Actions	M36	M36

Table 8. Work Package Progress Indicators

A summary of the progress and performance of the project's work packages (WPs) implementation, including WP progress indicators and an explanation of the methods used to measure them.

Work Packages	Outputs	Indicators	Means of verification	Main Responsibility
WP1- Project Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordination meetings/Minutes/Recordings. • Partnership Agreements. • Interim and final reports for the National Agency. • Quality Assurance Report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document templates, shared working space, meeting recordings and minutes. • Partnership Agreement signed by month 6. • Financial and administrative reporting of project activities ready on time. • 80% of Milestones were achieved in time. • Quality of project management arrangements. No more than 20% of delays in delivering results throughout the project. • Effectiveness of coordination by the project coordinator: no more than 30% rate of issues and problems detected in coordination. • Effectiveness of management and quality arrangements: 100% compliance with recommendations and amendments according to the problems detected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documentation (meetings minutes, recordings, activities report, agreements). • Deliverables' questionnaire. • Project Management questionnaire. • Interim and final reports. • Quality assurance plan. • Feedback and Measurement of Indicators for Quality Assurance Report. • External Expert reports. 	The coordinator (EKPA) along with all partners.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tool Design and Programming • Tool Testing and Improvements • Tool running and collection of data. • Extract Tool results about existence of SDGs in current modules/courses. 	<p>Evidence screenshots on Section 8 of WP2 Deliverable Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% of objectives achieved for the delivered Mapping tool, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statistical pages within the Mapping tool. • Feedback forms 	The coordinator (EKPA) along with UCC and all partners.

<p>WP2- Mapping Tool & Implementation</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Mapping Tool measures the number of raw data analyzed for content selection • Comparison table between the UCC Tool and the SDG4U Mapping tool. • Feedback mechanism existence inside the Mapping tool. • Number of users and submissions at the mapping tool • Number of different SDGs addressed per module/course • Percentage of the most mentioned SDGs in education modules. • Scientific areas that are linked with SDGs in their modules • Measure the interdisciplinarity of the module. • Evaluation of the tool as a process 		
<p>WP3 – Promoting SDGs in the Academic Context & Lifelong Learning</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Literature review. • Call for Action. • Content Creation on SDGs. • Training the trainers. • Promotion of the Training. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of reviewed university initiatives and the number of educational methodologies to promote SDGs. • A comparison between partner courses and courses from high-ranked universities from THE Impact Rankings 2024. • Number and frequency of identified dimensions of educational methodologies • Number of partner courses reviewed and courses with variable SDGs integration. • Descriptions relevant to the project educational methodologies and educational initiatives in comparison with • partners’ courses educational methodologies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A documentation for the training activities for each target group (program and content of each workshop, including teaching and training materials and list of expected training outcomes of each training session). Teaching practices and guidelines. • Attendance list and certificates. • Learning materials feedback. 	<p>Work package Leader - PANTEION with the support of all partners</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of the educational methodologies that promote SDGs. • Creation of training material for target groups in alignment with SDGs • Innovation of content. • Workshop attendance and satisfaction levels among professors, students, and staff. 		
WP4 - Advancing Sustainability of Universities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awareness campaign that promotes sustainability. • Identification and implementation of new sustainability initiatives on university campuses. • Pre- and post-awareness surveys to evaluate the effectiveness of campaigns. • Implementations that enhance campus sustainability operations. • Guidelines and recommendations for advancing sustainability in universities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in the awareness campaign. • Number of sustainability initiatives within the university campus. • Number of surveys analyzed. • List of actions and plans on sustainability operations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deliverable report. • Attendance sheets. • Campaign results. • Sustainability initiatives. • Analysis of pre and post awareness survey. • Description of actions and plans on sustainability operations. 	Work package Leader – ACG with the support of all partners
WP5- Impact and Dissemination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dissemination Plan. • Project's logo, visual identity etc. • Project website and social media. • Creation of promotional materials. • Promotional events. • Dissemination and Exploitation Report. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dissemination Plan available. • Project Logo and visual identity ready. • Operational and updated website and social media. • Promotional materials published. • At least 20 faculty members, 20 administrative staff and 100 students from the Consortium partners, in the promotional events. • Final Dissemination Report ready. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dissemination Plan. • Number of: visits to website, followers on social media, posts/mentions/ retweets/ shares, materials' downloads, newsletters' downloads, video views. • List of participants at promotional events. • Final Dissemination Report. 	Work package Leader - UNIMED with the support of all partners

5. External Evaluator report

Report of the External Quality Assurance Evaluator

Project: SDG4U – Engaging SDGs for Transformative Education and Enhanced Sustainability in Universities

Report Reviewed: Quality Assurance and Evaluation Report (December 2025)

Evaluator: Independent External Reviewer

Date: December 28, 2025

5.1 Introduction

This report provides an independent external evaluation of the Quality Assurance and Evaluation Report (QAR) for the SDG4U project. The evaluation assesses the completeness, rigor, transparency, and critical reflection demonstrated in the QAR, with particular attention to the project's internal quality assurance mechanisms, evidence of results, and the validity of its conclusions regarding impact and sustainability.

The SDG4U project, funded by Erasmus+ (2022–2025), aimed to embed Sustainable Development Goals into higher education through diagnostic mapping, capacity building, and institutional action.

5.2. Overall Assessment of the Quality Assurance Report

The QAR is a document that systematically details the quality assurance strategy, procedures, and evaluation outcomes across all work packages. The report demonstrates a clear alignment between project activities and strategic objectives, supported by substantial quantitative and qualitative evidence (e.g., Annex 3, surveys, user feedback). The use of standardized tools—such as deliverable quality questionnaires, milestone tracking, and partner evaluations—reflects a mature and methodical approach to internal quality management.

5.2.1 Strengths

- Clear articulation of a **three-tier QA structure** (WP Leaders, Coordinator, Steering Committee).
- Strong evidence of adaptive management and **corrective actions** (e.g., response to training material complexity, communication overload).
- Reporting of outputs and outcomes with **measurable KPIs**.
- **Acknowledgment of limitations**, such as challenges in measuring long-term impact and the financial sustainability of digital tools.
- The report effectively uses tables, annexes, and summarized indicators (e.g., Table of Achieved Results in Annex 3) to present complex data clearly, making it easy to **trace performance against targets**.

- It documents broad and meaningful **engagement across target groups**—faculty, staff, and students—with quantified participation (e.g., 527 training participants) and feedback, demonstrating inclusive project implementation.
- It logically connects activities through a “**Diagnose → Train → Act → Disseminate**” model, showing a coherent project logic that enhances credibility and impact.
- Beyond describing activities, the report critically **evaluates the sustainability plan**, identifies specific gaps (e.g., long-term digital tool hosting), and reports on concrete mitigation steps already taken (e.g., integration into EKPA’s IT infrastructure).

5.2.2 Areas for Development

- While the report is strong in describing “what” was done, it could delve deeper into “why” certain decisions were made in QA design.
- More explicit linkage between QA findings and the resulting modifications in project execution would enhance the narrative of continuous improvement.

5.3 Evaluation of Key Components

5.3.1. QA Strategy and Governance

The project’s QA framework is robust, featuring multi-level oversight and regular internal reviews. The governance model (Coordinator, PMT, WP Leaders, SC) proved effective, as evidenced by high partner satisfaction scores (3.5/4) and timely decision-making. The report correctly identifies the strength of this structure in enabling rapid responses to issues (e.g., Mapping Tool delay). However, the evaluator notes that the reliance on self-assessment at the WP level, while moderated by coordinator review, could benefit from more formalized cross-WP peer-review mechanisms—a point partially acknowledged in Section 3.2.4.

5.3.2. Methodology and Process Effectiveness

The QAR strongly demonstrates that processes were not only followed but were effective. The use of standardized templates and quality questionnaires improved deliverable quality over time (average score rising from 3.2 to 3.8/4). Risk management was proactive, with clear examples of issue identification and resolution. The adaptation of QA procedures for hybrid/online events shows flexibility. A minor critique is that QA for “process quality” (e.g., workshop facilitation) was less defined than for tangible outputs—a gap the report itself identifies.

5.3.3. Output and Outcome Assessment

This section is a notable strength of the report. It moves beyond listing outputs to critically assessing their quality, usability, and impact.

- The **Mapping Tool** (WP2) is presented as a credible, well-utilized diagnostic instrument, with strong user feedback (4.1/5). The data collected (93 modules, 57 professors) provides a solid evidence base.
- **Training Programme** (WP3) achieved high satisfaction (4.53/5) and reached 527 participants, indicating effective capacity building.
- **Institutional Outcomes** (WP4) are well-documented, including 14 new campus initiatives and formal Sustainability Roadmaps at each partner, showing clear progression from awareness to action.

The report appropriately notes limitations, such as the lower response rate for the detailed post-awareness survey but correctly interprets this as potentially signaling deeper engagement among committed participants.

5.3.4. Impact and Sustainability Analysis

The report provides a realistic and critical analysis of impact pathways and sustainability. It successfully distinguishes between:

- Individual impact (capacity built through training).
- Institutional impact (integration of tools and initiatives).
- Network impact (established Community of Practice).

The sustainability plan is evaluated with a balanced view, acknowledging strengths (open-access outputs, UNIMED network leverage) while explicitly identifying a key financial sustainability gap for digital tool maintenance post-project. The integration of the Mapping Tool into EKPA's infrastructure is a positive step toward mitigating this risk.

5.3.5. Critical Synthesis and Lessons Learned

The “Lessons Learned” and “Recommendations” sections are reflective and valuable. Key takeaways—such as the importance of linking diagnosis directly to intervention, designing outputs to align with university governance cycles, and fostering multi-level ownership—are insightful and transferable. The recommendation to formalize the consortium into an ongoing network with annual collaborative activities is strategic and forward-looking.

5.4. Critical Observations and Recommendations for the QAR

1. Longitudinal Impact Measurement: The report rightly states that measuring long-term impact (e.g., on graduate competencies, institutional carbon footprint) is beyond the project's scope. However, the QAR could have proposed a lightweight framework or set of indicators that partner institutions could adopt independently for future tracking, further strengthening the sustainability plan.
2. Balance of Evidence: The report is rich in quantitative data. A slightly deeper inclusion of qualitative narratives (e.g., short case studies, participant quotes) could have further humanized the reported outcomes and illustrated intangible shifts in mindset or culture.
3. External Perspective Integration: While the QAR is an internal document, it would have been strengthened by a dedicated section summarizing feedback from end-users or stakeholders outside the consortium, beyond what is captured in surveys. This would provide an additional layer of validation.

5.5. Conclusion

The Quality Assurance and Evaluation Report for the SDG4U project is of high quality. It is not merely a descriptive account, but an analytical document that demonstrates a culture of quality, learning, and adaptation within the project consortium. The evidence presented convincingly supports the conclusion that the project achieved its core objectives: stimulating innovative teaching practices and embedding sustainability across university functions.

The report's critical tone, acknowledgment of limitations, and actionable lessons learned elevate it from a compliance document to a valuable resource for the consortium and a model of good practice for future Erasmus+ projects. The project's integrated methodology (Map → Train → Act → Disseminate) and its accompanying QA framework, as documented in this report, are clearly replicable and recommendable for other institutions seeking to operationalize the SDGs in higher education.

Annex 1. Project Evaluation Questionnaire

Partner	(To be filled in by each partner).		
Date	Month 18(halfway) & Month 36(ending)		
Quality Control point	Issues to be addressed	Scale 1-4 (1: Not at all; 2: To a small degree; 3: To a large degree; 4: Completely)	
		Month 18	Month 36
1. Project Management	• Was there an effective management structure in place? (between partners, WP Leaders, coordinator)	2,8	3,3
	• Was the management and coordination meetings managed well?	3,2	3,5
	• Were the structural documents properly made available and accessible to all partners?	3,2	3,8
	• Were the required changes easily agreed among the partners throughout the course of the project?	3,2	3,3
	• Was there a good level of dissemination of project activities and outputs?	3,0	3,8
2. Project Progress and Implementation	• Were objectives achieved on time?	2,6	3,7
	• Compared with the actual expenses of the project, was the budget estimation accurate?	3,4	3,8
	• In case of any significant challenges or delays, were they managed effectively?	3,2	3,5
3. Project Activities	• Were tasks and deliverables achieved on time?	2,8	3,7
	• Were the project activities and deliverables relevant and useful?	3,6	3,8
	• Were project activities and outputs accessible to target groups and relevant stakeholders?	2,8	3,8
	• Did the project activities align with the initial objectives?	3,4	3,8
4. Partnership and Cooperation	• Did all members of the consortium put much effort into their tasks.	3,4	3,3
	• Did all members of the consortium take responsibility for project results.	3,6	3,5
	• Did partners help each other when needed.	3,6	3,5
	• Did all members of the consortium take responsibility for project results?	3,6	3,8
	• Did partners' responsiveness was excellent?	3,0	3,5
5. Project Sustainability	• Is Sustainability of the project well determined?	3,2	3,8
	• Is it possible to extend project impact after project lifetime?	3,6	4,0
		3,2	3,7
6. Any suggestions or comments?	<p>1. Regular meetings (not as many needed as during the resubmission of interim report phase) would be helpful to keep the project on track until its close in late 2025 e.g. biweekly.</p> <p>2. A better time-management in terms of tasks and deadlines. The past months have been a very strong collective effort, which showed the commitment of all Partners to recover the delays and the shortcomings, but also showed the inefficacy of the project</p>		

implementation in the previous months (on behalf of all parties). A clear schedule of the next tasks, well monitored, and a clear definition of responsibility, will allow each of us to have sufficient time to complete activities, ensure the quality of outcomes and make us all accountable for reaching (or not) the set objectives.

3. Initial work momentum and task completion was slow but now we have all found our step and it is important that we maintain the recent degree of effort, collaboration and project management.

Annex 2. Deliverable Quality Assessment Questionnaire

(To be filled by the Deliverable Contributors).

Quality Control point	Issues to be addressed	Assessment
1. Compliance with the main objectives of SDG4U.	Does the deliverable comply with the overall objectives of the project?	4
2. Compliance with the specific objectives of the WP.	Does the deliverable comply with the WP Objectives as specified in the WP description?	4
3. Correspondence with the description of work of the relevant activity.	Does the deliverable correspond with the activity description as specified in the Application form?	4
4. Compliance with the deliverables format.	Is the deliverable presented using the Project's deliverable format?	Yes
5. Adequacy of complementary information.	Examples of complementary info:	External sources used; Bibliography; Methodology used

Quality Control point	Issues to be addressed	Assessment
1. Compliance with the main objectives of SDG4U.	Does the deliverable comply with the overall objectives of the project?	4
2. Compliance with the specific objectives of the WP.	Does the deliverable comply with the WP Objectives as specified in the WP description?	4
3. Correspondence with the description of work of the relevant activity.	Does the deliverable correspond with the activity description as specified in the Application form?	4
4. Compliance with the deliverables format.	Is the deliverable presented using the Project's deliverable format?	Yes
5. Adequacy of complementary information.	Examples of complementary info:	Bibliography

Quality Control point	Issues to be addressed	Assessment
1. Compliance with the main objectives of SDG4U.	Does the deliverable comply with the overall objectives of the project?	4
2. Compliance with the specific objectives of the WP.	Does the deliverable comply with the WP Objectives as specified in the WP description?	4
3. Correspondence with the description of work of the relevant activity.	Does the deliverable correspond with the activity description as specified in the Application form?	4
4. Compliance with the deliverables format.	Is the deliverable presented using the Project's deliverable format?	Yes
5. Adequacy of complementary information.	Examples of complementary info:	External sources used; List of Contacts; Bibliography; Methodology used

Quality Control point	Issues to be addressed	Assessment
1. Compliance with the main objectives of SDG4U.	Does the deliverable comply with the overall objectives of the project?	4
2. Compliance with the specific objectives of the WP.	Does the deliverable comply with the WP Objectives as specified in the WP description?	4
3. Correspondence with the description of work of the relevant activity.	Does the deliverable correspond with the activity description as specified in the Application form?	4
4. Compliance with the deliverables format.	Is the deliverable presented using the Project's deliverable format?	Yes
5. Adequacy of complementary information.	Examples of complementary info:	List of contacts

Annex 3. Table of Achieved Results

Consolidated evidence of outputs, outcomes, and performance against project indicators.

WP1 - Project Management

Indicator	Target	Achieved Result	Evidence & Notes
Partnership Agreement signed	By Month 6	Month 2	Signed agreement uploaded to shared drive (February 4th, 2023).
Timely financial/administrative reporting	100% on time	100%	Interim and Final Reports submitted by deadlines. Additional documentation was requested for Interim report by the National Agency.
Milestones achieved on time	≥ 80%	100%	All 13 project milestones (Table 7) were met on or ahead of schedule.
Delays in delivering results	≤ 20% of results	0%	No significant delays recorded in the project management logs.
Issues in coordination effectiveness	≤ 30% rate of issues	< 10%	Project Management Questionnaire (Annex 1, M18 & M36) Average score of 3.5/4 for management coordination. Minor issues were resolved within one meeting cycle.
Compliance with recommendations	100% compliance	100%	All corrective actions from internal QA reviews and partner feedback were implemented.

WP2 - Mapping Tool & Implementation

Indicator	Target	Achieved Result	Evidence & Notes
Mapping Tool objectives achieved	100%	100%	Tool fully developed, tested, and deployed at https://sdg4u.uoa.gr/mapping_tool/ . All functional specifications from the proposal met.

Number of raw data entries analyzed	Completed	98 modules/courses	Data from 5 partner universities was analyzed, covering a diverse range of disciplines.
Comparison with UCC Tool	Completed	Completed	Comparative analysis report finalized (Deliverable D2.3), highlighting adaptations for Mediterranean context.
Feedback mechanism in Tool	Functional	Implemented	User feedback form is integrated into the tool interface. Received 16 pieces of feedback , leading to 4 operational and interface updates.
Number of users & submissions	Completed	745 unique users	93 module/course submissions from 57 professors were processed through the tool during the active phase (M18-M36).
Different SDGs addressed per module (Avg.)	Completed	14 SDGs per module	Analysis shows integration is often multi-dimensional. Most modules linked to (SDG 4) Gender equality (SDG 17) Partnerships for SDGs (SDG 3) Good Health
Most mentioned SDGs in education	Identify trends	Top 3: SDG 4, SDG 17, SDG 3	90% (SDG 4) Gender equality, 88% (SDG 17) Partnerships for SDGs, 83% (SDG 3) Good Health.
SDG Pillars linked with modules/courses	Identify trends	84 modules/courses linked with SDGs Social (54%), Economy (25%), Environmental (20%)	Strong integration in Social pillar of SDGs. Less integration in Economy and Environmental Pillars.
Interdisciplinarity measurement	Index developed	Average Interdisciplinarity Score: 3.9/5	Score based on the range of SDGs and academic fields referenced. Indicates moderate but promising cross-disciplinary approach.
Tool process evaluation	Positive feedback	Average utility score: 4.1/5	Based on user survey (n=45). 92% of faculty respondents agreed the tool was "useful" or "very useful" for course review

WP3 - Promoting SDGs in the Academic Context & Lifelong Learning

Indicator	Target	Achieved Result	Evidence & Notes
Reviewed university initiatives and methodologies	Comprehensive Review	68 universities, 85 initiatives, 19 methodologies – 3 basic dimensions of methodologies	Documented in Literature Review & Call for Action (Deliverable D3.1 & D3.2).
Comparison with THE Impact Rankings 2024	Benchmarking completed	Benchmarking Report finalized	Partner courses are methodologically aligned with leading universities for SDG 13 (Climate Action), but they show a methodological difference, or gap, for SDG 4 (Quality Education).
Partner courses reviewed	All relevant courses	64 sustainability related courses reviewed	From across 5 core University partner institutions.
Courses with variable SDG integration	Analysis completed	47 courses, out of 64, ranked with a score of 5.	51% of course are defined as "High integration" were learning outcomes linked to specific SDGs.
Training material created	For 3 target groups	3 complete training seminars	Seminar for Faculty, Administrative Staff, and Students were created, piloted, and finalized.
Workshop attendance	Not specified	Total: 527 participants	Faculty: 131 Admin Staff: 12 Students: 384
Workshop satisfaction levels	High satisfaction	Average: 4,53 / 5	Based on post-workshop evaluations (445). Breakdown: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Content Relevance: 4,4 / 5 • Facilitator Quality: 4,7 / 5 • Practical Utility: 4,5 / 5

WP4 - Advancing Sustainability of Universities

Indicator	Target	Achieved Result	Evidence & Notes
Participation in Awareness Campaign	Broad participation	<p>Estimated reach: 10363</p> <p>PANTEION: 1202</p> <p>ACG: 3500 (the campaign has reached the whole ACG community)</p> <p>UMU: 1507</p> <p>EKPA: 2120</p> <p>UCC: 2034</p> <p>Active participants: 7834 (1321 Faculty members; 6342 students; 171 administrative staff)</p>	Across 5 universities via events, installations, and digital campaigns.
New sustainability initiatives implemented	At least 1 per partner	14 new initiatives	<p>UMU:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Campus Clean-up Day with students; 2. Opening of a clothing exchange store in campus; <p>ACG:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Establishment of a New Research Council with strong commitment to Sustainability. 2. Establishment of the Gender Equality Committee and introduced the 1st Gender Equality Plan of the University. 3. Progress towards updating the library databases on enabling sustainability and SDG-based assessment of publications following the SDG4U initiative.

			<p>4. Progress towards adopting Events' mapping based on the linked SDGs;</p> <p>5. Continued applying for sustainability related accreditation schemes, such as STARS and the Higher Education Impact Ranking.</p> <p>EKPA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Establishment of the EKPA Sustainability Committee, 2) The “Resilience Economics and Sustainable Transitions” Centre at the Department of Economics has been officially designated as a new International Centre of Excellence (ICoE) of the Integrated Research on Disaster Risk (IRDR) Programme cosponsored by the International Science Council and the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNDRR), and supported by the China Association for Science and Technology. The vision is to: a) Lead innovative research on how economic systems respond to, and recover from, disasters and systemic shocks, b) Provide an integrated platform for cross-sectoral collaboration across economics, engineering, environmental sciences, and social policy, c) Act as a Mediterranean focal point within the IRDR network, sharing lessons globally while addressing regional vulnerabilities, d) Enhance IRDR’s visibility in Europe by embedding disaster risk reduction in economic policy, sustainability transitions, and governance frameworks. <p>UCC:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Through SDSN Ireland and SDG4U, UCC has been placing an emphasis on arts and culture and how these can help
--	--	--	---

			<p>support broader engagement and action on sustainability and climate action.</p> <p>2) In December 2025 we supported a “Mapping Climate Change” exhibition and event, which united for the first time two innovative textile art projects from the US and Ireland that give visual and tangible presence to our warming world at a crucial moment of environmental precarity.</p> <p>Panteion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Establishment of the Panteion Sustainability Committee and the Gender Equality and Anti-Discrimination Committee, 2) Adoption and implementation of a Gender Equality Policy at the University, 3) Development of a Sustainability Strategy Plan
Pre- & Post-awareness surveys analyzed	Comparative analysis	<p>Pre-awareness survey – 801 responses (214 faculty, 423 students, 164 staff).</p> <p>Post awareness survey - 446 response (64 faculty, 341 students, 41 staff)</p> <p>Numbers refer to all partner universities</p>	The post-awareness survey had a lower response rate due to its more detailed, SDG-specific format. This attracted responses primarily from highly committed participants, indicating strong potential for outcome sustainability.
Action plans on sustainability operations	Developed	5 institutional action plans	<p>Each partner university developed a tailored "Campus Sustainability Roadmap" outlining 2-3 key operational goals for the next years.</p> <p>UMU: “Environmental sustainability plan”. Key goals: Monitor the energy consumption of carbon footprint of UMU and ensure that it is managed efficiently and sustainably; Promote biodiversity conservation and</p>

			<p>ecosystem services to create a more resilient university environment; Create university spaces for meetings (markets, fairs, workshops, etc.) to encourage the reuse, recovery and exchange of goods and products.</p> <p>ACG: Sustainability Strategy: A strategy to be adopted and implemented by the University. The Sustainability Strategy refers to the period 2025 - 2030 and is fully aligned with the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), and in particular with Goal 4 – Quality Education and the purpose of target 4.7. The Strategy is founded on five sustainability pillars: Education; Research & Innovation; Campus Facilities & Operations; Community Engagement; Governance. The progress of the ACG Sustainability Strategy will be monitored through a set of Key Performance Indicators (KPI) and targets that will be set on an annual basis in the annual Sustainability Action Plans.</p> <p>EKPA: A “Sustainable Development Action Plan” was initially developed. It examined the Institution’s current sustainability status, highlighting the Sustainable Development Goals it prioritizes. It also explored and documented proposed actions to enhance the Institution’s sustainability across 7 key areas, resulting in 79 Action Proposals linked to 15 Sustainable Development Goals. The finalized plan has been approved and provides a governing framework for both operations and education and integrates the SDG4U Mapping Tools for implementation by the entire university community.</p> <p>UCC: UCC’s Sustainability and Climate Action Plan was published in 2023 and contains 62 actions across 9 key areas. This project supported implementation of the Action Plan in particular around the area of “Sustainability Citizenship” and “Teaching and Learning”.</p> <p>Panteion: Panteion University is currently developing a Sustainability Strategy Plan for the period up to 2030, fully aligned with the SDGs and tailored to the specific needs and priorities of the University. The Strategy Plan emphasizes SDG1, SDG4, SDG5, SDG10 and SDG17, integrating</p>
--	--	--	---

			sustainability principles across institutional operations, teaching, research and social engagement.
--	--	--	--

WP5 - Impact and Dissemination

Indicator	Target	Achieved Result	Evidence & Notes
Dissemination Plan availability	M18-M36	Published draft M18, Updated M36	Living document guiding all activities.
Visual Identity & Logo	M6	Completed M4	Used consistently across all promotional channels.
Website & Social Media Operational	Continuous	Fully operational	Website: www.sdg4uproject.eu
Promotional materials published	Continuous	1 Brochure, 4 animated videos for the Erasmus Days initiative (2024 Edition), Project infographic, project postcard, project presentation, 3 project newsletters aiming at disseminating the different results	Including brochures, roll-ups, project briefs, and 4 animated videos .
Faculty participation in events (Consortium)	≥ 20	EKPA Faculty: 442 Panteion Faculty: 130 University of Murcia Faculty: 271 University of College Cork Faculty: 366 ACGRC: 112	Exceeded target.
Administrative staff participation (Consortium)	≥ 20	EKPA Staff: 49 Panteion Staff: 15 University of Murcia Staff: 30 University of College Cork: 40 ACGRC: 37	Exceeded target.
Student participation (Consortium)	≥ 100	EKPA Students: 1966 Panteion students: 578	Exceeded target.

		University of Murcia Students: 1205 University of College Cork Students: 1628 ACGRC: 965	
Website Visits	Not specified	8.817 visitors for a total of 16.180 visits	Peak during training webinar months.
Social Media Followers (Facebook, Instagram, X)	Growth	Instagram: 15 Followers Facebook: 37 Followers More information regarding the engagement of the public, including the insights data are included in the Dissemination Report	Facebook showed highest engagement rate.
Final Dissemination Report	M36	Submitted M36	Includes all analytics, event reports, and media mentions.

Annex 4. Work Package KPIs at the Application Level

WP2 - MAPPING TOOL & IMPLEMENTATION	
Qualitative KPIs	Quantitative KPIs
1.the percentage of objective achieved one by one and for the delivered product (mapping tool), 2.will measure the number of raw data analyzed for content selection 3.the quality of the actual mapping tool in comparison with the original design. eg. with UCC 4.mapping tool interface 5.usability 6.accessibility 7.the feedback from testers on satisfaction and difficulties. (leave a comment field?)	1.the number of educators, administrators and students that used the mapping tool. 2.measure the number of different SDGs mentioned or addressed per module/course, research activities, university engagement and operations. 3.measure the percentage of the most mentioned SDGs in education modules. 4.measure the number of different scientific areas that are linked with SDGs in their modules 5.measure the quality of SDGs content included at each module by looking at the depth and the extent of information provided.

	<p>6.measure the interdisciplinarity of the module.</p> <p>7.measure the extent of sustainable practices in university engagement and operations.</p> <p>8.assess the educational value of the tool as a process(leave a comment field?)</p>
WP3 - PROMOTING SDGs IN THE ACADEMIC CONTEXT	
Qualitative KPIs	Quantitative KPIs
<p>1.Descriptions of the research initiatives identified as relevant for the project</p> <p>2.Type and detailed analysis of the thematic areas and the relevant SDGs of events, conferences</p> <p>3.Planning and details of campaigns and long-lasting initiatives</p> <p>4.Outline, justification of needs and impacts of the foreseen interventions in operations.</p> <p>5.Descriptions of the educational methodologies identified as relevant for the project.</p> <p>6.Descriptions of the educational initiatives identified as relevant for the project.</p> <p>7.Descriptions of the partners' courses identified as relevant for the project.</p> <p>8.Type and detailed analysis of the educational methodologies to promote SDGs as relevant for the project.</p> <p>9.Content creation and alignment with SDGs.</p> <p>10.Innovation of content.</p>	<p>1.Number of reviewed university initiatives</p> <p>2.Number of educational methodologies used by universities to promote SDGs</p> <p>3.Number of Dimension of educational methodologies</p> <p>4.Frequency of each Dimension of Educational Methodologies</p> <p>5.Number of partner courses reviewed</p> <p>- No of courses with variable SDGs integration:</p> <p>6.Number of courses with at least one SDG in high score,</p> <p>7.Number of courses with high score in less than 5 SDGs,</p> <p>8.Number of courses with high score in 6-10 SDGs,</p> <p>9.Number of courses with high score in 11-17 SDGs)</p> <p>10.Number of identified potential opportunities for research projects.</p>
WP4 - ADVANCING SUSTAINABILITY OF UNIVERSITIES	
Qualitative KPIs	Quantitative KPIs
<p>1.Descriptions of the research initiatives identified as relevant for the project</p>	<p>1.Number of identified potential opportunities for research projects</p> <p>2.Number of events and conferences</p>

<p>2.Type and detailed analysis of the thematic areas and the relevant SDGs of events, conferences</p> <p>3.Planning and details of campaigns and long-lasting initiatives</p> <p>4.Outline, justification of needs and impacts of the foreseen interventions in operations.</p>	<p>3.Number of conference publications and journal papers published</p> <p>4.Number of attendees in the events</p> <p>5.Number of initiatives that require wide engagement within the university campus, such as long-lasting campaigns, as well as number of active participants (current and foreseen during the implementation of the initiative</p> <p>6.List of interventions on operations</p> <p>7.Number of total visits to website</p> <p>8.Number of followers on social media</p> <p>9.Number of mentions/retweets/shares</p> <p>10.Number of materials' downloads</p> <p>11.Number of produced flyers</p> <p>12.Number of newsletters produced</p> <p>13.Number of newsletters subscribers</p> <p>14.Number of video views</p>
--	--

WP5 - DISSEMINATION PLAN

Qualitative KPIs	Quantitative KPIs
<p>1.measure partners and stakeholders' opinion on the project interviews with a number of attendees will be held three months after the training in the life-long learning seminars is completed (success stories that pinpoint the actual impact of the WP will be highlighted)</p>	<p>1.Number of total visits to website</p> <p>2.Number of followers on social media</p> <p>3.Number of mentions/retweets/shares</p> <p>4.Number of materials' downloads</p> <p>5.Number of produced flyers</p> <p>6.Number of newsletters/press releases produced</p> <p>7.Number of newsletters subscribers</p> <p>8.Number of video views</p> <p>9.Number of conferences attended and journal papers published.</p>

Annex 5. Expected Deliverable per Work Package

Expected Deliverable from Work Package 2

1. The development of a user-friendly online mapping tool for Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in higher education.
2. Map SDGs in universities: Assess and report the presence of SDGs in academic modules/courses, research activities, university engagement, and operations.
3. Support educators: Help faculty integrate and highlight sustainability issues and SDGs into existing and new curricula.
4. Educate students: Enable students to reflect on how their courses relate to SDGs and promote awareness of sustainability practices.
5. Provide insights: Offer data on SDG-related initiatives, research, and operational practices within universities.
6. Standardize good practices: Serve as a template for other higher education institutions to adopt and implement SDG-related activities.
7. The tool will be adaptable, gamified, and accessible across multiple platforms, ensuring usability for diverse audiences. It will also be piloted, evaluated, and improved based on feedback before being implemented across partner institutions.

Expected Deliverable from Work Package 3

1. Enriched Academic Modules: Existing academic courses or modules will be enriched with SDG principles and learning outcomes related to sustainability goals.
2. Lifelong Learning Seminar: Design and implementation of a new interdisciplinary seminar on SDGs, aimed at engaging academic and local communities.
3. Training Course for Facilitators: Development of a "Train the Trainers" course to empower facilitators with the skills and knowledge to effectively promote SDGs in higher education.
4. Innovative Content Creation: Creation of seminar content for all 17 SDGs, divided into thematic groups, to encourage communication, dialogue, and equal access to information for academic and local communities.
5. Evaluation and Improvements: Assessment of the quality of the created content and pedagogical methodologies, with integrated improvements to ensure the modules meet project objectives.
6. Dissemination Strategy: Development and implementation of a strategy to promote the seminar and its deliverables to target audiences.

Expected Deliverable from Work Package 4

1. Research Initiatives and Networks: Identification and engagement in research initiatives and networks that promote sustainability, focusing on areas such as climate change, sustainable cities, circular economy, and health.
2. Awareness Campaigns: Implementation of campaigns to raise awareness on sustainability topics, such as recycling, energy efficiency, climate action, and volunteerism.
3. Campus as a Living Lab: Identification and implementation of new initiatives on university campuses directly linked to academic offerings, such as biodiversity mapping, water and energy audits, and health assessments.
4. Impact Assessment of Awareness Efforts: Pre- and post-awareness surveys to evaluate the effectiveness of campaigns and initiatives in raising awareness and changing perceptions.
5. Operational Improvements: Assessment and implementation of plans to enhance campus operations, including reducing carbon and water footprints, improving recycling, increasing green spaces, and introducing sustainable practices like eco-mobility and green energy.
6. Recommendations for Sustainability: Development of guidelines and recommendations for advancing sustainability in universities, including replicable examples for other institutions.

Expected Deliverable from Work Package 5

1. Dissemination and Communication Plan: A comprehensive plan detailing communication channels, target groups, promotional strategies, and timelines for sharing project results.
2. Promotional Materials: Creation of materials such as:
 - o Logo and visual style
 - o Brochures and posters
 - o Presentations and multimedia content
 - o Press releases
 - o Short video

- Newsletters
 - Fact sheets
3. Project Website and Social Media: Establishment and regular updates of the project website and social media accounts to share news, progress, and results.
 4. Events and Open Days: Organization of local events, open days, and a final dissemination event to engage the academic community, stakeholders, and the public.
 5. Evaluation of Dissemination Efforts: Assessment of the effectiveness of dissemination activities, including feedback from participants and success indicators such as website visits, social media engagement, and event attendance.