



**DRAFT**

# Output 4.1

## Quality Plan

**Version 1**

**«Implementation of Education Quality Assurance system via cooperation of University-Business-Government in HEIs» / EDUQAS**

586109-EPP-1-2017-1-RO-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein

## 1. Introduction

The aim of the Quality Plan is twofold:

On the one hand, the project evaluation will assist the consortium partners in enhancing the processes and activities during its implementation. This **formative evaluation** focuses on the ways of improving the project while it is still on-going.

On the other hand it will guide project partners and stakeholders in assessing the extent to which the project was effective and achieved its aims and objectives. This **summative evaluation** will be undertaken after the project has been completed and judges its overall effectiveness and its impact on the target group.

A useful distinction is that formative evaluations are usually intended for the project partners while summative evaluations are intended for the external audience. ("When the cook tastes the soup, that's formative; when the guests taste the soup, that's summative" Bob Stake, quoted in Scriven, 1991, p. 169.)

Project evaluation program will be several-fold and include internal quality control as well as self-evaluation of project process & results by students, trainers, experts & professionals. Its principal aim is to support an exploration of an appropriate range of approaches to ensure the quality of project implementation and outputs.

A quality control & monitoring plan will be utilized. Activities and outcomes will be internally evaluated every 6 months by the **Steering Committee** (SC). Three SC meetings will be organized using Skype in the middle of each project year, and 3 others will take place at the end of each project year. SC will include a project coordinator, 3 project regional coordinators and one expert from each Consortium member. SC will check the correspondence between proposed and accomplished activities. Other SC functions: evaluation of training process & quality control of training materials for trainers and teaching materials for education courses; generation of recommendations on best practice dissemination, points of deviation & problems solving.

Evaluation of project implementation will be multilayer and include external and internal control as well as constant evaluation of feedback obtained from students, trainers, trainees, staff, teachers, experts etc. **Internal reviewing conducted by SC.** SC constantly analyses the compliance of the activities conducted with the working and quality plans. SC provides recommendations on problem solving if needed. **External evaluation conducted by students, LLL, trainees, representatives of business and industry who participate in the project activities.** Feedback obtained and analysed, SC provides recommendations if needed.

To ensure the quality of innovation courses developed, self-evaluation surveys will be performed by teachers, students and trainees from PCs. Analyses of the feedback will be conducted and reported to the SC. SC in its turn will develop recommendations to the partners regarding the feedback obtained from the participants. The quality control reports and self-evaluation tests results will be accumulated in the project's database. Project Quality control implies implementation of the following tasks: organization of the Steering Committee (SC); skype meetings of the SC; E-mail Panel Discussion will be organized for day-to-day communication of SC members;

SC will be responsible for keeping the project pace in line with the timeframe, in which the deliverables should be achieved. Partners are required to achieve the outputs of the project in accordance with the initial project progress plan though some modifications can be possible. If the modifications are required, they should be well-grounded and obviously needed. SC has the right not to adjust the changes that the partners are willing to make so that the project feasibility and sustainability is ensured. The benchmarks

for analyses of the project progress will be its compliance with the initial timeframe and ability of the partners to overcome difficulties that might occur as soon and as effectively as possible.

### ***Aims of the formative evaluation***

- Assess the progress towards meeting the aims and objectives
- Identify gaps and issues
- Gather and disseminate best practices
- Ensure that project outputs are meeting stakeholders' needs
- Ensure the project can respond flexibly to changes in the environment and that it isn't overtaken by events

### ***Formative questions***

- Have the milestones been met on schedule?
- What is holding up the progress?
- What should we do to correct this?
- Is the project management effective?
- Do partners agree with the interim findings?
- Is our dissemination effective?
- What lessons have we learned?
- Do we need to change the plan?

### ***Aims for the summative evaluation***

- Assess whether the programme has achieved its aims and objectives
- Assess the impacts, benefits, and value of the project in the broader context
- Identify the achievements and stimulate the discussion with the community
- Synthesise knowledge from the programme and lessons learned
- Identify the areas for future development work

### ***Summative questions***

- Have the objectives been met?
- Have the outcomes been achieved?
- What are the key findings?
- What impact did the project have?
- What benefits are there for stakeholders?
- Was our approach effective?
- What lessons have we learned?
- What would we do differently?

The main **evaluation criterion**, regarding the outputs and their impact, is the extent to which these have been achieved in relation to the approved project plan.

Generically, in **EDUQAS** evaluation will be aiming at:

- ***Increasing understanding of user needs***. The aim is to evaluate the needs in the context of current services and to identify where **EDUQAS** fits best.
- ***Fulfilling requirements for accountability***. In terms of the ERASMUS+ Programmes, there are contractual obligations on projects to undertake evaluation. Projects which expend public money must expect to be held accountable, so evaluations are needed to gather evidence to support the claimed

achievements. ERASMUS+ is interested in the learning that comes from projects, thus, 'negative' achievements (e.g. evidence that a promising approach does not in fact work) are quite acceptable.

- ***Determining whether processes are working correctly.*** For example, part of evaluation will focus on whether the project's management is effective. This might involve a review of how decisions are being taken and implemented.
- ***Judging the effectiveness of EDUQAS*** in relation to the achievement of the outputs as described in the application for funding.
- ***Assessing the impact of EDUQAS*** on encouraging internal QA system and developing innovation capabilities in PC countries students.
- ***Checking whether the EDUQAS conform to specification.*** Quality assurance is part of the evaluation. The main questions that EDUQAS partnership needs to answer in relation to quality assurance are:

-Are the members EDUQAS and the cooperative networks functional and able to support students employment ?

- Are the modernised QA System effective in enhancing creativity and competence in innovations development?

-Is the newly developed system of training for trainers and Life Long Learning (LLL) effective in enhancing QA policy development?

### ***What will be evaluated?***

There are three major project objectives that have a strong relevance to the project's evaluation plan:

1. Establishment of 6 university QA Unit in Kazakhstan (2) and Ukraine (4);
2. Development of teaching methodology and the training packages including courses and eLearning components in the partner countries.
3. Development of University-business-government network infrastructure.

The main idea of the project is to improve education quality assurance systems through development of efficient internal quality standards leading to better employability of students in Partner Countries Universities. The internal QA system will be based on analysis of needs and capacities in Kazakh and Ukrainian HEIs, experiences and best practices from the successful QA action line of the Bologna Process.

Specific project objectives are:

- to establish 6 quality assurance cells as bodies that bring quality assurance activities together and support development of quality culture embraced by all;
- to provide internal quality assurance guidelines and procedures aiming to improve educational programmes and other activities;
- to build capacity of teaching and non-teaching staff involved in quality assurance cycle;
- to modernize internal information systems of quality evaluation and to improve university QA infrastructure;
- to develop quality assurance experts network via cooperation of universities-business-State open for new members.

The established QA Unit should not only provide the infrastructure for networking and implementation of project ideas, but also to foster the creativity of people involving of the implemented projects. Thus, the educational component is seen to combine both the creation of quality culture at various levels through motivation, trust, responsibility of students, institutional leadership, individual staff members and business aspects in order to build up hard&soft skills of students/trainees/LLL.

Development of the training packages including e-Learning components will help students to gain knowledge and experience in the following training courses. Training packages will be developed in accordance with the requirements of the Bologna Process and National Qualifications Framework and include open access theoretical, practical and eLearning components. The courses combine various modern types of educational activities such as discussions, round tables, practical work on EDUQAS equipment, case studies, simulation games, team work, etc. Two separate simultaneous test trainings will be organized: the first for students within the winter semester and the second for LLL, both during the third project year.

Modernization of the BSc & MSc curricula according to the developed courses will be conducted – courses will be included into the educational process as a selective part of curricula of respective specialties.

Training courses will be developed using the competence-based approach in accordance to the requirements of the Bologna process and national Qualifications Frameworks. Courses developed as project outputs will be included to the variable parts of curricula at each participating PC-university. Training programme will be a combination of lectures, simulations, case studies, project and team work. The training courses material will be developed in English and Ukrainian; teachers will be encouraged to modify the courses to keep them up-to-date. All training materials will be developed with the involvement of university professors, experts from companies, ministries, agencies. Experience of the business incubator, students' research laboratories, Scientific & Technological parks at partner universities will be used as well. It is also intended to attract already retired experts from academia and business.

**The current document must be read in conjunction with EDUQAS Project Implementation Manual which analyses the tasks and deliverables of Work Package 4 Quality Plan.**

## **2. Quality plan and evaluation activities as described in the application for funding**

Evaluation strategy is based on system approach to a EDUQAS project external and internal control. Evaluation is expected to be performed synchronically by experts, trainers, students, LLL and practitioners any) in evaluation profiles. Gaps help to understand the project's aims and processes in the context of educative, practical, social and individual expectations.

It is planned to provide the evaluation at every university at the beginning, in the middle and at the end of pilot phase in order to follow the dynamics of development.

The evaluation results serve as indicators of progress for all project activities. They will be used for supervision by SC, for monitoring visits by coordinator, self-evaluation by students (including LLL) and trainers, for summaries and progress reports.

### *EDUQAS team of evaluators*

Evaluation strategy, resources and database are to be developed by a team of evaluators whose functions are:

1. developing strategy, planning and realizing evaluation of the project's process and results;
2. comparing results and elaborating recommendations for necessary corrections and best practice dissemination;

3. giving feed-back to those whose activity & level were evaluated;
4. informing those who are involved in the process of control;
5. writing reports generalizing results for providing quality assurance in activities of start-up cents;
6. issuing an evaluation digest;
7. developing a EDUQAS project's evaluation database.

### ***EDUQAS computerized instruments used for evaluation***

Special computer programme is designed for:

1. providing evaluation (including self-evaluation mode) of a QA Unit, training materials and sessions as well as students' cognitive and personality development efficiency;
2. constructing profiles of QA Unit, course units, training sessions and student personality;
3. providing feedback with recommendations for improvement;
4. accumulating data in EDUQAS evaluation database.

**EDUQAS** evaluation programme gives an opportunity to all participating universities to provide self-evaluation getting results with short comments immediately.

A comparative system analyses is possible after development of results by the evaluation team.

### ***EDUQAS evaluation database***

The results of evaluation are planned to be accumulated in EDUQAS database including:

1. Strategy & mechanism of quality assurance;
2. EDUQAS evaluators list with their function descriptors;
3. Data of project process and results evaluation;
4. Data of QA Unit efficiency evaluation;
5. Data of training process and materials evaluation;
6. Data of students' cognitive and personality efficiency evaluation;
7. Recommendations for corrections and best practice disseminations based on evaluation results analyses;
8. Records of feed-back meetings;
9. Evaluation digest (reports).

### **Short and long term impact indicators**

<b>Short term impact</b>	<b>Target groups/potential beneficiaries</b>	<b>Quantitative indicators</b>	<b>Qualitative indicators</b>
QA units for new program design, development and pilot self-evaluation established at PC universities	Administrative staff Academic staff Students	6 QA units operate in Kazakhstan and Ukraine	Modernized QA organizational structure
Corporate QA infrastructure developed	Administrative staff Academic staff	Equipment for quality evaluation at 6 PC HEIs	Internal information systems enhanced
Internal quality standards and guidelines on the basis of ESG	Administrative staff Students Academic staff	set of internal standards& guidelines for program	Quality culture embraced by all

implemented	Business State	design&evaluation	
Students&academic staff involvement in the QA process during student study "life-cycle"	Students LLL Academic staff Business	12 students handbook for QA during study life cycle at PC HEI	Strengthened stakeholders' participation in QA process
Capacity of QA&academic staff at PC HEIs built	QA specialists Academic staff	6 training packages developed in accordance with European experience	Formation of staff capable to change
QA expert network developed	Administrative staff Academic staff National QA agencies	Number of experts involved in network (regionally, locally, nationally and internationally)	Strong contacts established between the experts of the network
International cooperation strengthened	Students Academia Public bodies of PCs and EU	Number of universities, specialists, QA agencies cooperate internationally	

<b>Long term impact</b>	<b>Target groups/potential beneficiaries</b>	<b>Quantitative indicators</b>	<b>Qualitative indicators</b>
Conditions for better employability of university graduates created	Students LLL Academic staff Business State Society	Graduates employability survey; 6 institutional strategy & policy papers;	Strengthened links between universities and labor market
Inclusion of modern approaches into (self)-evaluation process of respective programs	Administrative staff Academic staff Students LLL	6 internal quality standards proposals; 12 programs descriptions	European experience, best practises and e-tools introduced into PC evaluation process
Improved internal QA guidelines and procedures integrated to national QA systems	Academia, Business, National QA agencies, Government	2 Internal guidelines&procedures recommended for QA public bodies of Kazakhstan and Ukraine	Academia, business, industry, associated partners, national QA agency provide constant support for the implementation of the project results at national level in Kazakhstan and Ukraine
Network mechanisms between academia, business and government established and developed in PCs and EU	Students Academic staff Business representatives National QA agencies	A number of academia, business and government representatives involved in constant network cooperation process	Strong contacts established between the elements of the network due to governmental support

**Quality Plan Matrix**

<p><b>Wider Objective:</b> - to improve education QA systems through develop. of efficient internal quality standards leading to better employability of students in PC HEI.</p>	<p><b>Indicators of progress:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developed QA infrastructure;</li> <li>• set of internal standards&amp; guidelines for program evaluation;</li> </ul> <p>Documents &amp; reports adopted</p>	<p><b>How indicators will be measured:</b></p> <p>QA units Project web-site Institution reports and records QA documents &amp; regulations</p>
<p><b>Specific Project Objective/s:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to establish QA unit for QA &amp; program evaluation</li> <li>• to provide internal QA guidelines &amp; procedures to build capacity of teaching &amp; non-teaching staff involved in QA cycle</li> </ul>	<p><b>Indicators of progress:</b></p> <p>6 QA units established in PC HEIs 12 progr. improved in PC HEIs 6 trainings: 36 academic staff from each PC trained, 36 QA specialists from each PC trained</p>	<p><b>How indicators will be measured:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6 QA new organizational structures</li> <li>• 2 PC HEIs QA standards&amp;guidelines</li> <li>• 6 training programs&amp; certification reports/feedbacks</li> </ul>
<p><b>Outputs (tangible) and outcomes (intangible)</b></p> <p>WP1. Overview of EU&amp;PC; proposals of standards; QA special. training; project web site. WP2. QA strategy, policy&amp;procedures; staff training; program development; regulations of students "life cycle".WP3.QA units launch; new equipment purchase; expert network development; pilot progr.assessm.WP4Evaluation plan; quality internal&amp;external reports. WP 5. Dissem.&amp;sustain. plan; project web-site; dissem.events; web-site devel. WP6. Project mngt board &amp; reports; financial reports; QA unit mngt.</p>	<p><b>Indicators of progress:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 joint evidence reports;</li> <li>• 6 surveys on EU QA systems/models</li> <li>• 36 QA specialists trained;</li> <li>• project web-site hosting.</li> <li>• 6 QA strateg. established; QA policy&amp;criteria developed; 36 staff from each PC trained, 12 program. improved, 2 regulations of students study "life-cycle" at each PC enhanced</li> <li>• 6 QA units; new equip.purchased, 12 pilot programs assessed in 6 PC HEIs.</li> <li>• Evaluation plan &amp;assessm. results</li> <li>• dissem. plan; 20+ D&amp;S activities in each QA unit, 2 intern. confer.; video management &amp; financial reports.</li> </ul>	<p><b>How indicators will be measured:</b></p> <p>Analytical reports; minutes of meetings; overview &amp; articles on QA at HEI; web-site statistics. Standards proposals; strategy &amp; policy papers; handbooks; programs descriptions; Training materials internal documents on new QA unit for each PC; invoices for equipment; progr.evaluation reports. int./ext. evaluation plan &amp; reports. dissem. events; events' reports; project web-site statistics; dissem. materials &amp; publications. project handbook &amp; progress report. external audit.</p>



### 3. Quality assurance and evaluation methodology

#### *Process of evaluation*

Each project output will be accompanied by a short “**Quality Evaluation Report**”(Appendix 1).

The “Quality Evaluation Report” will have two major sections:

1. Description and evaluation of the processes that led to the achievement of the output. This will be produced based on conducting interviews and questionnaires (Appendixes 1-7) with those involved in producing the respective outputs during the production of the output.
2. Evaluation of the output conducted internally and externally on completion of the output using questionnaires (Appendixes 1-7), peer reviews, interviews and document analysis. This will involve stakeholders such as students, lecturers, entrepreneurs and policy makers.

Peer review of deliverables – For deliverables to be evaluated using this instrument, each is reviewed by a partner, who is nominated by the WP leader and not involved in the production of the deliverable. The deliverable is sent to the WP leader at least 15 days before the expected delivery date. The WP leader immediately forwards it to the reviewer for evaluation. The reviewer verifies whether the deliverable satisfies the requirements, description, or objective; identifies deviations from requirements or problems; and suggests improvements to author. The reviewer returns the evaluation to the author, whose responsibility it is to either accept or reject the suggestions and decide what actions are to be undertaken. The deliverable is then submitted to the WP leader along with the reviewer’s evaluation for final approval or approval contingent on further modification. For certain deliverables the peer review process may be carried out by multiple reviewers to ensure quality.

Peer review evaluations should include the following information:

General comments:

- Thoroughness of contents;
- Correspondence to project objectives.

Specific comments:

- Relevance;
- Format (layout, spelling, etc.);

Suggested actions:

- The following changes should be implemented;
- Missing information
- Further improvements.

Meeting and event evaluations – to be done by all participants, students, trainees. Quantitative and qualitative data collected through anonymous questionnaires. A 5-point Likert scale is used wherever possible. A summary of the data collected, including suggestions for changes and improvements will be compiled after each meeting or event. A Meeting evaluation questionnaire (Appendix 6) is used for partner meetings, and a Dissemination and exploitation activities evaluation questionnaire (Appendix 2) is used for events .

**Timetable of evaluation**

OP	What will be evaluated	Method of evaluation	Estimated End Date		Internal/ External Control
			due project month	due date	
4.1.	Quality Plan	analysis of project quality plan efficiency	6	04.2018	Internal
5.1.	Dissemination and Exploitation Strategy	analysis of D&E Strategy efficiency	6	04.2018	Internal
1.3	Project Web-portal (design, content, launching)	analysis of project Web-portal efficiency	6	04.2018	Internal
1.1	EU&PC QA system experience	analysis of EU&PC QA System experience	9	07.2018	Internal
3.4.	PC partner network creation	analysis of PC partner network efficiency	9	08.2018	Internal
1.2	PC administrative staff trained in EU	administrative staff training evaluation questionnaire, analysis of profiles of PC admin. staff	12	10.2018	Internal
6.1.	Coordination & operation management	analysis of coordination & operation management	18	04.2019	Internal
6.2.	Financial management	analysis of financial management efficiency	18	04.2019	Internal
4.2	QA Unit functioning	analysis of work efficiency of QA Unit	12	10.2018	Internal & external
1.2.	Training packages	analysis of training packages efficiency, <b>peer reviews</b>	12	10.2018	Internal & external
2.2.	6 QA Unit created: - QA Unit network; - QA Unit concept formulation; - QA Unit constituent documents development & approval on University level; - QA Unit infrastructure allocation; - QA Unit equipment purchase; - QA Unit network web-portal launch	analysis of QA Unit network, QA Unit concept efficiency, QA Unit constituent and approval documents, QA Unit infrastructure, documents of equipment purchase; QA Unit network web-portal efficiency	12	10.2018	Internal

4.2	QA Unit functioning&&	analysis of work efficiency of QA Unit	24	10.2019	internal & external
1.2	PC teaching staff trainings in EU about QA Policy in each PC university;	analysis of training materials and profiles of PC teaching staff	24	10.2019 (02.2018) (05.2018) (09.2018) (11.2018) (02.2019)	Internal
4.2	QA Unit functioning&&	analysis of work efficiency of QA Unit P&&	24	10.2019	Internal & external
4.2	QA Unit functioning&&	analysis of work efficiency of QA Unit P&&_____	24	10.2019	Internal & external
2.1	Develop QA strategy & policy	analysis of 20+ students profiles	8	05.2018	Internal & external
2.2	Design program development	analysis of 20+ students profiles	24	10.2019	Internal & external
2.3	Improve regulations of students study "life-cycle"	analysis of upgraded curricula efficiency	20	06.2018	Internal
5.3.	D&E activities	analysis of dissemination & exploitation activities efficiency	36	10.2020	Internal & external
3.4	EU&PC + business - university -government-network established	analysis of EU&PC+ business -university - government efficiency	36	10.2020	Internal & external
4.2.	Internal & external project evaluation	analysis of internal & external project evaluation	35	09.2020	Internal
6.3	Manage QA Unit	analysis of QA Unit management efficiency	36	10.2020	Internal & external
6.1.	Coordination & operation management	analysis of coordination & operation management	36	10.2020	Internal
6.2.	Financial management	analysis of financial management efficiency	36	10.2020	Internal

**Tools for evaluation**

- Output evaluation report (Appendix 1)
- Dissemination and sustainability activities evaluation questionnaire (Appendix 2)
- QA Unit user questionnaire (Appendix 3)
- Training packages evaluation questionnaire (Appendix 4)
- Student & LLL training evaluation questionnaire (Appendix 5)
- Meeting evaluation questionnaire (Appendix 6)
- Project management questionnaire (Appendix 7)

#### 4. Main outputs and responsibilities among partners

##### Description of main outputs - WP4 Quality plan. Lead partner KhNEU

<p>OP 4.1</p>	<p><b>Program for project evaluation developed</b></p> <p><b>Activities</b> This deliverable will be achieved by the activity 4.1:</p> <p>(1) Project's progress will be permanently supervised by the SC.</p> <p>(2) Quality plan will serve an indicator of progress for all other activities.</p> <p>(3) Monitoring visits by the coordinator.</p> <p>(4) Self-evaluation surveys with students, teachers, LLL.</p> <p>(5) Regular evaluation by SC and external reviewers.</p> <p>(6) Circulation of summary and progress reports.</p> <p>Program is planned to be in service by the end of 6th month.</p>	Report	EN	May, 2018
-------------------	--	--------	----	-----------

<p>OP 4.2</p>	<p><b>Internal project quality assessment performed</b></p> <p><b>Activities</b> This deliverable will be achieved by the activity 4.2:</p> <p>(1) Project coordinator will monitor all activities.</p> <p>(2) SC will evaluate EDUQAS functioning and training packages.</p> <p>(3) Self-evaluation surveys will be performed by teachers, students and LLL from PCs.</p> <p>(4) SC will prepare the reports reflecting recommendations on best practice dissemination, points of deviation and problems solving.</p> <hr/> <p><b>External project quality assessment performed</b></p> <p><b>Activities</b> This deliverable will be achieved by the activity.</p> <p>(1) Hired external reviewers will monitor the project execution and prepare series of evaluation reports which will then be analysed in depth and followed up by SC.</p> <p>(2) Training packages and EDUQAS activities assessment by students and LLL trainees.</p> <p>(3) Final report of external reviewers focused on quality assessment of intended project outcomes.</p>	Report	EN, UA	Oct, 2018
-------------------	--	--------	-----------	-----------

**WP4 Partners' role and staffing resources**

Work Package	Partner nr	Partner acronym	Country	Category 1	Category 2	Category 3	Category 4	Total	Role and tasks in the work package
QUALITY PLAN	P1	UCv	Romania		43	6	156	205	WP4.2
	P2	KTH	Sweden		35	5	63	103	WP4 leader (EU), WP4.1, WP4.2
	P3	Ulg	Belgium		35	4	44	83	WP4.2
	P4	PWr	Poland		46	4	48	98	WP4.2
	P5	UL	Latvia		50	4	45	99	WP4.2
	P6	UL	France		22	8	32	62	WP4.2
	P7	KhNUE	Ukraine		28	14	65	107	WP4.2
	P8	LPNU	Ukraine		16	4	29	49	WP4.2
	P9	DSUM	Ukraine		22	4	32	58	WP4 leader (PC), WP4.1, WP4.2
	P10	NMAU	Ukraine		16	4	29	49	WP4.2
	P11	KAUIR	Kazakhstan		16	4	29	49	WP4.2
	P12	KazUEFIT	Kazakhstan		16	4	29	49	WP4.2
	P13	IHE	Ukraine		0	0	10	10	WP4.2
	P14	NAHEQA	Ukraine		0	0	10	10	WP4.2, WP4.1
	P15	MESU	Ukraine		10	0	0	10	WP4.2
	P16	MESRK	Kazakhstan		10	0	0	10	WP4.2
	P17	HCERES	France		5	0	0	5	WP4.2

**Project Workplan for WP4**

Beginning Date: 15/10/2017

End Date: 14/10/2020

Coordinating Partner: DSUM

Activities		Year	Number of weeks	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5	M6	M7	M8	M9	M10	M11	M12
OP	Title														
4.1.	Develop evaluation program	I	2					1=	1x						
4.2.	Internal&external evaluation		7						1=	1x	1=	1x	1=	1x	1x
4.2.	Internal&external evaluation	II	12	1x	1x	1=	1x	1x	1x	1x	1x	1x	1x	1x	1x
4.2.	Internal&external evaluation	III	12	1x	1x	1x	1x	1x	1x	1x	1x	1x	1x	1x	1x

= activity carried out in the Programme Country

x activity carried out in the Partner Country

## **Structure of the Output Evaluation Report**

**Introduction** (Brief description of the output as in the application)

### **Description of the processes.**

Starting date and timing in relation to planned date and reasons if modified

Partners' involved and their contribution

Obstacles encountered and solutions adopted

Lessons learned

### **Output evaluation**

Who did it?

What methods were used

What the results are

Lessons learned



**Appendix 1. Output Evaluation Questionnaire**

LOGO EDUQAS + logo co-funding						
<b>questionnaire 1</b>		<b>Output evaluation questionnaire</b>				
<i>Aim to identify participants' opinions regarding the quality of the outputs produced within the project and the processes involved.</i>						
Country	Town	Organisation	OUTPUT NAME			
Date	Time	Duration	Organisational affiliation			
Occupation	Educational qualification	Gender	Age group			
<p>Instruction: <i>evaluate the output considering proposed criteria.</i>  <i>Mark corresponding cells with: "A"- if level is high "B"- if level is adequate; "C"- if level is average;"D"- if level is low.</i></p>						
<b>To what extent the output:</b>			<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
1	Corresponds to the description produced in the approved work-plan					
2	Contributes to the overall development of the project					
3	Corresponds to a real need					
4	Was achieved in line with the approved work-plan					
5	Involved the majority of the partners					
6						
TOTAL						
<p>Comment box: Please respond in brief to the following questions:</p> <p>1. What was your contribution to the development of the output?</p> <p>2. What were the main obstacles you had to overcome in order to achieve/ contribute to the achievement of the output?</p> <p>3. What lessons have you learned as a result of the work undertaken to achieve this output?</p> <p>4. How would you characterise the work of the partner who led the production of this output? (Refer to planning, leadership, coordination of effort and commitment)</p>						

**Appendix 2. Dissemination and exploitation activities evaluation questionnaire**

LOGO EDUQAS + logo co-funding					
<i>questionnaire 2</i>		Dissemination and exploitation activities evaluation			
Aim to identify participants' opinions regarding the quality of the dissemination/sustainability event					
Country	Town	Organisation	Who conducted the event		
Date	Time	Duration	Organisational affiliation		
Occupation	Educational qualification		Gender	Age group	
Instruction: <i>evaluate the output considering proposed criteria.</i> Mark corresponding cells with: <b>"A"</b> - if level is high <b>"B"</b> - if level is adequate; <b>"C"</b> - if level is average; <b>"D"</b> - if level is low.					
To what extent the information presented was:		A	B	C	D
1	Comprehensible				
2	Interesting				
3	The right length				
4	Useful				
5	Relevant to your interests				
6	Has prompted you to act on it				
TOTAL					
Comment box:					

**Appendix 3. EDUQAS user questionnaire**

LOGO EDUQAS + logo co-funding						
<i>questionnaire 3</i>		<b>QA Unit user evaluation</b>				
Aim: to identify user's opinions regarding the quality of the services offered by the QA Unit						
Country	Town	QA Unit name	Organisational affiliation			
Occupation		Educational qualification	Gender	Age	Date	
Instruction: <i>evaluate the output considering proposed criteria.</i> Mark corresponding cells with: " <b>A</b> "- if level is high " <b>B</b> "- if level is adequate; " <b>C</b> "- if level is average; " <b>D</b> "- if level is low.						
How satisfied were you with the services provided by the QA Unit ?			A	B	C	D
1	Common set of equipment, tools and processes in the QA Unit					
2	Accessibility of programming					
3	Educational activity (workshops, courses etc.)					
4	Technical assistance					
5	Networking					
6	Management and operational assistance					
TOTAL						
Comment box:						

**Appendix 4. Training packages evaluation questionnaire**

LOGO EDUQAS + logo co-funding						
questionnaire 4		Training packages evaluation				
Aim to identify participants' opinions regarding the quality of the training sessions						
Country	Town	Organisation	Organisational affiliation			
Occupation	Educational qualification	Gender	Age group	Date		
<p>Instruction: we would be grateful if you could take the time to answer the following questions. The purpose is to keep in touch with your needs and requirements. We want you to know that what you write will be of great value to us, to you and to future students. Please use the comment box to highlight the things you have enjoyed and the things that need to be improved. Evaluate the quality of the training sessions considering proposed criteria. Mark corresponding cells with: "A" - if level is high; "B" - if level is adequate; "C" - if level is average; "D" - if level is low.</p>						
To what extent?			A	B	C	D
1	The course has met my educational needs					
2	The modules were highly relevant in enabling me to do my job better (if employed already)					
3	The modules could influence my future career/job choices					
4	The modules have equipped me with the appropriate skills and knowledge to enhance my practical role, I have received greater job satisfaction as a result of undertaking these modules					
5	Market research, sales and marketing					
6	I was given the opportunity to give regular feedback throughout the year					
7	Recommended texts were relevant and useful					
8	Written course materials were relevant and useful					
9	Learning outcomes of the modules have been made clear					
10	The modules are well organised					
11	The workload is manageable					
12	Clear written assessment guidelines and assessment criteria were provided					
13	Assessment arrangements and marking are fair					
14	Lecturers are good at explaining things					
15	Lectures have made the subject interesting					
16	Lecturers are enthusiastic about what they are teaching					
17	The modules are intellectually stimulating					
TOTAL						
Comment box:						

**Appendix 5. Teacher (administrative staff) training evaluation questionnaire**

LOGO EDUQAS + logo co-funding				
<i>questionnaire 5</i>		<b>Teacher (administrative staff) training evaluation</b>		
<i>Aim to identify the extent to which the participants to the training sessions have acquired the knowledge and skills proposed</i>				
<i>Country</i>	<i>Town</i>	<i>Organisation</i>	<i>Organisational affiliation</i>	
<i>Occupation</i>		<i>Educational qualification</i>	<i>Gender</i>	<i>Age group</i>
<p><i>Instruction: we would be grateful if you could take the time to answer the following questions. The purpose is to keep in touch with your needs and requirements. We want you to know that what you write will be of great value to us, to you and to future students. Please use the comment box to highlight the things you have enjoyed and the things that need to be improved. Evaluate the quality of the training sessions considering proposed criteria. Mark corresponding cells with: "A" - if level is high; "B" - if level is adequate; "C" - if level is average; "D" - if level is low.</i></p>				
<b>To what extent?</b>			<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>
<b>Information in the cells below is to be completed in line with the aim of the training programme by the promoters</b>				
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
<b>TOTAL</b>				
<p><b>Comment box:</b></p>    				

**Appendix 6. Meeting evaluation questionnaire**

LOGO EDUQAS + logo co-funding								
<i>questionnaire 6</i>		<b>Meeting evaluation</b>						
Aim <i>to identify participants' opinions regarding the quality of meetings</i>								
Country		Town	Organisation	Who conducted meeting				
Date	Time	Duration	Organisational affiliation					
Occupation		Educational qualification	Gender	Age group				
Instruction: <i>evaluate the quality of meeting considering proposed criteria. Mark corresponding cells with: "A" - if level is high; "B" - if level is adequate; "C" - if level is average; "D" - if level is low</i>								
<b>To what extent?</b>				<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	
1	The meeting was planned							
2	The date of the meeting was communicated to partners in good time							
3	The programme of the meeting was clear and adequate to the aim							
4	The schedule of the meeting was in line with the plan							
5	Activities were organised							
6	The coordinator conducted the meeting in a professional manner							
7	The technical support was adequate							
8	The amount of time allocated to each objective was adequate							
9	Participants were allowed the opportunity to express their opinions and views							
10	Participants were given the opportunity to ask questions							
11	The response to the questions were satisfactory							
12	The meeting has achieved its aims							
<b>TOTAL</b>								
Comment box: Please write any comment you might have regarding the organisational aspects of the meeting								

**Appendix 7. Project management questionnaire**

LOGO EDUQAS + logo co-funding						
<b>questionnaire 7</b>		<b>Project management evaluation</b>				
Aim: to identify participants' opinions regarding the quality of the project management						
Country	Town	Organisation	Who conducted management			
Occupation		Educational qualification	Gender	Age group		
Instruction: evaluate the quality of project management considering proposed criteria. Mark corresponding cells with: "A" - if level is high; "B" - if level is adequate; "C" - if level is average; "D" - if level is low						
<b>How efficient was project management aimed at</b>			<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
1	<b>project coordination:</b> was it provided long-term plan to ensure the project implementation & distribution of tasks among partners; hand-out materials reflecting activities leading to the expected outcomes; schedule of deliverables; tables of financial resources; tables of activities, deliverables, partners' role & resources in accordance with 8 working packages; schedule of travels;					
2	<b>management meetings:</b> were management & steering group meetings sufficient, regular, relevant & efficient?					
3	<b>reporting:</b> were instructions, schedule and templates of documents for activity & financial reports provided					
4	<b>control of project activities &amp; budget:</b> was regular monitoring, evaluation, control and feedback based on received data provided?					
5	<b>EDUQAS project financial and accounting management:</b> does it comply with the requirements of sound financial management, in particular regarding economy and efficiency? are accounting records up-to-date, accurate & reliable, drawn up according to proper accounting standards, methods, policies & rules?					
6	<b>bank management:</b> are electronic transfers used properly, project-dedicated specific bank accounts used?					
7	<b>documentation, filing and record keeping:</b> is documentation kept clear & relevant, providing sufficient evidence that contractual conditions have been met?					
8	<b>modifications to the grant agreement:</b> were modifications requested in writing in good time & the necessary agreement from the Agency received?					
9	<b>no-profit principle:</b> has the funding been used solely to carry out work programme activities for which the operating grant has been awarded (compliance with the work programme)?					
10	<b>payroll and time management:</b> was it provided proper calculation of pay and compliance with national social security & related rules; adequate staff contracting; adequate systems for allocating staff costs to projects; adequate control of attendance; sound remuneration practices?					
11	<b>travel &amp; subsistence:</b> are travel & subsistence reasonable, justified, prudent, in accordance with an initial work plan & in the interest of the project, adequately documented & checked?					
12	<b>control and audit visits:</b> can the following evidences be provided for verifying that funding has been used solely to carry out activities relating to the project; for checking that costs are eligible, incurred and reported in accordance with relevant rules and obligations (compliance with the financial rules, specific and general conditions of the grant agreements/decisions); for verifying if costs are					

	supported by appropriate supporting documentation and that amounts can be traced back to the organisation's accounts and accounting systems; for checking that reported costs are correct; for verifying that activities have taken place and/or the output has been produced.				
TOTAL					
Comment box:					



## Contents

1. Introduction.....	2
Aims of the formative evaluation .....	3
Formative questions .....	3
Aims for the summative evaluation .....	3
Summative questions.....	3
What will be evaluated? .....	4
2. Quality plan and evaluation activities as described in the application for funding.....	5
EDUQAS team of evaluators .....	5
EDUQAS computerized instruments used for evaluation.....	6
EDUQAS evaluation database .....	6
Short and long term impact indicators .....	6
Quality Plan Matrix .....	8
3. Quality assurance and evaluation methodology .....	9
Process of evaluation .....	9
Timetable of evaluation .....	10
Tools for evaluation .....	12
4. Main outputs and responsibilities among partners .....	13
Description of main outputs - WP4 Quality plan. ....	13
WP4 Partners' role and staffing resources .....	14
Project Workplan for WP4 .....	15
Structure of the Output Evaluation Report.....	16
Appendix 1. Output Evaluation Questionnaire .....	17
Appendix 2. Dissemination and exploitation activities evaluation questionnaire .....	18
Appendix 3. EDUQAS user questionnaire.....	19
Appendix 4. Training packages evaluation questionnaire.....	20
Appendix 5. Teacher (administrative staff) training evaluation questionnaire.....	21
Appendix 6. Meeting evaluation questionnaire .....	22
Appendix 7. Project management questionnaire.....	23

