Annex F – Checklist for reviewing intellectual outputs

* **Checklist for reviewing Intellectual Outputs** will be used for quality assurance of all intellectual outputs. It will have standardized elements, but also leave room for accommodating it to the specific character of each intellectual output.

**Standardized quantitative indicators** will be determined for all LAWGEM intellectual outputs:

1. Are all required tasks fulfilled?

2. Is each particular IO completed in a timely manner?

3. How many LAWGEM team members took an active part?

4. Did all consortium partners fulfil their tasks and responsibilities?

5. Were all IOs completed in a timely manner?

More specific **Quantitative indicators** will be outlined as follows –

In the case of the **Textbook**:

Number of chapters,

Number of authors involved in their writing,

Involvement of consortium institutions’ participants in each article/chapter,

Number of online readers and commentators,

Others -

In the case of the **syllabi**:

Number of research members included in their creation,

Number of courses for which participants from all consortium partners took an active creation role

Others -

In the case of the whole **Curriculum** and the Law and Gender master’s program pilot implementation:

Number of registered students and attendants from all partner institutions

Others -

In the case of **EST**:

Number of samples obtained in each partner institution,

Number of conducted qualitative interviews

In the case of **GELC**:

Number of online visitors,

Number of comments,

Number of cases where legal assistance was asked for,

Number of prepared legal opinions and advice

In the case of the **LLL P**latform – number of followers, readers, feedback commentators

**Standardized general qualitative indicators** will be outlined by the following questions:

1. Does the created IO fulfill the promised quality and aims?

2. Do the reviews and reports prove the expected quality and expectations?

3. Do the online evaluations, reviews, and QAt estimations, as well as the feedback of Associate partners contain positive quality proofs?

**More specific qualitative indicators will be the following :**

In the case of **Curriculum and syllabi** – quality of articulated aims, outcomes, of the topics and references enlisted, consistency and encompassing quality of the proposed content.

**Concerning the pilot realization of the master’s program** – checking the feedback, evaluation by students, as well as by the QAt and external evaluators.

Regarding the LLL LAWGEM platform – relevant for the qualitative indicators will be those who react online or comment on the LAWGEM and its LLL platform from the point of learning capacities and impact towards those involved in the educational process and the ordinary public.

In the case of the **Textbook –** quality of articles approved by internal reviewing done by the QAt as well asby academics and intellectuals who reviewed them as external agents to LAWGEM.

Concerning the Qat’s monitoring and evaluation of the Textbook chapters, the specific checklist will be used.

* **The checklist for the QAt evaluation of the LAWGEM TEXTBOOK chapters (methodological and substantial):**

1. **Is the chapter abstract clearly articulated?**
2. **Is the language of the chapter gender sensitive?**
3. **Is the native speaking proofreading secured?**
4. **Are the subtitles and subchapters consistently ordered and elaborated?**
5. **Is the conclusion adequately articulated?**
6. **Are the main ideas on a gender sensitive approach to the particular legal field clearly defined?**
7. **Is the academic standard of quality well applied?**
8. **Are the guidelines for writing the chapters respected?**
9. **Are the reviewers’ comments taken into consideration?**
10. **Are the ideas of different authors for the same chapter well accorded?**
11. **Are the presented ideas consistently, systematically, and logically well ordered?**
12. **Are the used academic references rich enough in numbers and quality, are they relevant and numerous enough?**
13. **Are the ideas presented in the chapter convincing?**
14. **Are the ideas in the chapter elaborated in a way open to critical reconsideration?**
15. **Are the relevant female authors from the particular legal field analyzed?**
16. **Are the ideas about the importance of a gender sensitive approach in the given legal field well articulated?**
17. **Is an explanation offered for the eventual invisibility of female authors throughout the history of the particular legal field, as well as for the eventual lack of full visibility of female legal subjects?**

* **18. Are the main current problems in the field covered by the chapter sufficiently discussed and analysed?**
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