

## **Annex 1**

### **Description and evaluation of the activity of the Uzbek Local Coordination Board (ULCB)**

**1. Main functions of the Uzbek Local Coordination Board (ULCB)** ULCB is the Uzbek coordinating body for key activities performed in Uzbekistan. It provides

better communication, coordination and monitoring of the work being performed at Uzbek partner HIEs. Project related issues are communicated during ULCB meetings.

#### **2. Meetings of the ULCB:**

- 1) 1<sup>st</sup> ULCB meeting at Tashkent Financial Institute in Tashkent on 3 December, 2017.
- 2) 2<sup>nd</sup> ULCB meeting at Karakalpak State University in Nukus on 20 June, 2018.
- 3) 3<sup>rd</sup> ULCB meeting at Karshi State University in Karshi on 4 December, 2018

#### **3. Key issues discussed at the Meetings of the ULCB and results of these discussions**

##### **3.1. 1st ULCB meeting**

###### ***Recent developments in doctoral education in Uzbekistan:***

It was proposed that referenced journal committee within the project should be established.

###### ***Evaluation and feedback on the knowledge sharing event in Turin:***

In overall, the job shadowing week gave the chances to establish network with colleagues in host university and to learn more detail about organization the doctoral education in Italy.

Taking account the participants feedbacks It was proposed to increase the number of participants and number of days for the job shadowing week at the University of Granada.

###### ***Planning of UZDOC 2.0 activities in Tashkent (Tashkent Chemical -Technological Institute, 5-9 February 2018):***

- The programme of the meeting was developed;
- To ensure a high participation of governmental bodies, external stakeholders and other Higher Education Institutions at the Quality Assurance Conference it was concluded that NEO office in Tashkent, representatives from the Innovative Ministry, representatives from the Ministry of Higher Education, representatives from the recently established government body "Agency of Quality Assurance in education" can be involved in the process.
- To ensure a good selection of doctoral supervisors and doctoral candidates for the trainings on Thursday/Friday, 8-9 February it was decided to involve participants with enough knowledge of English language.
- Specific topics decided to be addressed during the training for doctoral supervisors doctoral

andidates are:

- a) European structure of doctoral education
- b) Education, sciences and Industry relations
- c) Start-up establishment

- To ensure a wide dissemination of the events in Uzbekistan (media)it was decided that TCTI will send the official letter to Central TV office, Publication in local newspapers. Other partner also will publish some articles in local newspapers and each HEI's web sites (e. g. NamSU can submit analytical article to the Pedagogika journal). Also Official letter will be sent to Ministry of Higher Education.

#### ***Equipment purchase***

- possible changes with regard to Namangan State University request:

Decision was made to establish doctoral study Centre at Namangan State University and Tashkent Chemical-Technological Institute.

- launching the Equipment purchase procedure:

NamSU can be responsible for the tendering process in Uzbek side.

#### ***Planning of 2018 activities:***

- 1-day Knowledge-sharing event on collaboration with business and industry sector at Polytechnic University of Turin, May 2018:

The number of days should be increased. Board proposes at least two participates from each partners will be feasible.

- 2<sup>nd</sup> Uzbek Local Coordination Board meeting in Nukus:

Dates will be decided by the Local Coordinator & Contact Persons

- Job shadowing week in Granada:

The number of days should be increased. Board proposes at least two participates from each partners will be feasible.

- 2-day parallel training for doctoral candidates and doctoral supervisors:

Approximately October 2018 at NamSU.

- *Particular aspects of Collaborative Doctoral Education to be addressed at the Knowledge-sharing event in Turin:*

Doctoral thesis discussion process would be interesting to visit. The partnership between doctoral school and industry also interesting.

Also interesting to know how researchers can defend the thesis or conduct research by not disconnecting with the work position.

*- Specific activities/operations of the Postgraduate/Doctoral Office of the University of Granada to be explored during the job shadowing week in Granada:*

Exploring the Doctoral centers, activities, in different faculties, Dissertation discussion must be observed if possible. Writing and publishing scientific articles in peer reviewed journals.

Developing the research proposals for calls, applying for international donor organizations, Marie Curie proposals, Horizon 2020.

*- Institution willing to host the 2-day parallel training for doctoral candidates and doctoral supervisors:*

*NamSU, approximately time is October 2018 at NamSU.*

### **3.2. 2nd ULCB meeting at Karakalpak State University in Nukus on 20 June, 2018**

Guidelines for the Joint Doctoral Centre implementation

Established Joint Doctoral Centre

Shared best practices (Knowledge sharing event in Budapest) 2.5 Model of a doctoral program

Raised awareness on the need of career development and career planning

Dissemination & exploitation

Produced project website content

Dissemination and exploitation reports

3st ULCB meeting

4st ULCB meeting

### **3.3. 3rd ULCB meeting at Karshi State University in Karshi on 4 December, 2018**

Evaluation and feedback on the Roundtables in Tashkent

UZDOC 2.0 Website – translation

Dissemination and exploitation reports

Model Joint Doctoral Programme

Virtual Doctoral Centre

Surveys for PhD candidates

Planning of UZDOC 2.0 activities in Budapest, March 12 & 13 2019: consortium meeting #5 and Knowledge Sharing event on quality of doctoral education and organisation of doctoral schools.

Planning of final event in Nukus

**4. According to your opinion, to what extent the ULCB has been able to fulfil the role envisaged in the UZDOC2.0 Project Description?**

The degree of fulfilment of the role may be considered as full enough considering that the work was carried out also by means of contacting through the Internet.

**5. What have been the factors (if any) hindering the activity of the ULCB?**

There were no factors considerably hindering the activity of the ULCB.

Abdulaziz Kurbanov,  
Karshi State University

## Annex 2

### Evaluation report on the job shadowing exercise in Turin October 9- 13, 2017

#### Background

According to the detailed project description „During the project, two job shadowing events lasting for 5 working days will be organized in the Europe (Torino and Granada) for 7 Uzbek participants with multiplier role in their institution, during which learning and in depth exchange of experiences will be achieved, facilitating cooperation between institutions and actors involved; trainees from Uzbekistan – academic and non-academic (administrative) staff assigned to work in the newly established Joint Doctoral Centre at TFI - will have the opportunity to work alongside European colleagues and gain experience of the role of personnel working in the support structures for doctoral candidates, and gain an insight into the area of doctoral education on European HEIs.”

The aim and the content of the job shadowing exercise is detailed as follows in the detailed project description: „...job shadowing will create opportunities for Uzbek colleagues to link with European partners and to establish contacts and networks which can be further maintained and broaden once the project ends. We expect that a number of new initiatives will be born from these events. Uzbek partners are invited to take the necessary measures to ensure financial sustainability of listed outcomes, including government support and support of decision-making bodies of the partner universities.”

Due to the fact that the legal circumstances that were supposed to support the general renewal of the doctoral education in Uzbekistan are being articulated in a slightly different manner compared to the original expectations the 1<sup>st</sup> job shadowing event which was organised in Turin had to set a bit less ambitious objectives.

#### The programme of the event

The main objective of the programme was to establish a solid knowledge and develop a better understanding related to the support and administrative services of the Doctoral School of Politecnico di Torino.

The detailed programme can be seen below.

Monday 9 <sup>th</sup> October	Tuesday 10 <sup>th</sup> October	Wednesday 11 <sup>th</sup> October	Thursday 12 <sup>th</sup> October	Friday 13 <sup>th</sup> October
09:30 – 13:00 <b>Introductory session</b> Welcome by Head of Doctoral School  Tour de table: Your expectations, needs, concerns  Presentation of the job shadowing programme General presentation of the University and its organization	9:30 – 11:30 <b>I3P – Italian University Incubator and meeting with innovative start-ups</b>  11:45 – 13:00 <b>QVAL: research evaluation and international publication ranking</b>	9:30 – 11:30 <b>The International Area: international relations and networks</b>  11:45 – 13:00 <b>Masters and long life learning</b>	9:30 – 13:00 <b>The Research Area: Support Services for management of funded research projects</b>	9:30 -11:30 <b>The Technological Transfer Area: the private – public partnership</b>  11:30 – 13:00 <b>Internationalization of the PhD (co-tutelle agreement, Joint PhD, Marie Curie)</b>
Lunch 13:00-14:00	Lunch 13:00-14:00	Lunch 13:00-14:00	Lunch 13:00-14:00	Lunch 13:00-14:00
14:00 – 15:00 <b>Doctoral School presentation</b>  15:00 – 16:30 <b>PhD in Italy and Europe</b>	14:00 – 16:30 <b>Case studies from PhD Candidates (international mobility, apprenticeship, collaboration with enterprises)</b>	Free time	14:00-15:30 <b>Stage &amp; Jobs Placement:</b> <b>The career service</b>  15:30 – 16:30 <b>My research in 3 minutes</b>	14:00-15:00 <b>Closing session</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key takeaways</li> <li>• My roadmap</li> </ul>
16:30 Reporting	16:30 Reporting		16:30 Reporting	15:00 Reporting
End of programme: 17:00	End of programme: 17:00		End of programme: 17:00 20:00 Social Dinner	15:30 End of programme

## The purpose and method of the evaluation

According to the detailed project description to ensure the appropriate quality of the different actions a continued internal evaluation activity should be carried out<sup>1</sup>.

Before the job shadowing event started ELTE contacted the Turin colleagues to become informed about the planned activities of the exercise in order to be able to develop a questionnaire which can reflect on the different elements of the activity.

The questionnaire was agreed by the Turing project team and it was distributed among the six Uzbek participants of the activity. Each item had to be evaluated on a four grade scale. All the participants filled in the questionnaire and after the job shadowing event was over all the questionnaires were sent to the ELTE project team. The evaluation results were calculated based on the average of each scale related to the content items. The maximum values could range between 4 and 1.

The data can be seen in the appendix in a summarised format.

## Results

The participants found programme in general satisfactory (mean 3,1) and thought that it would be useful (mean 3,5) in their everyday activities in their home country.

They also considered that the individual thematic lectures and/or interactive sessions were either very useful or useful. The highest average evaluation (mean 3,6) was given to **The Research Area: Support Services for management of funded research projects** and **Internationalization of the PhD (co-tutelle agreement. Joint PhD, Marie Curie)**. The lowest evaluation (mean 2,8) was given to **The Technological Transfer Area: the private – public partnership**.

The participants were fully satisfied or satisfied with the organisation of both the professional and the non-professional (leisure time) activities. The same impression articulated from the open ended questions: the participants enjoyed the job shadowing exercise and highly evaluated the professionalism of the Turin colleagues. The only criticism expressed was in relation to the too short periods of time spent on sight-seeing and other cultural events.

## Conclusions

The programme was well organised and it was found useful by the participants.

---

<sup>1</sup> Internal evaluation will show achieved project's results, measure the achievements of every partner, the effectiveness of knowledge transfer within the consortium and the efficiency of the project management. It will evaluate main activities carried out by each partner during the monitored period, indicating the status of accomplishment of the tasks and the resources allocated to those activities. An internal evaluation tool - form containing self-evaluation and self-assessment questions - will be provided by WP leader for this task, facilitating controlling and monitoring of each partner's activities in each step of the project using indicators of progress and measures. (Project description, p. 37)

## Appendix to the Job shadowing evaluation report

1. You received some preliminary information concerning the purpose and the programme of the job shadowing event a few weeks before the event.

**Have you found this preliminary information clear and satisfactory enough?**

*Please circle the relevant number below!*

	4	3	2	1	mean
	Fully satisfactory	Satisfactory	Partly incomplete	Very incomplete	
responses	4	15			3,1

2. Have you found the professional content of the programme as a whole useful from the point of view of your activity in the Uzbek doctoral education?

*Please circle the relevant number below!*

	4	3	2	1	mean
	Very useful	Useful	Only partly useful	Not at all useful	
responses	12	9			3,5

3.1. Have you found the programme items listed in the table below useful from the point of view of your activity in the Uzbek doctoral education?

*Please circle the relevant number below!*

1. Doctoral School presentation					Mean
4	3	2	1		
Very useful	Useful	Only partly useful	Not at all useful		
12	9				3,5
2. PhD in Italy and Europe					
4	3	2	1		
12	9				3,5
3. I3P – Italian University Incubator and meeting with innovative start-ups					
4	3	2	1		
12	9				3,5
4. QVAL: research evaluation and international publication ranking					
4	3	2	1		
4	15				3,1
5. Case studies from PhD Candidates (international mobility, apprenticeship, collaboration with enterprises)					
4	3	2	1		
12	9				3,5
6. The International Area: international relations and networks					

4	3	2	1	
8	12			3,3
<b>7. Masters and long life learning</b>				
4	3	2	1	
4	15			3,1
<b>8. The Research Area: Support Services for management of funded research projects</b>				
4	3	2	1	
16	6			3,6
<b>9. Stage &amp; Jobs Placement: The career service</b>				
4	3	2	1	
16	3			3,1
<b>10. My research in 3 minutes</b>				
4	3	2	1	
4	6			3,3
<b>11. The Technological Transfer Area: the private – public partnership</b>				
4	3	2	1	
12	3	2		2,8
<b>12. Internationalization of the PhD (co-tutelle agreement. Joint PhD, Marie Curie)</b>				
4	3	2	1	
16	6			3,6

4. Are you satisfied with the organization of the professional programme?

**Please circle the relevant number below!**

	4	3	2	1	Mean
	Fully satisfied	Satisfied	Partly satisfied	Dissatisfied	
responses	16	6			3,6

5. Are you satisfied with the non-professional programme?

**Please circle the relevant number below!**

	4	3	2	1	
	Fully satisfied	Satisfied	Partly satisfied	Dissatisfied	
responses	12	9			3,5

6. Are you satisfied with the non-professional circumstances of the event (accommodation, travel, food, etc.)?

**Please circle the relevant number below!**



<b>Level of satisfaction</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Mean</b>
<b>Non- professional elements</b>	<b>Fully satisfied</b>	<b>Satisfied</b>	<b>Partly satisfied</b>	<b>Dissatisfied</b>	
accommodation	12	9			3,5
travel	12	9			3,5
food	12	3	4		3,1
Other, please specify			6		
Other, please specify			2		

7. Further notes concerning the professional content:

- the programme was very useful; a lot of things can be implemented into the home country
  - professional programme was very well structured
- excellent presentations

8. Further notes concerning the organizational aspects:

- more cultural programme
- organisation was good during the whole period

9. Any further notes:

- Great opportunity
- More time to visit the town

### Annex 3

#### Evaluation Report

#### Quality Assurance Consultation workshop

Tashkent, 5 – 6, February 2018.

Hosted by Tashkent Chemical-Technological Institute

**Main purposes of the event were** to contribute to the development, implementation and adaptation of innovative quality assurance mechanisms and support structures by raising the awareness and knowledge concerning the advantages of cooperation among Uzbek HEIs including the development of joint doctoral programmes.

The evaluation report consists of three parts: (i) summary of the evaluation by the participants (produced by the ELTE-team); (ii) evaluation by UGR-team responsible for WP2; (iii) conclusions by the ELTE-team responsible for WP3

**The Workshop had four elements as follows:**

- Introduction to the concepts of doctoral programme and joint doctoral programme (Prof Antonio Goonzales, UGR)
- Case studies by Uzbek Universities (TCTI, NamSu)
- Exercise in designing a model of a joint doctoral programme (JDP)
- Discussion on the Guidelines for the establishment of the (virtual) Joint Doctoral Centre

**The objectives of the exercise concerning JDP were**

- to develop a better understanding on how a Joint Doctoral Programme can function;
- to clarify the participants' ambitions and expectations related to JDP;
- to identify the main steps and procedures that are necessary in the planning and implementation phase of a JDP
- to understand the personal and institutional challenges in relation to JDPs

#### EVALUATION BY THE PARTICIPANTS

Key conclusions from the evaluation questionnaire filled by 16 participants are as follows

1. The 94 % (n=15) of the participants found the **preliminary information** concerning the Quality Assurance Consultation workshop fully satisfactory and 6% (n=1) satisfactory. (Mean: 3.9)
2. The 81 % (n=13) of the participants found the **professional content of the Quality Assurance Consultation Workshop as a whole** very useful and 19% (n=3) useful from the point of view of their activity in the Uzbek doctoral education. (Mean: 3.8)

3. As to the components of the **Consultation Workshop**, evaluation by the participants is as follows:

<b>1. Presentation:</b> “Introduction to concepts of doctoral programme and joint doctoral programme”			
Very useful 81% (n=13)	Useful 19% (n=3)	Only partly useful	MEAN 3.8
<b>2. Case studies by Uzbek universities: TCTI</b>			
Very useful 81% (n=13)	Useful 19% (n=3)	Only partly useful	MEAN 3.8
<b>3. Case studies by Uzbek universities: NamSu</b>			
Very useful 73% (n=11)	Useful 27% (n=4)	Only partly useful	MEAN 3.7
<b>4. Exercise in designing a model of a joint doctoral programme</b>  (moderated by the Team of ELTE)			
Very useful 88% (n=14)	Useful 12% (n=2)	Only partly useful	MEAN 3.9
<b>5. Discussion on the Guidelines for the establishment of the (virtual) Joint Doctoral Centre</b>			
Very useful 88% (n=14)	Useful 12% (n=2)	Only partly useful	MEAN 3.9

4. The 94% (n=15) of the participants were fully satisfied and 6% (n=1) satisfied with the organizational aspects of the Workshop.

#### ***Evaluation by the ELTE-team***

The Quality Assurance Consultation Workshop was well structured, the different type of activities made a good mix of theory and practice. As the main focus of the whole activity was to fine tune the opportunities related to Joint Doctoral Programmes it was important to get a better understanding of the participants’ views on this opportunity. It has become clear that depending on the subject areas different directions can be seen as best options for Uzbek Higher Education Institutions. The Consultation Workshop provided all the participants (facilitators and Uzbek representatives) with a better and deeper understanding regarding the benefits and costs of a JDP. The fact that the new legislative system of doctoral education was still in progress at the time of the event and that the related rules and regulations were not yet crystal clear caused some sort of ambiguity for practical exercise in designing a model JDP.

***It seems desirable to modify the concrete content of output D2.5.*** The Project Plan envisages that “during the lifecycle of the project, a model of a new JDP will be created ... through which they will be able to accomplish cooperation, and to implement quality standards..” (p.39) Under the current

circumstances of the Uzbek doctoral education, it seems more useful to develop less formalized ways of cooperation. On the other hand, it would be useful to prepare suggestions for the necessary conditions and steps in developing cooperation (and JDP if feasible) with foreign European universities.

## Annex 4

### Internal Evaluation Report

## Quality Assurance Seminar

Tashkent, 7 – 8, February 2018.

Hosted by Tashkent Chemical-Technological Institute

**Main purposes of the event were** to contribute to the development, implementation and adaptation of innovative quality assurance mechanisms and support structures by raising the knowledge and capacity of the participating Uzbek HEIs in implementing quality assurance standards in doctoral education.

The evaluation report consists of three parts: (i) summary of the evaluation by the participants (produced by the ELTE-team); (ii) evaluation by UGR-team responsible for WP2; (iii) conclusions by the ELTE-team responsible for WP3.

### EVALUATION BY THE PARTICIPANTS

Key conclusions from the evaluation questionnaire filled by 14 participants are as follows

1. The 57 % (n=8) of the participants found the **preliminary information** concerning the Seminar received before the event fully satisfactory and 43% (n=6) satisfactory. (Mean: 3.6)
2. The 64 % (n=9) of the participants found the **professional content of the Quality Assurance Seminar as a whole** very useful and 36% (n=6) useful from the point of view of their activity in the Uzbek doctoral education. (Mean: 3.6)
3. As to the components of the **Quality Assurance Seminar**, evaluation by the participants is as follows

<b>1. Presentation on <i>Quality assurance in doctoral education in Uzbekistan in the context of the recent reforms</i></b>			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 36% (n=5)	Useful 64% (n=9)	Only partly useful	3.4
<b>2. Presentation on <i>Quality assurance in doctoral education in Europe</i></b>			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 50% (n=7)	Useful 50% (n=7)	Only partly useful	3.5
<b>3. Panel discussion on <i>Experiences from the job shadowing week in Turin</i></b>			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful	Useful	Only partly useful	3.5

50% (n=7)	50% (n=7)		
<b>4. Presentation on <i>Quality assurance in doctoral supervision</i></b>			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 71% (n=10)	Useful 29% (n=4)	Only partly useful	3.7
<b>5. Presentation on <i>Quality assurance in administrative processes</i></b>			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 57 % (n=8)	Useful 43% (n=6)	Only partly useful	3.6
<b>6. Presentation on <i>Quality assurance in internationalisation</i></b>			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 43% (n=6)	Useful 57 % (n=8)	Only partly useful	3.4
<b>7. Panel discussion on <i>Quality assurance of doctoral theses</i></b>			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 43% (n=6)	Useful 57 % (n=8)	Only partly useful	3.4

4. The 64% (n=9) of the participants were fully satisfied and 36 (n=5) satisfied with the organizational aspects of the Seminar.

#### ***Evaluation by the ELTE-team***

The quality evaluation seminar according to the participants' perception was successful from both organisational and content perspective. The participants developed a better understanding of those education forms and contents which might be the most useful for them in the current circumstances.

It would be useful to have an internal discussion by the responsible organization on the possible weaknesses of those items where the mean value was less than 3.6 that is half or more of the participants were not fully satisfied with that.

## Annex 5

### Internal Evaluation Report

#### Training for doctoral candidates and supervisors

Tashkent, 8 – 9, February 2018.

Hosted by Tashkent Chemical-Technological Institute

**Main purposes of the event were** to contribute to the development, implementation and adaptation of innovative quality assurance mechanisms and support structures by raising the capacity of the participating Uzbek HEIs in implementing quality assurance standards in doctoral education.

The evaluation report consists of three parts: (i) summary of the evaluation by the participants (produced by the ELTE-team); (ii) evaluation by UGR-team responsible for WP2; (iii) conclusions by the ELTE-team responsible for WP3

Key conclusions from the evaluation questionnaire filled by 33 participants are as follows:

The 70 % (n=23) of the participants found the **preliminary information** concerning the Seminar received before the event fully satisfactory and 30% (n=10) satisfactory. (Mean: 3.7)

The **58%** (n=19) of the participants found the **professional content of the Training for doctoral candidates and supervisors as a whole** very useful and 42% (n=14) useful from the point of view of their activity in the Uzbek doctoral education. .(Mean: 3.6)

As to the components of the **Training for doctoral candidates and supervisors**, evaluation by the participants is as follows

1. Joint session: Sharing views on doctoral supervision			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 58% (n=19)	Useful 42% (n=14)	Only partly useful	3.5
2. Joint session: Priorities and expectations			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 55% (n=18)	Useful 45% (n=15)	Only partly useful	3.5
3. Plenary talk on publications			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful	Useful	Only partly useful	3.6

70% (n=23)	24% (n=8)	6% (n=2)	
<b>4. Case studies - publications</b>			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 70% (n=23)	Useful 30% (n=10)	Only partly useful	3.7
<b>5. Plenary talk on research integrity and ethics</b>			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 64% (n=21)	Useful 36% (n=11)	Only partly useful	3.7
<b>6. Case studies - research integrity and ethics</b>			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 58% (n=19)	Useful 42% (n=14)	Only partly useful	3.6
<b>7. Session on "My action plan"</b>			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 48% (n=16)	Useful 52% (n=17)	Only partly useful	3.5

The 65% (n=20) of the participants were fully satisfied and 35 (n=11) satisfied with the organizational aspects of the Training. (Note: This question was answered by 31 participants)

Among the participants there were 14 doctoral students, 15 supervisors and 4 participants working in university administration. We also analysed the evaluation by students and supervisors separately.

#### **Evaluation by doctoral students**

The 57 % (n=8) of the doctoral students found the **preliminary information** concerning the Seminar received before the event fully satisfactory and 43% (n=6) satisfactory. (Mean: 3.6)

The 50% (n=7) of the doctoral students found the **professional content of the Training for doctoral candidates and supervisors as a whole** very useful and 50% (n=7) useful from the point of view of their activity in the Uzbek doctoral education. (Mean: 3.5)

As to the components of the **Training for doctoral candidates and supervisors**, evaluation by the doctoral students is as follows

<b>1. Joint session: Sharing views on doctoral supervision</b>			
4	3	2	MEAN



Very useful 57% (n=8)	Useful 43% (n=6)	Only partly useful	3.6
<b>2. Joint session: Priorities and expectations</b>			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 57% (n=8)	Useful 43% (n=6)	Only partly useful	3.6
<b>3. Plenary talk on publications</b>			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 43% (n=6)	Useful 57% (n=8)	Only partly useful 6% (n=2)	3.4
<b>4. Case studies - publications</b>			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 50% (n=7)	Useful 50% (n=7)	Only partly useful	3.5
<b>5. Plenary talk on research integrity and ethics</b>			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 57% (n=8)	Useful 43% (n=6)	Only partly useful	3.6
<b>6. Case studies - research integrity and ethics</b>			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 64% (n=9)	Useful 36% (n=5)	Only partly useful	3.6
<b>7. Session on "My action plan"</b>			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 43% (n=6)	Useful 57% (n=8)	Only partly useful	3.4

The 57% (n=8) of the participants were fully satisfied and 43% (n=6) satisfied with the organizational aspects of the Training.

### ***Evaluation by supervisors***

The 73 % (n=11) of the supervisors found the **preliminary information** concerning the Seminar received before the event fully satisfactory and 27% (n=4) satisfactory. (Mean: 3.7)

The 53% (n=8) of the supervisors found the **professional content of the Training for doctoral candidates and supervisors as a whole** very useful and 47% (n=7) useful from the point of view of their activity in the Uzbek doctoral education. (Mean: 3.5)

As to the components of the **Quality Assurance Seminar**, evaluation by the supervisors is as follows

<b>1. Joint session: Sharing views on doctoral supervision</b>			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 47% (n=7)	Useful 53% (n=8)	Only partly useful	3.5
<b>2. Joint session: Priorities and expectations</b>			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 40% (n=6)	Useful 60% (n=9)	Only partly useful	3.4
<b>3. Plenary talk on publications</b>			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 88% (n=13)	Useful 6% (n=1)	Only partly useful 6% (n=1)	3.8
<b>4. Case studies - publications</b>			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 80% (n=12)	Useful 20% (n=3)	Only partly useful	3.8
<b>5. Plenary talk on research integrity and ethics</b>			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 67% (n=10)	Useful 33% (n=5)	Only partly useful	3.7
<b>6. Case studies - research integrity and ethics</b>			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 47% (n=7)	Useful 53% (n=8)	Only partly useful	3.5
<b>7. Session on "My action plan"</b>			

4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 47% (n=7)	Useful 53% (n=8)	Only partly useful	3.5

The 53% (n=8) of the participants were fully satisfied and 47% (n=7) satisfied with the organizational aspects of the Seminar.

### ***Evaluation by the ELTE-team***

The Training for doctoral candidates and supervisors proved to be successful from the perspective of supervisors and doctoral students as well. The timing (time slots allocated to different activities) could have been more sensitive to the content and other requirements of the particular issue.

It is supposed that those who are fully satisfied marked the “very useful” and the expectations of those who marked the “useful” have not been fully met. As the share of the “very useful” answers (50% of the doctoral students and 53% of the supervisors) was lower than in the case of the other two events, it seems desirable to make a deeper evaluation of the possible weaker points and consider the lessons for the second training activities.

It seems desirable to devote more time for well-designed case studies / group work and less for plenary presentations

From an evaluator’s perspective it can be mentioned that the technical facilities for presentations were not the most appropriate and it may hinder the understanding of the presentations. The lack of Wifi connection also caused difficulties for some lecturers.

## Annex 6

### Evaluation Report

#### Knowledge sharing event on Collaboration with Companies

15 May 2018, Torino

Hosted by Politecnico di Torino

**Main purposes of the event were** to further the quality development in the Uzbek doctoral education by sharing experiences with the Uzbek colleagues on the collaboration with companies during the PhD career, on the training of PhD candidates towards the private sector, as well as the experiences of doctorate holders working in companies.

The evaluation report consists of two parts: (i) summary of the evaluation by the participants (produced by the ELTE-team); (ii) conclusions by the ELTE-team responsible for WP3.

#### EVALUATION BY THE PARTICIPANTS

Key conclusions from the evaluation questionnaire filled by 19 participants are as follows:

1. The 89.5 % (n=17) of the participants found the **preliminary information** concerning the **Knowledge sharing event** fully satisfactory and 10.5% (n=2) satisfactory. (Mean: 3.9)
2. The 84.2 % (n=16) of the respondents found the **professional content of the Knowledge sharing event as a whole** very useful and 15.8% (n=3) useful from the point of view of their activity in the Uzbek doctoral education. (Mean: 3.8)
3. As to the components of the **Knowledge sharing event**, evaluation by the participants is as follows:

**Please circle the relevant number below!**

1. Presentation on GM Industrial PhD Programme			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 73.7% (n=14)	Useful 26.3% (n=5)	Only partly useful	3.7
2. Presentation on European Industrial Doctorate			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 63.2% (n=12)	Useful 36.8% (n=7)	Only partly useful	3.6
3. Presentation of cases of Companies Granting PhD Scholarships			

4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 89.5% (n=17)	Useful 10.5% (n=2)	Only partly useful	3.9
<b>4. PhDs Working in Companies: Presentation on „From PhD to business opportunity: the role of I3P in the CoACH project's case”</b>			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 89.5% (n=17)	Useful 10.5% (n=2)	Only partly useful	3.9
<b>5. PhDs Working in Companies: Case Studies from Doctoral Graduates</b>			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 94.7% (n=18)	Useful 5.3% (n=1)	Only partly useful	3.9
<b>6. Collaboration with Companies: Technology Transfer System @ Polito</b>			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 78.9% (n=15)	Useful 21.1% (n=4)	Only partly useful	3.8
<b>7. Bridging the gap between research and entrepreneurial activities through education</b>			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 89.5% (n=17)	Useful 10.5% (n=2)	Only partly useful	3.9
<b>8. Soft skills: monitoring the training courses addressed to PhD students</b>			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 78.9% (n=15)	Useful 21.1% (n=4)	Only partly useful	3.8
<b>9. The importance of university-industry relations for the career development of doctorate candidates: an example of Université libre de Bruxelles</b>			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 84.2% (n=16)	Useful 15.8% (n=3)	Only partly useful	3.8
<b>10. Discussion Panel about the Role and Challenges of Cooperation with Business/Industry in both European and Uzbek Contexts</b>			

4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 100.0% (n=17)	Useful (n=0)	Only partly useful	4.0

The **programmes that the participants found most useful were as follows:**

- Collaboration with Companies: Technology Transfer System @ Polito (n=6)
- PhDs Working in Companies: Presentation on „From PhD to business opportunity: the role of I3P in the CoACH project's case” (n=4)

4. The 100.0% (n=19) of the participants were fully satisfied with the organizational aspects of the professional programme.

#### ***Evaluation by the ELTE-team***

The knowledge sharing event addressed the most relevant issues of the collaboration between universities (doctoral education and research) and companies from the perspectives of both the industry and education. It also highlighted both the common and differing interests. Uzbek participants could gain relevant experiences about the European practice in this respect.

## Annex 7

### Evaluation Report

**Job shadowing event: Granada, 3 – 7, September 2018.**

**Hosted by University of Granada**

**Main purposes of the event were** to further the quality development in the Uzbek doctoral education by gaining an insight into the area of doctoral education on European HEIs.

The evaluation report consists of two parts: (i) summary of the evaluation by the participants (produced by the ELTE-team); and (ii) comments by UGR organizing the event.

#### EVALUATION BY THE PARTICIPANTS

Key conclusions from the evaluation questionnaire filled by 13 participants are as follows:

1. The 90.9 % (n=10) of the participants found the **preliminary information** concerning the **Job shadowing event** fully satisfactory and 9.1% (n=1) satisfactory. (Mean: 3.9)
2. All respondents found the **professional content of the Job shadowing event as a whole** very useful from the point of view of their activity in the Uzbek doctoral education. (Mean: 4)
3. As to the components of the **Job shadowing event**, evaluation by the participants is as follows:

1. Introduction to the Doctoral Schools by their directors			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 69.2% (n=9)	Useful 30.8% (n=4)	Only partly useful	3.7
2. Introduction of the Council of Doctoral Representatives			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 92.3% (n=12)	Useful 7.7% (n=1)	Only partly useful	3.9
3. Visit and presentation of the administrative units at the EIP			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 92.3% (n=12)	Useful 7.7% (n=1)	Only partly useful	3.9
4. Peer to peer meeting with doctoral candidates at the EIP			
4	3	2	MEAN
This meeting was not held.			
5. Visit to the Mind, Brain and Behavior Research Center Simulation of an Research group meeting			

4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 53.8% (n=7)	Useful 46.2% (n=6)	Only partly useful	3.5
<b>6. Introducing the industrial doctorates at the UGR</b>			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 30% (n=3)	Useful	Only partly useful 70% (n=7)	1.9
<b>7. The Research Transference Office (OTRI)</b>			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 92.3% (n=12)	Useful 7.7% (n=1)	Only partly useful	3.9
<b>8. Visit to the International Welcome Centre</b>			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 76.9% (n=10)	Useful 23.1% (n=3)	Only partly useful	3.8
<b>9. Presentations on <i>Managing International projects</i></b>			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 100% (n=13)	Useful	Only partly useful	4.0
<b>10. Managing international projects: working groups</b>			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 92.3% (n=12)	Useful 7.7% (n=1)	Only partly useful	3.9
<b>11. Lecture on academic publications</b>			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 58.3% (n=7)	Useful 41.7% (n=5)	Only partly useful	3.6
<b>12. The International Relations Office-ORI of the University of Granada</b>			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 92.3% (n=12)	Useful 7.7% (n=1)	Only partly useful	3.9
<b>12. The internationalization at the UGR: Internationalization Strategy and Internationalization Plan</b>			



4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 100% (n=13)	Useful	Only partly useful	4.0

4. The 50% (n=6) of the participants were fully satisfied and 50% (n=6) satisfied with the organizational aspects of the professional programme. (Mean: 3.5)

5. The 91.7% (n=11) of the participants were fully satisfied and 8.3% (n=1) satisfied with the non-professional programme.

### ***Evaluation by the UGR***

The overall evaluation by the UGR is positive with some observations. The group engaged in the programme activities, but also they showed more interest in some of them than others.

The second day was a bit hectic and I reported to the coordinator in UNICA, Marta Wasowska in order to re-conduct some attitudes in the following days. Our Uzbek colleagues seemed to be very tired, two of them didn't even show up the first day and during the lunch time we were informed that part of the group had been in a disco the last two nights. After a reminder of the compromises sent by the coordination in Brussels, everything worked better.

Following the advice of Marta Wasowska we modified slightly the programme in order to lighten it up and permit the group to rest and enjoy the city life. The attractiveness of the city was undeniable and they were very satisfied with the non professional programme.

We noticed that we made a good advance in the understanding of the cotutelle and explored further possibilities of cooperation with this tool.

We had to modify the programme of visits to the units at the EIP several times: the second day we split the group into two to visit two faculties following the preferences that they had expressed the day before: Science and Civil Engineering. The visit to Science was very good and they were enthusiastic, but with the civil engineering group they told us that they didn't want to continue with the visit because they literally were "not interested". In the afternoon we had to improvise a visit to the Faculty of Fine Arts after a request of one of the members and the rest of the group took the rest of the day off. We decided to cancel the visit to the CIMCYT because they were not interested. We also decided to cancel the activity on Industrial Doctorates, since the leaders of the group advised us that this had been the focus in the training organized previously by the University of Torino.

We also noticed that the language was a problem for part of the group, in spite of the fact that English was a requisite to attend the job shadowing. One of our experts from the Office for International Projects is Russian and we asked her if it would be possible to give her talk in Russian. This was the most successful activity, the group had very an active and lively discussion and we immediately assumed that the passivity of some member of the group in the other activities was due to this language problem.

All in all, most of the activities were productive and the whole group benefited from the discussion and these inconveniences mentioned above were minor in comparison with the results.

## Annex 8

### Evaluation Report

#### Workshop: The role of support staff in doctoral education

Tashkent, 1 October 2018.

Hosted by Tashkent Institute of Finance

**Main purposes of the event were** to further the quality development in the Uzbek doctoral education by sharing experiences with the Uzbek colleagues on the role of support staff in doctoral education.

#### EVALUATION BY THE PARTICIPANTS

Key conclusions from the evaluation questionnaire filled by 14 participants are as follows:

1. The 64.3 % (n=9) of the participants found the **preliminary information** concerning the Workshop fully satisfactory, 21.4% (n=3) satisfactory and one participant partly incomplete and also one participant very incomplete. (Mean: 3.4)
2. The 78.6% (n=11) of the respondents found the **professional content of the Workshop as a whole** very useful and 21.4% (n=3) useful from the point of view of their activity in the Uzbek doctoral education. (Mean: 3.7)
3. The 57.1% (n=8) of the participants were fully satisfied, 28.6% (n=4) satisfied and 14.3% (n=4) only partly satisfied with the organizational aspects of the Workshop. (Mean: 3.4)

## Annex 9

### Evaluation Report

#### Roundtable with business & industry representatives from Uzbekistan

Tashkent, 2 October 2018

Hosted by Tashkent Institute of Finance

**Main purposes of the event were** to further the quality development in the Uzbek doctoral education by discussing key issues of the cooperation between the business sector and the doctoral programmes.

The evaluation report provides a summary of the evaluation by the participants.

#### EVALUATION BY THE PARTICIPANTS

Key conclusions from the evaluation questionnaire filled by 17 participants are as follows:

1. The 47.1% (n=8) of the participants found the **preliminary information** concerning the event fully satisfactory and 52.9% (n=9) satisfactory. (Mean: 3.5)
2. The 29.4% (n=5) of the respondents found the **professional content of the event as a whole** very useful, 64.7% (n=11) useful and 5.9% (n=1) only partly useful from the point of view of their activity in the Uzbek doctoral education. (Mean: 3.2)
3. As to the **components of the Roundtable**, evaluation by the participants is as follows:

1. Setting the context: University-business-industry cooperation in doctoral education: Perspectives from Europe and Uzbekistan			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 35.3% (n=6)	Useful 52.9% (n=9)	Only partly useful 11.8% (n=2)	3.2
2. ROUNDTABLE(1): What is the added value of university-business-industry cooperation in doctoral education? Needs, expectations, and potential benefits as seen by different actors			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 29.4% (n=5)	Useful 70.6% (n=12)	Only partly useful	3.3

<b>3. ROUNDTABLE (2): Laying ground for successful university-business-industry cooperation in doctoral education: How to make it happen? How to support doctoral candidates in their career development?</b>			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 5.9% (n=1)	Useful 88.2% (n=15)	Only partly useful 5.9% (n=1)	3.0
<b>4. Turin Polytechnic University in Tashkent – presentation by Prof. Igor STIEVANO, Vice-Rector</b>			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 30.8% (n=4)	Useful 69.2% (n=9)	Only partly useful	3.3
<b>5. Visit to the Tashkent campus of the Polytechnic University of Turin</b>			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 27.3% (n=3)	Useful 63.6% (n=7)	Only partly useful 9.1% (n=1)	3.2

4. The 45.5% (n=5) of the participants were fully satisfied and 54.5% (n=6) satisfied with the organizational aspects of the professional programme (Mean=3.4).

## Annex 10

### Evaluation Report

#### Knowledge sharing event on quality of doctoral education and organization of doctoral schools

13 March 2019, Budapest

Hosted by Eötvös Loránd University, Faculty of Education and Psychology

**Main purposes of the event were** to further the quality development in the Uzbek doctoral education by sharing experiences with the Uzbek colleagues on the organization and quality development of the doctoral education in Europe as well as at ELTE, including good practices in supervisory work and the doctoral students' experiences.

The evaluation report consists of two parts: (i) summary of the evaluation by the participants (produced by the ELTE-team); (ii) conclusions by the ELTE-team organizing the event and responsible for WP3.

#### EVALUATION BY THE PARTICIPANTS

Key conclusions from the evaluation questionnaire filled by 17 participants are as follows:

1. The 59 % (n=10) of the participants found the **preliminary information** concerning the **Knowledge sharing event** fully satisfactory and 41% (n=7) satisfactory. (Mean: 3.6)
2. The 63 % (n=10) of the respondents found the **professional content of the Knowledge sharing event as a whole** very useful and 37% (n=6) useful from the point of view of their activity in the Uzbek doctoral education. (Mean: 3.6)
3. As to the components of the **Knowledge sharing event**, evaluation by the participants is as follows:

1. Lessons from the transformation of the doctoral education in Hungary from an Academy-managed system to a university-based system			
Very useful 53% (n=9)	Useful 35% (n=6)	Only partly useful 6% (n=1)	MEAN 3.5
2. Quality assurance in doctoral education: European experiences			
Very useful 50% (n=8)	Useful 50% (n=8)	Only partly useful	MEAN 3.5
3. Doctoral education at ELTE: quality requirements, organization, key mechanisms			
Very useful 56% (n=9)	Useful 38% (n=6)	Only partly useful 6% (n=1)	MEAN 3.5

4.The role of national-level bodies (Hungarian Doctoral Council and Hungarian Accreditation Committee) in ensuring good quality of doctoral education			
Very useful 63% (n=10)	Useful 37% (n=6)	Only partly useful	MEAN 3.6
5. Report and discussion on the preparation of Joint Doctoral Programme of Uzbek HEIs			
Very useful 63% (n=10)	Useful 25% (n=4)	Only partly useful 12% (n=2)	MEAN 3.5
6.Doctoral schools' experiences with quality developments (Round-table discussion)			
Very useful 56% (n=9)	Useful 44% (n=7)	Only partly useful	MEAN 3.6
7.Doctoral students' experiences with the new requirements introduced in 2016			
Very useful 63% (n=10)	Useful 31% (n=5)	Only partly useful 6% (n=1)	MEAN 3.6
8. Group work: good practices in supervisory work			
Very useful 37% (n=6)	Useful 63% (n=10)	Only partly useful	MEAN 3.4

4. The 71% (n=12) of the participants were fully satisfied and 29% (n=5) satisfied with the organizational aspects of the professional programme. (Mean: 3.7)

5. As to the non-professional circumstances:

- The 63% (n=10) of the participants were fully satisfied and 37% (n=6) satisfied with the accommodation (Mean: 3.6).
- The 29% (n=4) of the participants were fully satisfied, 50% (n=7) satisfied and 21%(n=3) partly satisfied with the food (Mean: 3.1).
- The 36% (n=4) of the participants were fully satisfied, 55% (n=6) satisfied, and 9% (n=1) partly satisfied with the other aspects of the non-professional circumstances.

### ***Evaluation by the ELTE-team***

Most content related elements of the knowledge sharing event were rated high, which is a reassuring information as the main objective of this particular event was to show how the transition from one system to another, EU compatible system, can be implemented, and how the

smooth running of the transition can be ensured. The only “Partly useful” option was chosen just 5 times.

Several members of the Uzbek team participated at the pre-conference program where they could get information about the practice of Doctoral School of Chemistry at the Faculty of Sciences of ELTE. On the basis of the informal feedback received from the participants this was an instructive component of their stay in Budapest.

The activity labelled “Group work: good practices in supervisory work” was an active training program aimed at supporting the development of skills needed to create an institutional strategy for the development of the quality of supervisory work. All Uzbek participants showed a high level activity during this program and the following plenary reporting on this was found of high quality by the organising ELTE team.

The fact that the lowest rating was given to the food offered is an important sign to be taken into consideration; cultural differences in dietary habits should be taken into consideration with greater caution as they might have an impact on the whole endeavour.

## Annex 11

### Evaluation Report

#### Workshop on Supervision of PhD candidates

Namangan, Uzbekistan, 3-4 July 2019

Hosted by Namangan State University

**Main purposes of the event were** to further the quality development in the Uzbek doctoral education by discussing key issues of supervision of PhD candidates.

The evaluation report provides a summary of the evaluation by the participants.

#### EVALUATION BY THE PARTICIPANTS

Key conclusions from the evaluation questionnaire filled by 21 participants are as follows:

1. The 61.9% (n=13) of the participants found the **preliminary information** concerning the Workshop fully satisfactory, 28.6% (n=6) satisfactory and 9.5% (n=2) partly incomplete. (Mean: 3.5)
2. The 57.1% (n=12) of the respondents found the **professional content of the Workshop as a whole** very useful and 42.9% (n=9) useful from the point of view of their activity in the Uzbek doctoral education. (Mean: 3.6)
3. As to the components of the **Workshop**, evaluation by the participants is as follows:

<b>Presentation on the Expectations of PhD students &amp; supervisors by Jacques Lanarès</b>			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 66.7% (n=14)	Useful 33.3% (n=7)	Only partly useful	3.7
<b>Presentation on the responsibilities, preparation and skills required by supervisors/ doctoral students by Melita Kovacevic and Kenneth Wann</b>			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 66.7% (n=14)	Useful 33.3% (n=7)	Only partly useful	3.7
<b>Activity: Reflection on Expectations of PhD students &amp; Supervisors (questions document)</b>			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 71.4% (n=15)	Useful 23.8% (n=5)	Only partly useful 4.8% (n=1)	3.7



<b>Activity: Charter in groups about “Making a PhD student – supervisor”</b>			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 66.7% (n=14)	Useful 33.3% (n=7)	Only partly useful	3.7

4. The 85.7% (n=18) of the participants were fully satisfied and 14.3% (n=3) satisfied with the organizational aspects of the professional programme (Mean=3.8).

5. The 81% (n=17) of the participants were fully satisfied and 19% (n=4) satisfied with the organization of the non-professional part of the programme (accommodation, travel, meals) (Mean=3.8).

## Annex 12

### Evaluation Report

#### Final event

Nukus, 11 –13, September 2019

Hosted by Karakalpak State Institute

**Main purposes of the event were** to further the quality development in the Uzbek doctoral education by training on transferable skills and research ethics; as well as by discussion on implementation priorities in doctoral education in Uzbekistan.

The evaluation report consists of two parts: (i) summary of the evaluation by the participants; and (ii) conclusions by the ELTE-team responsible for WP3.

#### EVALUATION BY THE PARTICIPANTS

Key conclusions from the evaluation questionnaire filled by 16 Uzbek participants are as follows:

1. The 80 % (n=12) of the participants found the **preliminary information** concerning the **event** fully satisfactory and 13.3% (n=2) satisfactory and 6.7% (n=1) partly incomplete. (Mean: 3.7)
2. The 68.7 % (n=11) of the respondents found the **professional content of the event as a whole** very useful, 18.8% (n=3) useful and 12.5% (n=2) only partly useful from the point of view of their activity in the Uzbek doctoral education. (Mean: 3.6)

3. As to the components of the **Knowledge sharing event**, evaluation by the participants is as follows:

1. Training 1: TRANSFERABLE SKILLS			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 81.2% (n=13 )	Useful 18.8% (n=3)	Only partly useful	3.8
2. Presentation of Survey and Recommendations on the career development of doctoral candidates in Uzbekistan			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 68.8% (n=11 )	Useful 25.0% (n=4 )	Only partly useful 6.3% (n=1 )	3.6
3. Training 2: Research Ethics and Integrity			

4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 81.2% (n=13)	Useful 18.8% (n=3)	Only partly useful	3.8
<b>4. PANEL – implementation priorities in doctoral education in Uzbekistan</b>			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 81.2% (n=13)	Useful 18.8% (n=3)	Only partly useful	3.8
<b>5. Presentations: PhD programme in practice – from different perspectives</b>			
4	3	2	MEAN
Very useful 81.2% (n=13)	Useful 18.8% (n=3)	Only partly useful	3.8

4. The 81.31% (n=13) of the participants were fully satisfied and 18.8% (n=3) satisfied with the organizational aspects of the professional programme. (Mean: 3.8)

#### ***Evaluation by the ELTE-team***

The final event of UZDOC 2.0 consisted of five important elements. The Uzbek participants evaluated most of them “Very useful” or “Useful” and the “Partly useful” option was chosen only ones. Both the formal and informal feedback (received from the Uzbek delegates/attendees) show that the final program was high standard/quality. The two interactive trainings (Transferable skills; Research Ethics and Integrity) where the members of the Uzbek and the international team worked together were very useful and instructive. Most of the Uzbek colleagues showed high level activity in the group work and during the whole program as well.

