

**Assessment grid of the project proposal submitted in the framework of  
Priority Axis No 1, Specific Objective 1.2  
devoted to Strategic Projects**

**No 547 - TESI - TN MASTER– Training and Education in Social Innovation  
TransNational Master**

**Summary of the project proposal (as from section A.1 of the application form –  
copied and pasted)**

1. Overall objective.

The Joint Master's Program TESI intends to develop and promote the culture and the instruments of social innovation approach in the social policies of the Adriatic-Ionian area. The project is based on the relevant partnership developed during the first step of the TESI Project in 2023. The partnership includes 6 Universities and one research center from 6 Adrion Countries (Italy, Croatia, Greece, Albania, Serbia, and Slovenia), with the support of the University of San Marino as an associated Partner. The JM will enroll 25 participants from the Adrion countries.

2. The expected change your project will make to the current situation.

The TESI TN Master, starting with the student selection processes, will avoid discrimination based on gender, race or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age, or sexual orientation. Through the implementation of the Master, the importance of sharing knowledge, good practices on social innovation, and the principle of equal access to information and training will be emphasized. Within the project activities, including the people selection for the Master, gender equality will be strongly promoted by adopting the 'gendered innovation' approach, defined by the EC, which integrates the sex and gender perspective in knowledge generation and develops specific tools.

Competencies and skills in social innovation should be raised through capacity-building approaches, focusing on contemporary social challenges in public administration's governance, urban regeneration, social entrepreneurship, welfare, social services, and migration. The JM will include an internship abroad in one of the partner Universities and a "project work" applicable: a) to develop social innovation management strategies in a real-life working or b) to research a specific case study in one of the developing areas studied during the teaching modules.

3. The main outputs you will produce and those who will benefit from them.

The primary outcomes of the project will be:

- to form the professional figure of the social innovator;

- to develop an education process/program for 25 social innovation managers;
- to strengthen and extend the inter-university network for social innovation training and education;
- to improve and diffuse the social innovation stakeholder network;
- to create a sustainability plan for a new edition of the self-financed TESI master's degree;
- to disseminate new training models on social innovation and related challenges in the IPA ADRION area.

4. The approach you plan to adopt-

All partners will be included in the process in the specific phases of the project.

- 1) Initial phase. Public presentation of the Master's program in each partner's country to communicate the significance of the project;
- 2) Central phase. Development, organization, and delivery of the Master's program;
- 3) Final phase. Evaluation of the Master's program and elaboration of a new sustainable project to develop in the following years.

Specifically, the Master's course will be organized through dedicated teaching modules with innovative teaching techniques. Each module will be divided into three parts: theory, case studies, histories, and practical laboratories. The program envisages funded mobility schemes to partner universities. Also, it includes a training/internship period to allow students to write their thesis in a real-life working or research context. For that purpose, TESI embraces several businesses and consortia in the project partnership, with which agreements for hosting students have been established. During the two-year project period, various monitoring and evaluation activities will be carried out to analyze and understand the strengths and weaknesses of the project.

5. Future sustainability plan.

All stakeholders, such as teachers, students, and the Scientific board, will be involved in the evaluation process. It will promote a continuous comparison with the network of stakeholders to identify the elements of sustainability functional to replicate the Master in the future with an eye to the needs of the social context and the academic offer, having as a horizon the Adrion IPA countries.

<b>Project initial total eligible budget (in EUR)</b>	<i>Out of which: INTERREG Funds</i>
EUR 999.981,27	EUR 849.984,07

**Partners involved:**

<b>Project partner No</b>	<b>Partner name</b>	<b>Abbreviation</b>	<b>Total INTERREG budget</b>	<b>Total budget</b>	<b>Country</b>
1	Alma Mater Studiorum - University of Bologna	UNIBO	508.801,50	598,590.00	Italy
2	University Iuav of Venice	Iuav	76.011,25	89,425.00	Italy
3	University of Belgrade - Faculty of Philosophy	UBFZF	57.174,41	67,264.02	Serbia
4	University of Tirana	UT	56.271,70	66,202.00	Albania
5	Science and Research Centre Koper	ZRS Koper	46.325,21	54,500.25	Slovenia
6	Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb	FFZG	54.825,00	64,500.00	Croatia
7	Department of Special Account for Research Funds - Hellenic Open University	HOU	50.575,00	59,500.00	Greece
			<b>849.984,07</b>	<b>999.981,27</b>	

**Overview of the overall final score:**

	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Attributed scores</b>
	<b>Work plan and management</b>	<b>15/25</b>
	<b>Communication</b>	<b>5/5</b>
	<b>Budget</b>	<b>11/20</b>
<b>Operational criteria</b>	<b>Minimum score: 30/50</b>	
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>31/50</b>

## Quality assessment grid

### Operational Assessment

Criterion No	Workplan	12
1.a	<p>Is the proposal's intervention logic (i.e., project specific objectives, outputs and expected results) clearly defined and consistent?</p> <p>Do the project main outputs clearly link to the programme output and results indicators?</p> <p>Do the project main outputs clearly link to programme specific objectives and the project specific objectives?</p> <p>Is the overall approach suitable to obtain the planned outputs and results?</p> <p>Is the Master programme in line with the outcomes of the preparatory project granted under ADRION 2014-2020?</p>	3
	<p>+/- The proposal's intervention logic is generally clear and consistent, with well-structured objectives and outputs and results aligned to the programme's expected output and result indicators. The overall approach is suitable to achieve the planned outputs and results, and the proposed activities are logically structured. However, while the overall framework is consistent, some important implementation aspects must be further elaborated as the description is not providing enough details.</p> <p>+/- The Master programme is not fully in line with the outcomes of the preparatory project, as it does not present important details listed in the Action Plan. The application form lacks a clear description of modules, partner responsibilities, and admission criteria, all of which were defined in the Action Plan. It also lacks the structure of mobility scheme and distribution of internships, making implementation unclear. Moreover, the information regarding the accreditation process is not clearly presented in the proposal. Some changes have been introduced compared to the Action Plan— the third accreditation is no longer foreseen at the University of Belgrade but at a newly introduced associated partner, the University of San Marino. A clear justification for this deviation is necessary, although it is possible.</p>	
1.b	<p>Are the work plan and timing of activities, deliverables and outputs realistic, consistent and transparent? Are the proposed financial and human resources appropriate to implement the project?</p>	2
	<p>- The work plan does not present any explicit timeline, and the three main phases of the project— initial, central, and final—are not clearly defined in terms of timing. The central or implementation</p>	

	<p>phase also needs details for each of its sub-phases, and the timing for the final phase – evaluation is also insufficiently defined. Additionally, the justification provided for the involvement of human resources is insufficient to demonstrate that their roles and workload are consistent with the planned activities and proposed budget.+-However, despite the absence of an explicit timeline in the workplan, the overall structure is consistent as the activities follow a logical sequence.</p>	
1.c	<p>Does the project proposal clearly outline the ownership/durability, long lasting effects and transferability of outputs and results?</p> <p>Is financial, institutional, political sustainability ensured?</p> <p>Does the Sustainability Plan included as an Annex to the AF foresee adequate and reliable information (e.g.: reliable funding scheme from public/private resources, students fees etc.) for the next generation of masters?</p>	2
	<p>-The proposal addresses ownership, durability, and sustainability only in general terms, without providing concrete evidence on how these will be put into practice.</p> <p>- The proposal does not clearly outline ownership because it refers only generally to the Partnership Agreement that will be signed and potential joint ownership without specifying how rights and responsibilities will be distributed among PPs. It lacks information on how the Partnership agreement will be developed and implemented after the project ends.</p> <p>+-The proposal presents structured plan for transferability, through governance, communication, and replication mechanisms. However, it remains very general and does not clearly explain how the proposed bodies and strategies could function in practice and how they can be financed.</p> <p>- The Application Manual requires a clear strategy detailing how outputs will be used, maintained, and financed after the project ends. The sustainability plan and related activities in the work plan include estimated costs for the future editions of master and also mention some possible funding sources. However, the plan does not provide commitments or clear indication of funding sources, nor does it specify timelines for securing future financing. Although WP2 outlines that the sustainability strategy will be further developed through involvement of an additional department within UNIBO (DISA Business Sciences Department), these actions are planned to take place during project implementation. The DISA is expected to coordinate activities to develop a sustainability framework and will support project partners at identifying long-term funding and institutional solutions; however, this is a future activity, and the sustainability of the Master’s programme is not fully defined or secured in the developed sustainability plan. In addition, the role of the DISA was not explained in the section B of the project proposal.</p>	
1.d	<p>Will the target groups, the partners, and the stakeholders benefit from the co-operation?</p>	5

	<p>Is the minimum number of students – i.e. 25 – planned to be enrolled in the Master set up by the project?</p> <p>How does the proposal contribute to the respect of horizontal principles?</p>	
	<p>+ The target groups, partners, and stakeholders will benefit from the cooperation since it promotes knowledge exchange, joint development of teaching materials, and creation of network of academic actors. More importantly, the master trains a new professional figure—the social innovator / social innovation manager—which does not currently exist in the region, with enrolment of 25 students in the first edition of the programme.</p> <p>+ The proposal contributes to the respect of horizontal principles by promoting social inclusion, equal opportunities, and non-discrimination through its focus on social innovation and engagement with third-sector actors. It also encourages gender balance and accessibility in candidate selection and guarantees equality in both the learning process and project implementation.</p>	
	<b>Management</b>	<b>3</b>
2.a	<p>Does the management approach show good potential to secure a sound project management, coordination and risk mitigation?</p> <p>Is the proposed project management structure effective? Are the internal communication and management structures appropriate to ensure a smooth co-operation within the partnership?</p> <p>To which extent the need for engaging external expertise is justified (with specific reflection on partnership expertise)?</p>	3
	<p>+ -The budget proportion allocated to external expertise by the Lead Partner is not sufficiently justified, as the budget and role descriptions do not provide adequate detail. Furthermore, while high staff costs and significant staff involvement are foreseen, alongside the use of an in-house body for administrative tasks, the proposal does not clarify which tasks will be undertaken by project staff and which by the in-house body.</p>	
	<b>Communication</b>	<b>5</b>
3.a	<p>Are communication activities planned in the work plan and are they relevant for achieving communication objectives?</p> <p>Are the communication activities and deliverables appropriate to reach the relevant target groups and stakeholders?</p> <p>Will the proposed communication activities lead to sufficient visibility of the project among relevant target groups and stakeholders?</p>	5

	+ Communication activities are well integrated into WPs and clearly aligned with communication objectives, including the promotional events, launch of a dedicated project website, social media channels, and regular newsletters. The communication activities and deliverables are appropriate to reach the identified target groups, which include students, academics, civil society organisations, local authorities, and policymakers, through tools such as a project website, social media, multilingual materials, local events, and final conference. It is unclear why the final conference is planned as an online event, given the project's focus on engagement and visibility. The combination of promotional events, online dissemination, and stakeholder engagement through the Advisory Board ensures strong project visibility and presence in both academic and policy-making environments.	
	<b>Budget</b>	<b>11</b>
4.a	To which extent the presented budget is transparent and include sufficient details per partner and per cost category?  Is the application of simplified cost options (SCOs) appropriate and in line with the programme rules?	3
	+Budget is mainly transparent, including costs for staff at partners universities that will be involved, travel costs and external expertise. However, more details are necessary to clarify firstly staff involvement, primarily for the Lead Partner, and then for all project partners, as their roles are not presented with sufficient details neither in the AF nor in the budget. Additionally, the external expertise cost category needs more details, especially for the LP that foresee high proportion of staff costs, together with an in-house agency that will handle administrative issues. Furthermore, the roles of the two newly introduced departments (Dpt. Of Economics and DISA) is not explained. For PPs, it is necessary to provide detailed breakdown of external expertise costs related to internships or vouchers. +SCO is used only for travel costs of project team, in line with programme rules.	
4.b	To which extent resources planned by the project partners are adequate (in terms of quantity and quality) and reflects market prices?  Are the supporting students' services adequate, realistic and sound from a financial point of view?	2
	+In general terms, the resources seem to be adequate, budgeting in the case of staff costs for the Lead Partner. The staff cost allocation is disproportionate, with the Lead Partner receiving EUR 183.100 that is more than five times bigger amount compared to other partners. PPs staff costs budgets range between approximately EUR 28.000 and EUR 40.000. While the lead partner is responsible for overall coordination and the engagement of the in-house agency managing the Master's programme in Bologna – which could justify a higher allocation of total budget – this discrepancy in staff costs is not explained. Additionally, the justification for such high staff costs	

	<p>remains unclear, especially considering that management and administrative functions are also supported by external expertise. A clearer explanation of the workload distribution and staff involvement for each project partner is necessary to assess this imbalance.</p> <p>- The adequacy of student support services cannot be properly assessed, as the application and budget do not provide sufficient detail regarding their structure. In addition, the budget does not include the details related to students services as requested in the Application Manual.</p>	
4.c	<p>To which extent project budget is proportionate to the proposed work plan and project outputs? Is distribution of budget per period in line with workplan?</p>	3
	<p>+ - The project budget appears generally proportionate to the proposed work plan and expected outputs; however, the lack of detail in the work plan does not allow complete assessment. In particular, more specific information on staff involvement and distribution of tasks is necessary to justify the proposed budget.</p> <p>+ - It is difficult to assess if the distribution of budget per period is appropriate as the application form does not provide sufficient details regarding timeline of proposed activities.</p>	
4.d	<p>To which extent the budget allocated to staff and external expertise is in line with the project content and the costs are realistic? To which extent the budget allocated to equipment (if applicable) is realistic and in line with the project content?</p>	3
	<p>- More details are necessary to clarify firstly staff involvement, primarily for the LP, and then for all project partners, as their roles are not presented with sufficient details neither in the AF nor in the budget. Additionally, the external expertise cost category needs more details, especially for the LP that foresee high proportion of staff costs, together with an in house agency that will handle administrative issues. For PPs, it is necessary to provide detailed breakdown of externa expertise costs related to internships or vouchers.</p> <p>No purchase of equipment is foreseen.</p>	

<b>Antifraud checks</b>	No fraudulent behavior was identified for the beneficiaries involved in the project proposal
-------------------------	--

## Accreditation assessment

Criterion No		Y /N
1.	<p><b><i>Is the information on the accreditation process qualitatively presented?</i></b></p> <p><i>The assessor will verify that all the information needed for the accreditation of the Master Programme is provided</i></p>	
	<p>The documentation provided offers sufficient information to evaluate the Joint Master’s programme in accordance with the key standards prescribed by the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes. However, certain sections of the accreditation proposal could benefit from greater detail to enable a comprehensive understanding of specific aspects, particularly regarding the financial sustainability of the programme, the selection procedures, and the quality assurance process. For these areas, the information provided must be considered in conjunction with that presented in the Interreg application to allow a full appraisal of these aspects. The information included in the accreditation proposal and in the Interreg application is not always fully aligned.</p>	YES
2.	<p><b>Is the Master Programme accredited by at least 2 IPA ADRION Partner States or, in case, the accreditation process takes place only in one IPA ADRION participating country, the recognition procedures are undertaken in at least two other IPA ADRION participating countries</b></p>	
	<p>The Master Programme is accredited in Italy and recognition procedures are undertaken in two IPA ADRION participating countries, Albania and San Marino.</p> <p>The institutions that offer the joint Master’s Programme “Training and Education in Social Innovation – TESI” (University of Bologna, University of Tirana and University of San Marino), are recognised as higher education institutions by the relevant authorities of their countries. As stated in the Agreement, the respective national legal frameworks of these institutions enable them to participate in the joint programme.*</p> <p>As stated in the Agreement signed by the three universities, the TESI Master’s programme is jointly designed and delivered by the three academic partners. The jointness of the programme is primarily ensured within the Scientific Board, with representatives of the consortium partners (1 representative for each of the University who signed the agreement, plus representatives from other partners involved in the Interreg Adrion Project). The Scientific Board, together with the Director of the Master, will be responsible for the overall organisation and proper conduct of the teaching activities.</p> <p>* The proposal would benefit from further information and supporting documentation on the national legal frameworks permitting the consortium partners to engage in the joint program and confer a joint degree, especially in relation to the</p>	YES

	University of Tirana and the University of San Marino.	
<b>3.</b>	<p><b>Is the accreditation process activated based on the standards foreseen at national /EU level? Is the accreditation process conducted applying the procedure and standards prescribed by the European Approach for Quality Assurance of joint programmes?</b></p> <p><i>The assessor shall appraise that the documents provided on accreditation process comply with the minimum quality standards for accreditation. Below some quality standards used during the accreditation process:</i></p> <p><i>Reference to European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint programmes: <a href="https://www.eqar.eu/kb/joint-programmes/">https://www.eqar.eu/kb/joint-programmes/</a></i></p>	
	<p>Based on the documentation provided, all standards have been evaluated as compliant, with a few minor recommendations for improvement. The key findings are presented below, highlighting the main strengths and areas for improvement for each standard.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Joint design and delivery and cooperation agreement</i></li> </ul> <p>The agreement between the partners covers the terms and conditions of their partnership and outlines key aspects of the joint programme, including the denomination of the degree awarded in the programme; coordination and responsibilities of the partners; content of the Master programme; admission and selection procedures for students; insurance and safety and prevention aspects; costs and financing as well as personal data and privacy in the consortium.</p> <p>The roles of the universities participating in the joint programme are clearly defined in the agreement.</p> <p>The Scientific Board, together with the Master’s Director, comprising representatives from the three universities and one representative from the other partners of the Interreg Adrion Project, ensures the joint nature of the programme in all matters related to teaching activities and academic issues.</p> <p>Responsibility for all administrative matters is assigned to Fondazione Alma Mater, which acts as the Management Body/Administrative Office.</p> <p>The joint programme also includes an Advisory Board, consisting of ten members representing NGOs and public bodies, all of whom are social innovation practitioners from the Adriatic-Ionian area.</p> <p>The agreement clearly outlines the governance structure of the joint Master programme, ensuring its effective joint implementation.</p>	YES

### Key Strengths

- *The partnership agreement is comprehensive, covering key aspects such as degree denomination, partner responsibilities, programme content, admissions, financing, and data privacy.*
- *Roles of participating universities and governance bodies (Scientific Board, Master's Director, Administrative Office) are clearly defined, supporting effective joint implementation.*
- *Administrative responsibility is centralised under Fondazione Alma Mater, ensuring clear accountability.*
- *Inclusion of an Advisory Board with external practitioners enhances the programme's relevance and connection to the Adriatic - Ionian region.*
  
- *Didactic process and learning outcomes (Objective of the Master programme and target market; study plan; teaching staff; Directorship of the master programme; educational strategies)*

The objectives and structure of the joint Master's programme are clearly described in both the accreditation proposal and the Interreg Project documentation.

The programme aims to establish an innovative Master's degree that promotes the culture and tools of social innovation within the social policies and governance of the Adriatic–Ionian area. A key feature of the programme is its specialisation in five macro-topics: migration, ageing, social economy, urban and rural regeneration, and education.

Each participating university is responsible for specific modules, thereby ensuring an international perspective and the integration of diverse experiences and practical methodologies drawn from different territorial contexts.

The expected learning outcomes are clearly defined, although the programme could further clarify how these learning outcomes are systematically embedded within the curriculum across all modules.

The documentation does not demonstrate how the learning outcomes align with the respective national higher education qualifications frameworks of each awarding degree partner. To strengthen the evidence, it would be helpful to include:

- a matrix mapping the intended learning outcomes to the Framework for Qualifications in the European Higher Education Area (QF-EHEA), and
- a matrix mapping the intended learning outcomes to the relevant national qualifications frameworks.

The target market is clearly defined, and the design of the Master's programme takes into account the gaps identified in a

previous mapping of the educational offer on social innovation in the Adriatic–Ionian area conducted within the framework of the TESI Interreg project. The objectives and contents of the Master’s program are coherent with the findings of this analysis.

The Joint Master’s programme has an overall duration of approximately 15 months and is structured into three main components.

The first part, delivered at the University of Bologna, consists of ten teaching modules. The second part involves a mobility period at one of the partner universities, during which students participate in workshops, study visits, and an internship/project work with a pre-selected business partner. The third part is devoted to the preparation of the final thesis.

The ten teaching modules address various dimensions of social innovation, combining theoretical lectures with case study presentations, discussions, and workshops aimed at developing methodological skills.

The modules collectively demonstrate that the teaching content effectively supports the overall objectives of the Master’s programme. The curriculum structure and content are well designed to enable students to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

Regarding the teaching staff, the modules are organised and delivered by the entire TESI partnership through the mobility of professors and lecturers, thereby ensuring the programme’s genuine joint nature and its international dimension.

CVs of the key teaching staff from the partner universities are provided, demonstrating that their areas of expertise correspond to the five macro-topics covered by the joint programme. Each partner university contributes courses aligned with its specific academic strengths and the expertise of its faculty members.

The Directorship of the programme is entrusted to the Director (or delegate) of the Department of Political and Social Sciences at the University of Bologna, which hosts the Master’s programme.

The directorship and management provided by the University of Bologna bring significant experience and a well-established academic network in the organisation and coordination of international Master’s programmes involving partners from the Adriatic–Ionian region.

The educational strategies are clearly described and comprise a well-balanced mix of theoretical instruction, case study presentations and discussions, and workshops aimed at developing practical skills. The inclusion of mobility periods and project work ensures that students acquire practical skills and hands-on experience in the field of social innovation.

A notable strength of the programme is the active involvement of several stakeholders who have already committed to

offering internships in social innovation.

### **Key Strengths**

- *The programme's goals and structure are well-defined*
- *The curriculum is well structured and well balanced in terms of key components (teaching modules, mobility periods/internship, final thesis) and educational strategies*
- *Joint nature of the programme: Each partner university delivers specific modules, integrating diverse experiences and practical methodologies from different regional contexts. The mobility of professors further reinforces the programme's collaborative and international character.*
- *Strong programme management is ensured: the Direction and administrative management by the University of Bologna brings experience, an established academic network, and coordination capacity.*
- *Stakeholder involvement: active participation of stakeholders offering internships enhances practical learning opportunities.*

### **Areas for Improvement**

- *Clarify how the learning outcomes are aligned with both the QF-EHEA and the national higher education qualifications framework of each awarding institution.*
- *Detailed mapping of skills across modules: explicit linkage between modules and specific skills or competences could strengthen transparency and assessment.*
  
- *Recruitment and selection of the candidates (admission procedure; applicant's requirements)*

The Joint Master's programme will offer 25 places and will be open to candidates from all countries within the Adriatic-Ionian region. A public call for applications will be issued by the University of Bologna.

The proposal clearly specifies the admission requirements, the necessary documentation, and the selection criteria, including the minimum score required for admission.

However, no clear information is provided regarding the composition of the Admission Board. The agreement delegates

responsibility for the selection process to the administrative office of Fondazione Alma Mater; however, the roles of the other governance bodies in this process are not clearly defined. Student selection requires the involvement of all partner institutions, and it is essential for all roles and responsibilities in the selection procedure to be clearly defined and assigned.

Apart from the stated selection criteria, it is not specified whether candidates will also be invited to an interview stage.

The Interreg application further states that the TESI Master's programme, beginning with the student selection process, will ensure non-discrimination on the basis of gender, race or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age, or sexual orientation. It also highlights that gender equality will be actively promoted from the very beginning of the selection phase by adopting the 'gendered innovation' approach defined by the European Commission, even though the accreditation proposal does not specify how to ensure that the selection process is inclusive or how it addresses potential gender-based differences in the student body (e.g. through the use of diversity metrics).

The documentation does not specify the support measures in place for students with accessibility needs.

The Interreg application mentions that dedicated pages will be created on the UNIBO website; however, no further information is provided regarding the documentation and details that will be made publicly available to students (e.g., information on the programme's admission requirements, structure, curriculum, and education and examination regulations).

Regarding the recognition of qualifications for admission, the proposal clearly states that candidates holding a degree from abroad must provide a Declaration of Value. For degrees awarded by institutions within the European Higher Education Area (EHEA), the Declaration of Value may be replaced by a Diploma Supplement. The programme applies a uniform, centralised recognition policy across the consortium.

Regarding student assessment, the accreditation proposal mentions three different levels of evaluation:

- assessment at the end of each module through intermediate tests;
- evaluation of the internship report; and
- assessment of the final dissertation by an Academic Commission of lecturers.

The documentation does not specify the composition of the Academic Commission or clarify whether a joint examination

of the final thesis/dissertation is guaranteed.

### **Key Strengths**

- *Defined admission framework: The programme clearly specifies admission requirements, necessary documentation, and selection criteria, including minimum scores.*
- *Non-discrimination and gender equality commitment: The programme explicitly ensures non-discrimination based on gender, race, religion, disability, age, or sexual orientation and promotes gender equality through the 'gendered innovation' approach.*
- *Recognition of foreign qualifications: Clear procedures are provided for candidates with degrees from abroad (Declaration of Value or Diploma Supplement for EHEA institutions).*

### **Areas for Improvement**

- *Admission Board transparency: The composition of the Admission Board is not specified.*
  - *Governance of the selection process: While the administrative office of Fondazione Alma Mater is responsible for selection, the roles of other governance bodies in the process are unclear.*
  - *Inclusive implementation details: The accreditation proposal does not clarify how the selection process will ensure inclusivity or address potential gender-based differences among candidates.*
  - *More detailed information should be provided on how the final examination will be conducted and whether a joint examination is ensured.*
  - *Provide a clear and detailed description of the documentation and information that will be made publicly available to students*
- 
- *Personal development of the student (support services – tutoring; coaching, counselling; career service and placement)*

The Administrative Office, managed by the University of Bologna, will be responsible for organising the program's activities and managing its overall administration.

Academic tutors will assist students with both educational and administrative matters, including internship selection. They will also serve as intermediaries between students and the UNIBO Student Administration Office. One tutor is planned, according to the accreditation proposal, for the courses held at the University of Bologna, to provide support with logistical and teaching-related issues.

Regarding the internship, the Interreg proposal specifies that an agreement will be signed between the host organization and the student, identifying a designated supervisor; however, no information is provided about other types of support, including career services or placement assistance.

No additional coaching, counselling, or psychological services are foreseen for students' well-being.

No support materials or handbooks are mentioned that could provide essential information on administrative matters, campus facilities, or other forms of student support.

### **Key Strengths**

- *Centralised administration: The Administrative Office at the University of Bologna manages programme activities and overall administration.*
- *Structured internship arrangements: Agreements with host organizations include a designated supervisor for each student, ensuring formal oversight of internships.*

### **Areas for Improvement**

- *Lack of career and placement support: No information is provided on career services or placement assistance for students.*
- *Insufficient student well-being services: No coaching, counselling, or psychological support is foreseen.*
- *Absence of support materials: No handbooks or resources are mentioned to guide students on administrative matters, campus facilities, or general student support.*
  
- *Structure and organization (teaching settings; library and reading rooms; IT and support equipment; other services;)*

The proposal specifies that most lessons will take place at the University of Bologna; however, no further information is provided regarding the facilities and equipment available to students.

No additional details or clarifications are given concerning access to university structures or services, such as sports facilities, libraries, or digital resources. It is not specified what type of services are provided to students during the mobility or internship period abroad.

### **Areas for Improvement**

- *Access to university services: Details on access to libraries, sports facilities, digital resources, and other student services are missing.*
- *Support during mobility/internship: It is not specified what type of support or services will be available to students during mobility periods or internships abroad.*
  
- *Economic and Financial sustainability (minimum number of the participants; availability of the teaching and administrative staff; logistical and financial resources to expand in subsequent editions)*

The minimum number of participants required to activate the Master's programme is 25, which also represents the maximum number of participants. The governance structure of the Master's programme, involving the participation of the three universities and other partners in the delivery of both teaching activities and internships, ensures the availability of qualified academic and administrative staff.

The high quality of the staff represents one of the programme's main strengths. The teaching staff possesses the necessary experience to implement the study programme effectively and appropriately.

Furthermore, the project benefits from the expertise and experience of the partner institutions in various fields related to social innovation.

The administrative management, entrusted to the FAM, guarantees an adequate and well-structured administrative framework.

About financial resources, the feasibility budget for the first year demonstrates adequate coverage of the main costs foreseen for teaching and administrative management, as well as student accommodation and mobility expenses.

As for the economic and financial sustainability of future editions, it is positive that a study conducted by the Department of Business Sciences (DISA) of the University of Bologna will develop a sustainability framework, identifying best practices and strategies for securing long-term financial resources.

It is also noteworthy that each partner institution will carry out a research study, under the supervision of the DISA Department, to analyse the feasibility of various funding options within their specific regulatory and economic contexts.

It is also a notable strength that one of the objectives of the communication and outreach strategy, namely, to enhance visibility and foster strategic partnerships, is closely aligned with the sustainability strategy.

### **Key Strengths**

- *Qualified staff and governance: the governance structure involving three universities and partners ensures availability of highly qualified academic and administrative staff.*
- *Robust administrative management: administrative responsibilities entrusted to FAM provide a well-structured framework.*
- *Adequate initial funding: the budget covers key costs, including teaching, administration, accommodation, and mobility.*
- *Proactive sustainability planning: studies by the DISA Department and partner institutions aim to develop long-term financial sustainability strategies and explore funding options.*
  
- *Quality assurance (Quality assurance system in place in terms of program design, the monitoring of quality and periodic review).*

The quality assurance system within the programme promotes the active participation of all relevant actors and stakeholders, including students, faculty members, administrative staff, and the Scientific Board.

The evaluation assesses the effectiveness, adequacy, and quality of various aspects of the joint programme, including:

- teaching modules (lecturers, methods and tools, content);
- locations, rooms, and facilities;
- administrative procedures.

Each teaching module, as well as the internships, is subject to specific evaluation.

Nevertheless, the documentation does not include key quality indicators for consideration and analysis, such as student satisfaction with the programme, graduate career paths, student progression, success and drop-out rates, etc.

	<p>The involvement of the Scientific Board as the supervisor of all evaluation reports ensures a joint and coherent assessment of results.</p> <p>The evaluation process is further strengthened through a focus group involving both the Scientific Board and student representatives, aimed at discussing and analysing the evaluation results. It is also positive that a final report will be drafted with clear guidelines for the next edition of the Master’s programme, including a detailed blueprint to ensure a more effective and sustainable implementation, clarifying the roles of all actors involved.</p> <p><b>Key Strengths</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Inclusive quality assurance: Active participation of all relevant stakeholders (students, faculty, administrative staff, and the Scientific Board) in the QA process.</i></li> <li>• <i>Comprehensive evaluation: Assessment covers teaching modules, facilities, and administrative procedures.</i></li> <li>• <i>Scientific Board oversight: Supervision of evaluation reports ensures coherent, joint assessment of results.</i></li> <li>• <i>Focus group involvement: Engaging both students and the Scientific Board in discussing evaluation results enhances transparency and reflective improvement.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Areas for Improvement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Implementation clarity: While the QA process is well designed, explicit mechanisms for how evaluation feedback is integrated into curriculum changes could be further detailed.</i></li> <li>• <i>Establish mechanisms to measure key quality indicators for consideration and analysis</i></li> </ul>	
4.	<p><b>Are the recognition procedures of the master’s degree foreseen to be activated in line with the European transparency and recognition principles and tools?</b></p> <p><i>The assessor will verify that recognition/ validation of the master’s degrees is foreseen to be done following the arrangements and criteria used in mobility activities, in line with the European Charter for Higher Education (ECHE) and the recommended recognition tool: ECTS</i></p>	
	<p>The three universities, by signing the Agreement, commit to jointly awarding the Second-Level Master’s Diploma, in accordance with the laws and regulations of their respective countries. The accreditation proposal clarifies that the partner universities have verified and initiated the necessary recognition procedures with the relevant national authorities.</p>	YES

	<p>The three signatory universities each hold a published and accessible ECHE (Erasmus Charter for Higher Education), which clearly outlines the terms, conditions, and procedures for the recognition of credits earned during mobility periods.</p> <p>The Master’s programme is based on the ECTS system for measuring student workload and clearly defines the credit equivalence for each component of the programme: teaching modules, workshops, internships, and the final thesis. The total number of credits awarded for the Master’s degree is 60 ECTS, as required for second-level programmes. The workload, learning outcomes, and credit allocation criteria are specified in a clear and transparent manner.</p> <p>Credits for mobility activities are defined, and for the internship/project work, a document outlining the project and planned activities will be provided. The project work report will provide a comprehensive account of the student’s internship experience, including an evaluative assessment by the host organization regarding the student’s contributions and overall performance.</p> <p>However, it is not specified whether, a transcript of records will be issued containing a full, accurate and timely record of their achievements at the end of the mobility period (the activities, credits, and grades according to the ECTS system).</p> <p>It is not specified whether a joint Diploma Supplement is issued alongside the joint diploma to provide a comprehensive description of the degree, the institutions involved, and any study and internship mobility activities successfully completed.</p> <p><b>Areas for Improvement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Documentation of mobility/internship outcomes: Providing more information on how student achievements during mobility periods are recognised/documented could improve clarity and transparency.</i></li> </ul>	
<p><b>5.</b></p>	<p><b>Based on the information provided on the accreditation process; is it possible to claim that the Joint Master’ programme is ready to be implemented?</b></p> <p><i>Based on the information provided, the assessor will express its opinion on the readiness of the Joint Master programme to be implemented.</i></p>	
	<p>The overall assessment of the Joint Master’s Programme in Training and Education for Social Innovation is positive.</p> <p>The Joint Master’s programme demonstrates a well-structured, high-quality, and innovative design, with clearly defined goals, curriculum, and governance. Its joint nature, involving three universities and partner institutions, provides an</p>	

	<p>international perspective, diverse teaching methodologies, and stakeholder engagement. The programme benefits from experienced faculty, strong administrative management, and proactive planning for financial sustainability.</p> <p>Educational strategies are balanced, integrating theory, practice, mobility, internships, and project work, while quality assurance procedures actively involve students and staff and include mechanisms for forward-looking improvement.</p> <p>However, certain areas require clarification or improvement to ensure full transparency, inclusivity, and operational effectiveness, particularly with respect to admissions, learning outcomes, student support, facilities, and the integration of quality assurance findings into programme development.</p> <p>Given that, as communicated by the Lead Beneficiary, a new accreditation proposal will be submitted by December 2025, the Lead Beneficiary should clarify in a formal letter how the following recommendations will be integrated into the new proposal, or, if not feasible, how they will be addressed nonetheless to ensure the readiness of the Master’s programme for implementation.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Lead Beneficiary must provide an annex clarifying and attesting how the learning outcomes are aligned with both the QF-EHEA and the national higher education qualifications framework of each awarding institution.</p> <p>The final decision regarding the Joint Master’s programme readiness for the implementation, is subject to the provision of the requested clarifications and supporting documentation.</p>	
--	--	--

**The project proposal is: Mark with a “X”**

<b>Approved</b>	
<b>Approved under conditions</b>	<b>x</b>
<b>Rejected</b>	

*Proposed revised budget*

<b>Project initial total eligible budget (in EUR)</b>	<b>Project revised eligible budget (in EUR)</b>	<i>Out of which: INTERREG (in EUR)</i>	<b>Difference (in EUR and %)</b>
999.981,27	999.981,27	849.984,07	na

**Conditions for improvement following the quality assessment**

The project proposal builds on a previously funded project that developed the foundation for the joint master implementation and is generally well structured. However, some important parts of the proposal are described in a very general way and need to be further developed, as they do not provide the level of detail necessary for proper implementation and monitoring. The following aspects must be clarified or revised:

- Revise the “Project summary” section, taking into account that this information will be published in the programme website and programme communication tools.

Part B – Project Partners:

- LP – explain the roles of two newly introduced departments: Economics Department and DISA (business Science) Department as well as of the Fondazione Alma Mater in implementation.
- PP2 – revise sections on competences and role to avoid repetitions. Further elaborate on the role of the PP2 in implementation, especially in relation to internships.
- PP3- explain competences and experience in relation to the teaching module that the PP3 will coordinate and better explain the role of the PP3.
- PP4, PP5, PP6, PP7 – revise the section competences and experience that does not provide any relevant information related to the master implementation and the teaching module that the PP in question will coordinate.
- For all PPs – better explain the role in implementation of the internships.

Project work plan:

WP1

- Activity 1.1 Management Board and communication – Please provide additional information on the internal communication mechanisms between the various coordination bodies involved in project management. This must include the roles, internal communication, and decision-making procedures, and followed by a new deliverable that will produce a formal document describing internal coordination procedures. Correct the reference to the “Administrative Board” in the description of Activity 1.1 and describe the local administrative structures that will carry out these functions within each partner

institution. Additionally, provide detailed information on the student support services planned during master implementation, including how these services will be organized and delivered at the level of each project partner. Describe the responsibilities and communication mechanisms that will ensure the coordinated implementation of the master including support for mobility and student services. Include the elaboration of risk assessment and contingency plan. Please also include all related deliverables.

- Activity 1.2 Promotion and students' selection – revise the activity by dividing it in two separate ones – one related to promotion and the other to students' selection. In the activity related to student selection provide all relevant details related to enrolment procedure, as per Action Plan developed for the TESI project and add related deliverables such as selection procedure report including equal access. In each activity include the related timeline.
- Activity 1.3 Master Implementation – Please provide a comprehensive and detailed description of the master implementation, starting with the status of the accreditation process. The revised description must include a clear timeline for each phase of implementation, the expected workload and ECTS allocation (per module and total), and the students evaluation methods for each module. Detailed information must be added for all three parts of the programme (teaching modules, mobility/internship, thesis), including the specific roles and contributions of each project partner in each part. Further clarification is also needed on the structure and functionalities of the online platform, the support services available to students – both centrally at LP level and at each PP level, and the quality assurance mechanisms must be introduced and described. Please include all related deliverables necessary to monitor implementation of this activity.
- Activity 1.4 Mobility and Internships - Please revise this activity by providing a detailed description of the second part of the master's programme. The revision must include a clear timeline together with an explanation of the roles of project partners in organizing mobility and internships activities. Describe the procedures for student assignment to another university during mobility period and assignment to host institutions for internship, including the criteria that will be used. Explain the expected learning outcomes of the internship together with the evaluation methods; how students will be supervised during the internship and what kind of deliverables will be required from them following completion of internship. Please add related deliverables to adequately monitor this activity.

## WP2

**The sustainability plan is described as a deliverable to be developed during the project implementation; however, according to the call requirements, a sustainability plan should already be in place at the application stage.**

- Activity 2.4 –Please provide a justification for organising the final event in an online format, particularly considering the project's emphasis on visibility as well as in relation to allocated budget.

## C3 Project Partnership:

- Please provide a justification for the deviations from the original action plan developed under the TESI project, particularly regarding the changes in the accreditation process and provide justification that these deviations will not impact the implementation of the master. Provide more detailed information on the role and involvement of each partner in the implementation as well as on the role of the associated partner, that is involved in accreditation process. It must be clearly explained the role of the University of San Marino, considering its participation in the accreditation process.

## C7 Project Management:

- Please revise the project management section by providing clearer information on internal communication procedures and decision-making processes. Explain how the partnership

will monitor activities, outputs, and budget. Include a description of risk management, with a risk assessment and contingency plan to ensure timely response to potential implementation challenges.

#### Project budget:

- Please provide more details to clarify staff involvement, primarily for the LP, and then for all project partners, as their roles are not presented with sufficient details neither in the AF nor in the budget.
- Additionally, the external expertise cost category needs more details, especially for the LP that foresee high proportion of staff costs, together with an in-house agency that will handle administrative issues. For PPs, it is necessary to provide detailed breakdown of external expertise costs related to internships or vouchers.
- In line with the Application Manual, please provide the following information in the Attachment Section of the AF:
  - Indicate if enrolment and/or registration fees and/or taxes will be required to students, and if this is the case, indicate the required amount; keeping in mind that master course is completely funded by the Programme.
  - Describe the support envisaged for students' mobility and justify the amount.
  - Describe the support for students' accommodation and justify the amount.
  - Describe the support for students' insurance, if any, and justify the amount.
  - Describe the support for students' installation allowance, if any, and justify the amount.
  - Describe how is foreseen the disbursement of the above-mentioned support measures to students.
  - With reference to the above, describe which measures the project will put in place to ensure that participants will complete the master programme.

#### **Conditions for improvement following the accreditation assessment**

- **Admission and selection**
  - Clarify the composition of the Admission Board, as well as the roles and responsibilities of the other bodies involved in the selection process.
  - Specify whether an interview stage will be part of the selection process.
  - Provide detailed measures to ensure inclusivity and address potential gender-based or other differences among applicants.
- **Learning outcomes and curriculum**
  - Map specific skills and competences to individual modules for greater transparency and easier assessment.
  - Clarify how internship and mobility outcomes are formally assessed and documented.
- **Student support and services**
  - Include the provision of:
    - Career services, placement support, and professional guidance for students.

- Coaching, counselling, or psychological support for student well-being.
- Handbooks or support materials detailing administrative procedures, campus facilities, and resources.
- Specify the facilities, equipment, and access to libraries, sports, digital resources, and other student services, including during mobility periods.
- **Quality assurance**
  - Clearly outline how evaluation feedback will be systematically integrated into curriculum and programme improvements.
  - Establish mechanisms to measure key quality indicators for consideration and analysis

Date:

13 November 2025