

## EUROWEEK GUIDELINES 2014

Note: 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

- **During the previous EW**

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

- **Dates.** The dates of the EW week must always be between April and May.
- **Topic.** The topic decision is not only a host competence. 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.**

- **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.** If there are any places left over, the EW responsible 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, with the help of the “calendar tool” will set up the final deadlines for the different EW proceedings calendar:

	PROCEEDING	DEADLINES
1	<b>Project Posting</b> Deadline to submit the project proposals on <a href="http://www.primenetworking.eu">www.primenetworking.eu</a> .	Number of days before the beginning of the Euroweek starts 161 days, ends 148 days (for 2 weeks)
2	<b>Project Shopping</b> Deadline to participate in min. 1, max. 3-4 projects per institution on <a href="http://www.primenetworking.eu">www.primenetworking.eu</a> .	starts 147 days, ends 127 days (for 3 weeks)
3	<b>Project Remaking</b> The member of the Executive Board responsible of the Euroweek will reorganize students if there are projects which are not full.	starts 126, ends 116 days (for 10 days)
4	<b>Project Final List</b> Available on <a href="http://www.primenetworking.eu">www.primenetworking.eu</a> and on the EW host website.	115 days
5	<b>Participants Registrations Open</b> The EW host will send an application form or a link to the online	EW host decision

	form on their website.	
6	<b>Students' Redistribution (if necessary)</b>	96 days
7	<b>Final Number of Participants Confirmation</b> Each institution should send an email(*) to the EW host, confirming the final number of participants, students and academics.	EW host decision
8	<b>One Page Abstract of all Students' Projects</b> Each institution/project team should send the one page abstract by email(*) to the EW host. The Abstract will have a one page length, with no other instructions.	48 days
9	<b>Payment of Registration Fees Are Due</b> Invoices will be based on the registered students and academics and not to final participants in case there are finally less participants. <u>Measures to be taken in case of non-payment</u> The GA agreed that leaving the financial problem to the hosting institutions cannot be accepted; therefore measures must be taken: - After the Euroweek, the Managing Director is going to write and send a letter on behalf of Prime Networking to the Rector of the institution with a deadline (31/08) asking to make the payment. - If that institution does not respond, the EB will propose to the GA to exclude it from the network.	35 days
10	<b>Final Students' Project submission</b> Each institution/project team should send this assessment to by email(*) to the EW host. This paper should have a length of min. 10 and max. 20 pages and must follow the guidelines of the "Final Students' Project Template", document available on <a href="http://www.primenetworking.eu">www.primenetworking.eu</a> , Documents and on the EW host website. If the paper is submitted after the deadline, it will be excluded from the paper prize, and no flexibility will be allowed. The Managing Director can therefore allow the team to participate in the presentation competition.	14 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, such as [euroweek2014@mdh.se](mailto:euroweek2014@mdh.se).

- **After the previous AGM to the EW**

Now it's time for the project forming platform.

- The titles of the projects cannot be changed from those given when posting the project shopping platform.
- Project members dropping is a problem. This situation will be taken into account during the evaluation process.
- From EW 2013 and on: Project Shopping tool will be ready on the PN website.

**REMINDER FOR THE HOST**

- 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.

- To remind participants if there are any things they should do twice (like registration, for instance).
- Add the final EW deadlines for the different EW proceedings in the annual host website.
- Reminder in the host website: at the Global Village, students should avoid wasting food and not open all the cans if it is not necessary, in order to be able redistribute it among the people at the end.
- Host website: Add an academic short intro to the Euroweek topic.

## **1. JURIES**

Students will be aware of the evaluation criteria that juries will apply at the moment they register for the EW, not only of those for the projects but also about those related to the stands and the Final Students' Project.

This information will be available in the EW host website as well as in the Euroweek section of the PN website.

### **2a. JURIES CREATION**

Juries are set up by the host institution.

### **2b. JURIES COMPOSITION AND RULES**

#### **a) Project assessment (See jury assessment form evaluation criteria for project presentations in attachment nr. 1)**

- 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 5 members, including the president.
- President's role:
  - o To lead the session.
  - o To moderate the discussion between jury members.
  - o To give feedback to the students.
  - o To assure the correct formal procedure of the evaluation sheet.
  - o In case there are irreconcilable opinions between jury members about an evaluation, to help making the final decision.
- In case of jury/country coincidence in a project presentation, that jury member cannot vote. At least 3 of the 5 members must be allowed to vote.
- Juries cannot talk, ask questions or make any comments or remarks during the presentation or/and in the interactive part.
- Juries will be called for a jury briefing and will receive a printed document with the rules to observe (jury guideline).
- Professors involved in the project are allowed to accompany the students during the feedback given by the jury.
- Assessment procedure:
  - Immediately after the presentation the jury will conduct the qualitative evaluation (10 minutes) and this will be given as feed-back to the students (10 minutes). Professors involved in the project are allowed to 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 on the basis of 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 = 60If 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.

**b) Final Students' Project written paper assessment (See Euroweek Final Students' Project Paper assessment: written report evaluation criteria and guidelines of report in attachment nr. 2)**

- One jury provided by the organizing institution will assess all written reports in accordance with the evaluation criteria submitted by the academic group (Minutes of the AGM at Vilnius AGM, 02-10-13, item 9).
- The members of this jury will be people not related to the current EW.
- This jury will have a minimum of 5 members.
- The internal organization of the jury depends on the host institution.
- 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 is not related to the current EW and cannot access that information.
- The students will receive feedback from the jury

**c) Stand assessment (See Stand Assessment form in attachment nr. 3)**

- There will be a special jury for the stand 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 Stand" award is announced.

**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 the stand jury members during the closing event.

## **2. TEAMS**

They 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).
- **Participant 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 are allowed to present, but it doesn't mean that all of them are allowed to 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.

### **3. 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.

#### **REMINDER FOR THE HOST**

- To think how to check participation and inform about it on the annual EW.
- Provide rooms to practice presentations
- Control the attendance of students at presentations
- Lock the doors once the presentations starts to avoid interruptions

### **4. STANDS**

**4a.** Every project must create a stand.

**4b.** Stands assessment is part of the whole project assessment. However, the stand award will be kept separately. **See Assessment Form for Stands in attachment nr. 1.**

**4c.** The form that was produced for the EW 2008 in Girona will be used for the stands assessment. It can be found in the PN website, Documents, Downloads.

**4d.** Only material related to the project is allowed on the stands

#### **REMINDER FOR THE HOST**

- To define clearly the time for preparation and for project shopping itself in the EW schedule.
- Students are very demanding and expect the same facilities in all institutions as they have at home. The host website should make clear which facilities can be made available and which cannot.

### **5. FINAL STUDENTS' PROJECT**

- This must be submitted by sending it to a special email address (same as One Page Abstract) created for the Euroweek organization. No printed version must be delivered.
- The Final students' project should have a length of min. 10 and max. 20 pages and must follow the instructions of the Final Students' Project Template 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 14 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.** This deadline will be strict and not flexible.

## 6. PROJECTS

**6a.** Project files will only be named with the project code (for example EWK13NL01), so that all projects are identified and so as to avoid confusion with changes to the project titles.

### **6b. 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 a total amount to be distributed among the project presentation at the project members' earliest convenience.  
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.

It is mandatory to submit a project PowerPoint presentation on annual EW Tuesday, latest 8:00 PM. 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 out of competition.

#### **REMINDER FOR THE 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.

## 7. AWARDS

Project presentation awards:

---

#### **Prime Networking**

Rue Royale 150 Koningstraat  
Bruxelles 1000 Brussel  
B-Belgium

[info@primenetworking.eu](mailto:info@primenetworking.eu)

Banco Santander  
Bank account: 0049 1807 35 2110658393  
IBAN: ES21 0049 1807 35 2110658393  
BIC/SWIFT code: BSCHEM33

- There are 3 jury tracks
- 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.

Stand award:

- There is 1 Best Stand prize.

Final Students' Paper award:

- There is 1 Best Written Final Students' Paper award. There will be no distinctions between Bachelor students and Master students.

The best projects publication award disappears, as this has been proved as very unsuccessful. However, students will be informed clearly that E-journal exists and they might be able to publish in there.

## **8. CERTIFICATES**

**9a.** A participation certificate must be given to every student who has attended the stipulated number of presentations.

**9b.** For the awarded projects, stands and Final Students' Project, a certificate as a winner project must be also given to the institutions. This will not replace the Managing Director letter to the rector.

### **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, with the teams and academics involved in an excel file.

## **9. SCIENTIFIC SEMINAR**

Scientific Seminar has been proved to be much more a nightmare for the organizers than a successful item during the EW, so this activity is cancelled.

The Academic Forum is a new activity that will replace the Scientific Seminar. This activity is mandatory and will consist on what the host decides, it can also be a scientific seminar. Because of that change, any granted relationship of this activity with the E-journal is over.

## **10. FIRST IMPRESSIONS EVALUATION**

A quality survey is always a very good reference for the next EW organizer. From the EW'15 and on simple survey will be distributed to all academics and collected during the First Impressions, which will become an improvement of that meeting.

1. *Euroweek Proceedings defined as agreed upon the General Assembly in Västerås on 26<sup>th</sup> October 2011.*
2. *Euroweek Proceedings were updated upon the General Assembly in Brandenburg an der Havel on 17<sup>th</sup> October 2012.*
3. *Euroweek Proceedings were updated upon the General Assembly in Vilnius on 2<sup>nd</sup> October 2013.*
4. *Euroweek Proceedings were updated upon the General Assembly in Kapfenberg on 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2014*



**ATTACHMENT 1. JURY ASSESSMENT FORM EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR PROJECT PRESENTATIONS**



**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:**

<b>CRITERIA</b>	<b>100-80 (a)</b>	<b>79-60 (b)</b>	<b>59-40 (c)</b>	<b>39-20 (d)</b>	<b>19-0 (e)</b>
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:**

<b>CRITERIA</b>	<b>100-80 (a)</b>	<b>79-60</b>	<b>59-40 (c)</b>	<b>39-20 (d)</b>	<b>19-0 (e)</b>
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



**ATTACHMENT 2. EUOWEEK FINAL STUDENTS' PROJECT PAPER ASSESSMENT: WRITTEN REPORT EVALUATION CRITERIA**

**EUROWEEK FINAL STUDENTS' PROJECT PAPER ASSESSMENT: 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, 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.	Provide good supplementary information, but may be	Difficult to understand. Do not stand alone; text must be	No figures or tables are used, or they are so poorly prepared that they

			If taken from other sources, appropriate reference is given. Can stand alone without reference to text.	somewhat lacking in clarity, appropriate reference, or explanation.	consulted to figure out what is being presented. Inadequately referenced.	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 number of references are used. Style is incorrect and/or incomplete.	No references provided.
	% of 100%					

## Title of the Report/paper

**Surname1, Name1<sup>a</sup>; Surname 2, Name 2<sup>b</sup>; ...**

<sup>a</sup> author filliation

Adress

[e-mail@author1.pt](mailto:e-mail@author1.pt);[e-mail@author2.pt](mailto:e-mail@author2.pt)

<sup>b</sup> Co-author filliation

Adress

[e-mail@co.authors.pt](mailto:e-mail@co.authors.pt)

...

### ABSTRACT

This document, in the form of "model", briefly describes the rules for the preparation of the complete report/paper (10 pages maximum) for the Euroweek. It should be written on a sheet of A4 size (210x297mm) with margins of 20 mm around the perimeter (up, down, left and right). Authors can use this "model", replacing the text and should not be used footnotes and headers. The construction of the abstracts should consider the following: (a) the summary should only be written in one paragraph, (b) the summary must, commendably, addressing the following report/paper: introduction, aims, methodology, results and conclusions, (c) the summary must be interpreted isolated from the text of the report/paper, this means that it should not contain references to literature, figures or tables are placed within the full text. At the end of the summary shall be given a maximum of 5 keywords, formatted in italics. Regarding the selection of these must take into account the use not only of words and concepts maximum of 6 words per report/paper. Several words may be used instead of one, at most 3, where the separation of the same is not possible or does not make sense (for example, "Management System"). Finally, abbreviations may be used if these are generically known (for example, "EW")..

*Keywords: template, formatting, manuscript, Euroweek, PrimeNetworking*

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The report/paper title should be in Arial 18 Bold text left. The statement of the authors should appear in Arial Bold 12 left. The institution, address and email should appear in Arial 10 to the left and below the authors' names. If more than two institutions, should add as many as necessary, indicating the index in superscript in the order: a, b, c, e, ... etc..

Main headings (eg ABSTRACT, INTRODUCTION, MATERIALS AND METHODS, RESULTS AND DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND REFERENCES) should appear in Arial 11 Bold and everything in CAPITALS. The text of each section should appear justified (both sides) in Arial 10.

The spacing before and after paragraphs should be done with 0 points and the line spacing should be simple. In the main headings should be inserted 2 blank lines before the heading and one blank line after the title, as shown in this model.

The legend of the figures (placed beneath them) and tables (placed on top of them) should appear in Arial 9, centered on the page (see the examples). Figure 1 illustrates a typical legend to the figures. For the graph tables, they must appear only horizontal lines as illustrated in the example table.



Figure 1 – PrimeNetworking Logo

It is recommended that the data presented in the tables are not reproduced again in the text or figures, except for comments.

Table 1 – List of formats used in the model.

Section	Size
Title of Report/Paper	18
Author names	12
Adress	10
Main Titles and secondary titles	11
Text body	10
Referendes and subtitles	9

## 2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

In case of use graphics or images that contain written information, the font size used should be equal to or greater than 10 points.

Example of an equation (Arial 9), with the subtitle:

$$E = m \cdot c^2 \tag{1}$$

where:

E – energy

m – mass

c – speed of light in vacuum

### 2.1. Material and Methodos (secondary title)

As mentioned above, the secondary titles should appear in **Arial 11 Bold**.

## 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

If there is any doubt regarding the article writing should consult the Organizing Committee via e-mail: [euroweek@primenetworking.eu](mailto:euroweek@primenetworking.eu)



## 4. CONCLUSIONS

The References (Arial 10) should be indicated in accordance with the rules established for the citation of authors. The formatting of references should follow the major existing standards, such as the examples mentioned in the next paragraph. To clarify the format used, the rules of citation and formatting should follow the directions of the APA format, available in <http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/01/>

## 5. REFERENCES

Below are some examples of how the bibliography should be cited in accordance with the standards cited in the previous paragraph. The examples are presented in the following order: (1) book (2) Article in magazines, (3) Article in proceedings of Congress and (4) Web page:

1. Duncan, G. J., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (Eds.). (1997). *Consequences of growing up poor*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
2. Harlow, H. F, Michaelson, R.F. & Smith, R.O. (1983). Fundamentals for preparing psychology journal articles. *Journal of Comparative and Physiological Psychology*, 55, 893-896.
3. Schnase, J.L., & Cunnius, E.L. (1995). The importance of computing nowadays, Proceedings from CSCL '95: The First International Conference on Computer Support for Collaborative Learning. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
4. Bernstein, M. (2002). 10 tips on writing the living Web. A List Apart: For People Who Make Websites. Consultada em Maio, 2006, em <http://www.alistapart.com/articles/writeliving>



**ATTACHMENT 3. ASSESSMENT FORM FOR STANDS**

## Assessment form stands

- a. Creative value- originality** (the use of visual means to attract attention)
- b. Effective link with the project theme**
- c. Hospitality value** (the use of warm hearted and polite approach)
- d. The interactive communication on the project theme** (the use of helpful and efficient explanation)

Name of jury:

Scoring: 1- poor, 5- excellent

Project #	Project Name and Project Leader's email		a	b	c	d
1	name					
	email					
2	name					
	email					
3	name					
	email					
4	name					
	email					
5	name					
	email					
6	name					
	email					
7	name					
	email					
8	name					
	email					
9	name					
	email					
10	name					
	email					
11	name					
	email					
12	name					
	email					
13	name					
	email					

- a. **Creative value- originality** (the use of visual means to attract attention)
- b. **Effective link with the project theme**
- c. **Hospitality value** (the use of warm hearted and polite approach)
- d. **The interactive communication on the project theme** (the use of helpful and efficient explanation)

Name of jury:

Scoring: 1- poor, 5- excellent

Project #	Project Name and Project Leader's e-mail		a	b	c	d
14	name					
	email					
15	name					
	email					
16	name					
	email					
17	name					
	email					
18	name					
	email					
19	name					
	email					
20	name					
	email					
21	name					
	email					
22	name					
	email					
23	name					
	email					
24	name					
	email					
25	name					
	email					
26	name					
	email					