



EUROWEEK GUIDELINES

2018

PROFESSIONAL INTER-UNIVERSITY MANAGEMENT FOR EDUCATIONAL NETWORKING

PRIME Networking
Rue Royale 150 Koningstraat
Bruxelles 1000 Brussel

SEB Bank
Bank account: LV51UNLA0050023523597
IBAN: LV51UNLA0050023523597

TABLE OF CONTENT

<u>1</u>	<u>EUROWEEK TIMING</u>	<u>1</u>
1.1	DURING THE PREVIOUS EW	1
1.2	DURING THE PREVIOUS AGM TO THE EW	1
1.3	AFTER THE PREVIOUS AGM TO EW	2
1.4	REMINDERS FOR THE HOST	2
<u>2</u>	<u>JURIES</u>	<u>3</u>
2.1	JURY CREATION, COMPOSITION AND RULES	3
2.2	REMINDER FOR THE HOST	4
<u>3</u>	<u>TEAMS</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>4</u>	<u>STUDENT PARTICIPATION</u>	<u>5</u>
4.1	REMINDER FOR THE HOST	5
<u>5</u>	<u>PROJECT POSTER PRESENTATIONS</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>6</u>	<u>FINAL STUDENTS' PROJECT PAPER</u>	<u>5</u>
6.1	REMINDER FOR THE HOST	5
<u>7</u>	<u>PROJECTS</u>	<u>6</u>
7.1	TIMING OF PROJECT PRESENTATIONS	6
7.2	REMINDER FOR HOST	6
<u>8</u>	<u>AWARDS</u>	<u>7</u>
<u>9</u>	<u>CERTIFICATES</u>	<u>7</u>
9.1	REMINDER FOR THE HOST	7
<u>10</u>	<u>SCIENTIFIC SEMINAR/ACADEMIC FORUM</u>	<u>7</u>
<u>11</u>	<u>EUROWEEK GUIDELINES: UPDATES</u>	<u>7</u>

APPENDIX 1: Marking Grid of Project Presentations

APPENDIX 2: Written Report Evaluation Criteria

APPENDIX 3: Poster Presentation Assessment

Note Abbreviated References: PRIME Networking (PN), Euroweek (EW), Annual General Meeting (AGM), General Assembly (GA), EBM (Executive Board Meeting), Executive Board (EB), PMM (Project Management Meeting), Managing Director (MD), Responsible Leader (RL).

1 EUROWEEK TIMING

1.1 During the previous EW

The EW process starts during the closing ceremony of the previous Euroweek with a short introduction by the next host. That introduction should include:

- **Dates.** The dates of the EW event must always take place between April and May.
- **Topic.** The topic decision is not only a host decision. The host institution can/should suggest a topic, but it should be approved by the General Assembly two years before. If there is a lack of volunteers at the right time, this should be approved by the Executive Board.
- **Venue.** The host should provide some description of the school, the location and facilities.

1.2 During the previous AGM to the EW

The host submits:

- **Final dates**
- **Price for students and academics** - Previous years should be a reference to set up the prices.
- **Maximum number of participants**, six students and 2-3 academics per country, If there are any places left over, the EW responsible leader together with the host institution will redistribute them. This process should be finished 96 days before the beginning of the Euroweek.
- **Accommodation premises.**

The assembly establishes the final deadlines for the next EW proceedings calendar:

	Proceeding	Deadlines Number of days before the next Euroweek begins
1	Project Posting Deadline to submit the project proposals will be posted on PN website: www.primenetworking.eu (see <i>Project Proposal Template</i> on PN website). No project reference number is necessary.	starts 161 days, ends 148 days (for 2 weeks)
2	Project Shopping Deadline to participate in (min) 1 – (max) 3 projects per institution on the PN website: www.primenetworking.eu	starts 147 days, ends 127 days (for 3 weeks)
3	Project Remaking The Executive Board member responsible for Euroweek will reorganize students to make certain all projects are complete.	starts 126, ends 116 days (for 10 days)
4	Project Final List Available on www.primenetworking.eu and on the EW host website. Project references numbers will be assigned by the Executive Board responsible for Euroweek.	115 days
5	Participants Registrations Open The EW host will send an application form or a link to the online form on their website in an email to all PN member schools.	EW host decision
6	Students' Redistribution (if necessary)	96 days
7	Final Number of Participants Confirmation Each institution should send an email(*) to the EW host, confirming the final number of participants, students and academics.	EW host decision

8	<p>One Page Abstract of all Students' Projects</p> <p>Each institution/project team should send the one page abstract by email(*) to the EW host in the format provided (see <i>Abstract Template</i> on PN website). Project title should be <u>finalized</u>.</p>	48 days
9	<p>Payment of Registration Fees Is Due</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Invoices will be sent to participating schools for the registered students and academics participating in EW. <p>Measures to be taken in case of non-payment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The GA agreed that leaving the financial problem to the hosting institution is unacceptable; therefore, measures must be taken: ○ After the Euroweek, the Managing Director will send a letter on behalf of Prime Networking to the Rector of the institution with a deadline (31/08) asking to make the payment. <p>If that institution does not respond, the EB will propose to the GA to take serious measures and request immediate payment.</p>	35 days
10	<p>Final Students' Project Paper</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Each institution project team should submit their final written paper by email(*) to the EW host in the format provided (see <i>Written Paper Template</i> on PN website). ○ The project paper must follow the template guidelines, available on www.primenetworking.eu and the host website. ○ The project paper should be a min. of 10 pp. and max. 20 pp., and submitted by email(*) to the EW host. ○ If the paper is submitted after the deadline it will be excluded from the written paper competition, and no flexibility will be allowed. The Managing Director can allow the team to participate in the project presentation competition. 	21 days define HH:MM (local time of the host country)

(*) The host will have to confirm and inform the PN members of any special email address created for the Euroweek organization.

1.3 After the previous AGM to EW

- The project-forming platform.
- Project members dropping is a problem. This situation will be considered during the evaluation process.
- The project shopping platform will be on the PN website.
- The titles of the projects cannot be changed once the project abstract has been submitted.

1.4 REMINDERS FOR THE HOST

- Add the final EW deadlines for the different EW proceedings on the annual host website.
- Send reminders to participants of important dates and deadlines, such as registration.
- Add a short introduction to the Euroweek theme and topics.
- Global Village reminders on the host website: (1) students should avoid wasting food and not open all the food containers if it is not necessary. This will be helpful so that the food can be redistributed among the participants at the end; (2) host country to remind all participants that beer and wine is acceptable but no hard liquor should be served.
- To include in the closing ceremony agenda time for the introduction of the next EW host and coordinate timing, IT Support, etc.
- To publish a final list of accepted projects and their official titles.

2 JURIES

Students will be aware of the evaluation criteria that juries will apply for the project presentations, project posters and the written papers, when students are registered for the EW. This information will be available in the EW host website; as well as in the Euroweek section of the PN website.

2.1 JURY CREATION, COMPOSITION AND RULES

Juries are created by the host institution.

a) Project assessment (See Appendix 1 Marking Grid of Project Presentations):

- There will be 3 jury tracks.
- Jury members cannot be changed during the EW and they must remain in their track.
- Each jury is made of 6 members, including one jury chairman.
- The Role of the Chairman role:
 - To lead the session.
 - To moderate the discussion between jury members.
 - To give feedback to the students.
 - To assure the correct formal procedure of the evaluation sheet.
- In case there are irreconcilable opinions between jury members about an evaluation, to help make the final decision.
- In case of jury/country coincidence in a project presentation, that jury member cannot vote. At least 4 of the 6 members must be allowed to vote.
- Juries cannot ask questions or make any comments or remarks during the presentation and/or during in the interactive part.
- Juries will be called for a jury briefing and will receive a printed document with the rules to observe (jury guidelines).
- Professors involved in the project can accompany the students during the feedback given by the jury.

b) Assessment procedure:

- Immediately after the presentation the jury will conduct the qualitative evaluation (10 minutes) and this will be given as feedback to the students (10 minutes). Professors involved in the project can be present at this evaluation.
- Later (potentially even upon return to the home institution), the quantitative evaluation (grades) will be sent to the Project Leader. This will be performed by the Secretariat based on the completed evaluation forms provided by each Jury President. The Project Leader's e-mail will be on the evaluation form, and this information will be added in the form of EW 2008.
- To conduct the project assessment, the following criteria were approved during the AGM in Riga. Example of calculation:

Bachelor 1 = 100
 Bachelor 2 = 90
 Bachelor 3 = 80
 Bachelor 4 = 70
 Master 1 = 70
 Master 2 = 60

If the team group consists of: $(1 \times \text{Bachelor 1}) + (2 \times \text{Bachelor 2}) + (2 \times \text{Bachelor 3}) + (1 \times \text{Master 1}) = 100 + 180 + 160 + 70 = 510/6 = 85 \%$

This category counts for 10% e.g. 8,5 points for this team.

c) Final Students' Project written paper assessment (See Appendix 2 Written Report Evaluation Criteria – report template will be posted on PN website)

- One jury consisting of three members will assess all written papers in accordance with the evaluation criteria submitted by the academic group (Minutes of the AGM at Vilnius AGM, 02-10-13, item 9).
- The three jury members will consist of one Board member, 1 member from the host institution and 1 academically qualified Prime Networking member.
- Written reports will be assessed anonymously. The identity of the authors of the papers is only available in the members' part of the PN website; the jury not related to the current EW cannot access that information.
- The students will receive feedback from the jury.

d) Project Poster Presentation assessment (See Appendix 3 Poster Presentation Assessment – poster template will be posted on PN website)

- There will be a special jury for the project poster/pitch assessment. Ideally, they will be assessed by enterprises (cf. First impressions in EW Girona 2008) but whatever their composition, their names must be announced, if possible, during the Closing Ceremony and when the "Best Project Poster" award is announced.

2.2 REMINDER FOR THE HOST

- To set up the juries as soon as possible. Inform the co-opted ones via e-mail.
- To schedule the jury briefing as soon as possible in the EW agenda.
- To print the guideline for the jury members.
- To mention jury members for the project poster during the closing event.

3 TEAMS

Responsible leaders should make available all criteria to participating students in projects. A separate document with EW criteria for all competitions will be posted on the PN Website, separate from 2018 EW Guidelines. Teams must be composed by at least 3 and a maximum of 6 students from three different countries. Teams are made of:

- **Project Leader.** It is one of the academics involved in the project. He/she will be the overall project responsible and the speaker with the jury. From 2012 on, the project owner is the project leader (or vice versa).
- **Participating students.**
- **Facilitators.** They are each one of the responsible academics in each participant Institution.
- The Project Leader is a Facilitator as well.
- All people from registered teams can present, but it doesn't mean that all of them can be in the competition.
- If there is a problem of "project dropping", to be allowed to compete the remaining project members should be at least 3 students from at least 2 countries.
- The Host and the Board member responsible for EW, will track and update the status of number of final projects and participating students.

4 STUDENT PARTICIPATION

- If there are 21 or more projects, students should attend at least 6 projects and their own one.
- If there are 20 or less projects, students should attend at least 5 projects and their own one.

4.1 REMINDER FOR THE HOST

- Provide rooms to practice presentations.
- Control the attendance of students at presentations.
- Lock the doors once the presentations start to avoid interruptions.

5 PROJECT POSTER PRESENTATIONS

- Every project must create a project poster and presentation (elevator pitch).
- Poster presentation/elevator pitch assessment is part of the whole project assessment. However, the award will be kept separately. See Appendix 3 Poster Presentation Assessment.

6 FINAL STUDENTS' PROJECT PAPER

- This must be submitted by sending it to a special email address (same as One Page Abstract) created for the Euroweek organization. Do not send any hard/paper copies.
- The Final students' project paper should be a min. of 10 pages/max. 20 pages, and must follow the instructions of the Final Students' Project Paper (Template available on PN website) document that can be found on the PN website, Documents section, as well as on the EW host website.
- The assessment evaluation criteria will also be available on both the EW host and PN websites.
- Papers will be provided 21 days in advance before the EW starts. **If the paper is not sent by the deadline, it will not be allowed to participate in the competition for the written papers prize.**

6.1 REMINDER FOR THE HOST

- To define clearly the time for preparation of poster presentations in the EW schedule.
- To provide information regarding the facilities that will be made available to students.
- To identify a "poster presentation/pitch jury" comprised of individuals outside the member universities or business professionals.
- To limit food, snacks or sweets at project stands/poster presentations unless there is a direct relationship to the project itself.

7 PROJECTS

Project files will only be named with the project code (for example EWK18NL01), so that all projects are identified and to avoid confusion with changes to the project titles.

7.1 Timing of Project Presentations

Time slot per project is 90 min, of which presentation may not exceed a total of 70 min. Taking this into account the internal time distribution within this project presentation time slot will be:

30 min.: presentation

15 min.: interaction with the audience. This is the total amount of time (distributed across the student team) allocated to each team for Q&A with student audience.

05 min.: audience leaving the room

10 min.: jury evaluation

10 min.: qualitative evaluation feedback from the jury to the students

70 min.: total

(The remaining 20 minutes is reserved for students changing classrooms)

For Euroweek 2018 it is mandatory to submit a project PowerPoint presentation on Wednesday, no later than 8:00 PM, as a PDF file. This will be done using the PN memory stick cards and delivering it to the host. The host will make those presentations available for the jury members. The aim of this rule is to ensure that students are using the same file for the presentation. Those projects which haven't submitted the presentations in time will be excluded from competition.

7.2 REMINDER FOR HOST

- To indicate the Post Project timing in the annual EW web.
- To remember to keep a posting place on the annual EW web and to explain how to do it if necessary.
- To remember to be ready to make presentations available for the jury.
- To indicate to whom or where USB with presentations must be delivered.

8 AWARDS

Project presentation awards:

- There are 3 jury tracks
- The host institution has flexibility with regards to the number of prizes for project presentations and written paper prizes. (In prior years, the guidelines stated that if there are 7 projects or more in any track, there will be 2 awards; if there are less than 7 projects, only 1 award will be given).
- There is no overall prize award
- Poster presentation award: There is 1 best Poster Presentation prize.
- Final Students' Paper award: There is 1 best Written Paper award.
 - Written paper awards can be increased up to three best papers for publication funded by Prime.
 - Prime will pay for fees for publication of top 3 papers (up to 200 euros each, max= 600 euros, in effect as of Coimbra EW Conference).

9 CERTIFICATES

- A participation certificate must be given to every student who has attended the stipulated number of presentations.
- For the awarded student project presentations, written papers and project stands, a certificate as a winner project must be also given to the institutions. This will not replace the Managing Director letter to the rector.

9.1 REMINDER FOR THE HOST

- The EW certificates must be delivered before the EW ends. A scanned signature of the MD will be provided to the EW host.
- After the EW, the organizer must send to the PN Secretariat an email with the list of the awarded projects, the teams and academics involved in an excel file.

10 SCIENTIFIC SEMINAR/ACADEMIC FORUM

An Academic Forum / Scientific Seminar might be offered to (EW) academics based on what the host decides.

11 EUROWEEK GUIDELINES: UPDATES

A brief survey was conducted during the AGM in 2016 and the Guidelines were updated in 2017, and updated for EW 2018 after the AGM in 2017.

A. ACADEMIC CONTENT:

CRITERIA	100-80 (a)	79-60 (b)	59-40 (c)	39-20 (d)	19-0 (e)
1- Were the objectives academically relevant to the conference theme?	Yes, all objectives match with the theme and are central.	Yes, the main part of the objectives match with the theme.	Yes, but they are not much relevant to the main theme.	No, only few of them are related to the main theme.	No single objective match with the theme.
2- Did the research information relate logically to the objectives?	The research information is related logically, information needed is present.	The research information is related logically, but some information needed is missed.	The research information is related to the objectives but not logically. You can skip some information.	The research information very poor related to the objectives, it is easy to find information to improve the research.	No research information used in the project or the one used is useless.
3- Was the content analytical and academic?	Yes.	Yes but in a low academic level.	The content is basically descriptive, but academic.	The content is only descriptive and poorly academic.	No
4- Was the data dealt with critically?	Yes	Good critical level.	Critical level in average.	Really low critical level.	No
5- Were the sources of information cited in the presentation?	Yes	Nearly all of them.	Some of them.	Nearly no one.	No

B.1. PRESENTATION SKILLS TEAM MEMBERS:

CRITERIA	100-80 (a)	79-60 (b)	59-40 (c)	39-20 (d)	19-0 (e)
1- Was the purpose clearly presented?	Yes, more than once.	Yes, but it could be explained better.	Yes, but not clearly.	Presented but confusing and erroneous.	No
2- Was the presentation structure well-organized, easy to follow?	Is clearly and logically structured, easy to follow.	Logically structured but could be more clear and make it easier to understand.	The structure is not so clear but understandable. Some elements are missed or not well developed.	Sometimes difficult to understand.	The structure is not logical and that creates difficulties to understand it. An important range of elements are missed or not well defined.
3- Were the main points summarized?	Yes	Almost all of them.	Some of them.	Nearly no one of them.	No
4- Is the presentation clear, varied, confident, eloquent?	Very clear, varied, confident and eloquent.	Some of this points were missed.	Half terms.	Almost all of points were missed.	NO clear, varied, confident and eloquent.
5- Was the presentation media provide added value to the content?	Yes, all the media used added value to the content.	Not all media used added value but is good enough.	You could skip big part of media used.	You could skip nearly all media used.	No all the media used, is irrelevant.
6- Was body language communicative?	All members had good body language capturing the audience attention.	Just one or two didn't had body language.	Just some members had normal body language.	Just one or two members had some light body language.	All members were stuck, not looking the audience, and without any body language expression.
7- Did the presenters functions as a team?	Yes	Yes with exception of one member.	Yes, but not well coordinated	No, even the members tried it.	No

B.2. INTERACTIVE PERFORMANCE WITH THE AUDIENCE:

CRITERIA	100-80 (a)	79-60 (b)	59-40 (c)	39-20 (d)	19-0 (e)
1- Did the team arouse the interest, interact with the audience?	Yes, great interaction with the audience and the audience showed big interest during the presentation.	Almost all the audience were interested in the presentation of the team.	Only a small part of audience interact with the team.	Nearly nobody was interested in the presentation and very low interaction with the audience.	No interest aroused, no interaction with the audience.
2- Did the presenters communicate genuine involvement?	Yes, it's easily appreciated.	Yes, nearly all members.	Yes, but just few members.	Only one of the members.	No
3- Did the team plan enough time to involve the audience?	Yes, enough time and well executed.	Yes, some time but not enough.	Not enough time and badly executed.	Few time and without feedback possibility.	No
4- Was the interaction creatively executed?	Yes				No
5- Did the interaction provide valuable learning?	Yes				No



Written Report Evaluation Criteria

Score		Criteria	Excellent 100% (A, B)	Good 75% (C)	Fair 50% (D)	Poor 25% (E)
Given	Max					
	15	Structure	Presentation is clear and logical. Reader can easily follow line of reasoning. Logical connection of points.	Presentation is generally clear. Sentence flow is generally smooth. A few minor points confusing or not clearly connected.	Reader can follow presentation with effort. Structure not well thought out. Points are not clearly made.	Presentation is very confused and unclear. Reader cannot follow it or deduce the main points presented.
	10	Style	Level is appropriate for presentation of scientific results. Writing is free of errors in grammar, punctuation, and spelling. Flows smoothly.	Level is generally appropriate. Writing is generally error-free, but some errors in language or grammar may occur.	Enough errors in style or grammar occur that they become distracting. Voice may change randomly. May appear disjointed.	Writing style is consistently at an inappropriate level. Errors are frequent and distracting, so that it is hard to determine meaning. No logical connection of ideas or flow of sentences.
	25	Critical perspective	Show considerable critical thinking about information acquired from various sources. Able to critically discuss and independently evaluate information and to come to own conclusions.	Generally shows critical thinking skills. Able to provide some critical evaluation /discussion of information. Generally appropriate conclusions are drawn from it. Some assertions may lack support. May contain some minor mistakes, no significant errors are made.	Show some critical thinking. Lack of consistency in critical evaluation of information and viewpoints. Discussion and independent conclusions are inadequate. Significant logical errors are present.	Significant lack of critical thinking and perspective. Little independent thinking and conclusions. Authors accept viewpoints of others without critical consideration. Abundant logical errors.
	25	Content	Introduction contains pertinent background information. Given tasks and questions are thoroughly analyzed and elaborated. Results and conclusions are logically constructed and summarized. Information is consistently accurate.	Gives general information about the topic, but some relevant information may be missing, or significance is not clearly explained. Description of results is generally clear. No significant errors made.	Insufficient information on background, relevance, significance is given. Some information is accurate, but enough errors are made to be distracting.	Provides little or no information on background and significance. Information is inaccurate or with many errors. Discussion is very difficult to follow. Reader learns little.
	10	Use of figures and tables	Strong supplement to the text. Information is clearly presented. If taken from other sources, appropriate reference is given. Can stand alone without reference to text.	Provide good supplementary information, but may be somewhat lacking in clarity, appropriate reference, or explanation.	Difficult to understand. Do not stand alone; text must be consulted to figure out what is being presented. Inadequately referenced.	No figures or tables are used, or they are so poorly prepared that they detract from the presentation or do not illustrate the points made in the text.
	15	References	References to appropriate scientific articles are properly cited in the text and listed in proper format.	Appropriate references are used and cited, but some may be incomplete or in incorrect style.	Minimal numbers of references are used. Style is incorrect and/or incomplete.	No references provided.
	% of 100%					

Title of the Project:

Project number:

Reviewer:

Please, rate the poster and the presentation in the provided scale, being 1 very poor and 10 truly exceptional

Category	Poor	Fair			Average			Outstanding		Exceptional
Poster Design The poster is attractive. It presents the main outputs of the project. Text is appropriate in length. No grammatical/spelling mistakes. Good and relevant graphics. Easy to read	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Initial Situation: The topic fits in the overall topic of the EW. It explains the importance of the topic. It presents a concrete problem or an issue which needs to be studied.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Goal Setting: Information is accurate. Goals are realistic and concrete. Goals are measurable. It is relevant for the EW topic.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Approach-Methodology: The methodology is clearly explained and appropriated for the initial situation. Scientific but original approach	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Results: The results are clear, relevant for the topic and measurable. It has a potential application	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
References: References are relevant, actual with a highly academic level	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Verbal Interaction: Presentation has a logical, intuitive sequence of information. Students are committed and have knowledge about the content. Hospitality	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10