



Project Title: Modernising Undergraduate Renewable Energy Education: EU Experience for Jordan

Acronym: MUREE

Project Number: 530332-TEMPUS-1-2012-1-JO-TEMPUS-JPCR

Funding Scheme: TEMPUS (Joint Projects, Curricular Reform)

Grant Agreement Number: 2012-3324/001-001

Duration 3 Years Starting on 15/10/2012

Coordinator: Princess Sumaya University for Technology (PSUT), Jordan

Project Manager: Professor Abdallah Al-Zoubi

Address: Khalil Saket Street 118, Amman 11941, Jordan

Tel: +9626 5359949/+9627 77355299

Fax: +9626 5347295

Email: zoubi@psut.edu.jo

Project Website: <http://muree.psut.edu.jo/Home.aspx>

Deliverable Title	<i>Mid-Term Evaluation Report</i>		
Author(s)	<i>Mike Blakemore and Jens Palacios</i>		
Organisation Name(s)	TU-Berlin-External Evaluator		
Deliverable No.	8.4		
Deliverable Type	Report		
WP Number	2		
WP Leader	TU-Berlin		
Due Date of Delivery	15/4/2014	Project Month	16
Submission Date	15/9/2014	Project Month	25
Dissemination Level	International Level		
Total Number of Pages	3		

The Quality Committee and external independent evaluator produced a mid-term report on the basis of project documents, analysis of outputs and achieved results, stakeholder interviews and context analysis. The report has taken into consideration the following 5 aspects:

1. Relevance
2. Efficiency
3. Effectiveness
4. First impact
5. Sustainability

Following the interim report, and the comments received from the Commission, there was broad encouragement from the Commission, with some specific areas of recommendation.

The view of Prof. Blakemore is that the interim stage is largely a mechanism to report work in progress, and to flag up any issues. However, the next phase of the project is critical for delivery of the outcomes, and on that basis Prof. Blakemore recommends a particular approach when dealing with the Commission.

First, while the project has a positive relationship with the desk officer at EACEA we must work on the basis that the person may be moved to another task and a new desk officer may appear. They will prepare themselves by reading the application, focusing on the objectives,

and looking at the list of deliverables. Providing the deliverables, and having them accepted by the Commission, is critically important since that is how the Commission measure progress.

So the meeting between Mike Blakemore, Jens Palacios and Ahmad Albalasie took on the form where Professor Blakemore looked at the project as if he was a final external reviewer, expecting to see the objectives met, and expecting to read a full set of deliverables.

We looked first at the specific objectives of MUREE which in the application stated:

1. Develop, integrate, accredit and evaluate a bachelor degree program with an appropriate laboratory component in renewable energy jointly taught by universities in Jordan and brought into line with the Bologna requirements.
2. Engage faculty in the development of interactive instruction techniques for lectures and laboratory courses and sharing experiences with EU partner universities.
3. Develop and implement course content using VLE delivery and remote labs.
4. Extend services and training in collaboration with the local and regional industry and community.
5. Improve the human capacity of Jordanian universities by providing training and upgrading opportunities in the EU for aspiring young and women academic members of staff.

It is envisaged that these specific objectives will contribute to a sustainable outcome that will promote curriculum reform in engineering education and leave a longer-term legacy for Jordanian university.

The project's wider objective is to ensure that universities in Jordan are placed in a position to offer quality education compatible with European standards and meets socio-economic needs of the emerging knowledge-based society by strengthening renewable energy teaching in order to graduate professional leaders who can meet market needs of the country. Its direct aim is to enhance the capacity and enable Jordanian partner universities to develop sustainable renewable energy bachelor programmes with state-of-of-the-art educational technologies. MUREE will thus contribute to a sustainable outcome that will promote curriculum reform in engineering education and leave a longer-term legacy for Jordanian universities”.

Objective 1 is mission-critical. The Commission will expect to see a single bachelor programme that is jointly taught across the partner universities in Jordan. It will expect the programme to be accredited and externally evaluated. It will expect the programme to using important Bologna tools.

To date, however, the focus of activities seems to be on a small set of modules that will be taught at some of the partner universities. The interim report describes that process, but it will still be assumed by the Commission that they will eventually be components in a single bachelor programme. Unless the consortium has negotiated a contract amendment with the Commission (and we are not aware of any such amendment) then the original objectives remain and we will be measured on them.

The consortium therefore needs to take account of where it is with the selective modules, and then understand how it will work towards a single bachelor programme that is jointly taught. The Commission places a high priority on collaboration across institutions in teaching and learning, and that involves more than just developing some modules. The desk officer and evaluators will be asking the sorts of questions: Can you provide the overall structure of the proposed bachelor degree program? The commission will expect to see a clearly structured bachelor degree program. This will involve aims and objectives, learning outcomes and an

explanation of how the program will be “taught jointly in Jordan in line with Bologna”. The commission will also expect that any equipment purchase is clearly justified through the detailed information relating to the degree program. From the minutes of meetings, all we can see at this stage is a proposal for some modules to be taught at some Jordanian universities.

Can this issue be clarified please? If the Commission has accepted that the original objective 1 is not operative then we do not have a problem, but they must have formally accepted that in writing. If they have not, it is too late to ask them, and we must focus on the single bachelor programme with all the integration that requires.

Objectives 2-4 are being broadly addressed through the project activities, but please see the following comments about deliverables.

Objective 5 seems yet to be addressed: “providing training and upgrading opportunities in the EU for aspiring young and women academic members of staff”. Have people been identified (what methodology was used) and have EU partners been contacted to devise a programme of activities? The Commission place great emphasis on such issues.

Once they have looked at the objectives, the desk officer and the evaluators will look at the list of deliverables (Section C7 in the original proposal). In reviewing the deliverables with Prof. Blakemore we cannot find a single location where all the deliverables are available and in a consistent structure. When checking Dropbox there are some deliverables listed but it is not clear if they are final versions, and some (which were due before now) are only agendas, not final deliverables. Prof. Blakemore regards it as important that he has a full set of deliverables, and the Commission will expect to have a structured set. So, until Prof. Blakemore has a current set of structured deliverables it is difficult to make an overall quality judgment. For example, deliverable 5.1–5.4, relating to the training center and capacity building. Prof. Blakemore needs documentation in particular from 5.2, which he would expect to detail the rational scoping and implementation of the training center.