

**WP5****Quality Assurance Plan**

<b>Prepared by:</b>	<i>Lazar Petrović</i>
<b>Contributors:</b>	<i>Consortium partners</i>
<b>Work Package:</b>	<i>WP5</i>
<b>Type:</b>	<i>Report</i>
<b>Date:</b>	<i>10/05/2017</i>
<b>Email:</b>	<i>lazar.petrovic@kg.ac.rs</i>
<b>Form:</b>	<i>Draft version</i>

*The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents which reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.*

*The Quality Plan sets out the quality assurance procedures for the BE-OPEN project. Its aim is to ensure that the results and products of the project are of high quality and meet the specifications set in the project proposal. The Quality Plan includes a description of quality areas addressed, quality indicators and quality assurance related procedures and methods that will be implemented throughout the BE-OPEN project duration. All major processes to implement the QA strategy are described as detailed as considered necessary. Supporting templates and tools are provided in the annex. This plan will be implemented jointly by the overall project partnership. Its implementation will be led by the Quality Assurance Manager who is responsible for all quality-related issues. Project monitoring in terms aspects such as timely project implementation is not subject of the quality plan, but is integrated into the project management activities.*

## Content:

---

(1) Quality assurance approach applied.....	03
(2) Process quality.....	04
(2.1) Partner cooperation and collaboration	
(2.2) Project implementation processes	
(2.3) Project partner meetings	
(3) Product quality.....	09
(3.1) Products/Deliverables prepared for publication	
(3.2) Events (seminars, workshops, conferences)	
(4) Impact and Sustainability.....	18
(5) External quality assessment.....	19
(6) Annexes.....	20

*The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents which reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.*

**(1)****Quality assurance approach applied**

The BE-OPEN quality plans' major objectives are the assurance of:

- (1) Projects methodological quality, in terms of validity of the activities carried out and project products developed;*
- (2) Practical applicability and sustainability of the project results; and*
- (3) Sound project implementation in terms of partner cooperation and collaboration and project processes.*

In order to meet these objectives, quality assurance processes and procedures are put in place on the following quality aspects:

Process quality:

Three dimensions of process quality will be investigated in the framework of this project. Those are (1) the quality of partner cooperation and collaboration in general, (2) the quality of project implementation processes and (3) the quality of project partner meetings. For those aspects quality indicators are defined and appropriate evaluation/documentation tools are provided.

Product quality:

Product quality assurance will primarily be implemented by defining quality indicators, products (primarily deliverables prepared for publication such as reports, papers, products/services) must comply with, and a review process for such project deliverables. Particular quality assurance procedures are outlined for events.

Project Sustainability:

This quality dimension is cross-cutting through project processes and products and investigates the project performance in terms of measures to assure project sustainability. Sustainability indicators are defined and appropriate evaluation/documentation tools are provided.

The overall approach applied follows a combined quality concept that equally considers input, process, output and sustainability aspects as quality parameters. The following parts of this paper provide further information regarding the implementation of these quality assurance processes and procedures.

## (2)

## Process quality

Three dimensions of process quality will be investigated in the framework of this project, those are:

- (1) *The quality of partner cooperation and collaboration in general;*
- (2) *The quality of project implementation processes; and*
- (3) *The quality of project partner meetings.*

For those aspects quality indicators are defined and appropriate evaluation/documentation tools are provided.

### (2.1)

### Partner cooperation and collaboration

High quality partner cooperation and collaboration are integral parts of a high quality project performance especially in transdisciplinary projects that are strongly dependent on sound partner cooperation and collaboration. The following dimensions of partner cooperation and collaboration are investigated in the framework of the BE-OPEN project.

#### Quality indicators of partner cooperation and collaboration:

- (1) *Continuous and efficient communication among partners is assured with appropriate tools;*
- (2) *Ongoing and coherent information management is assured with appropriate tools;*
- (3) *Partners have access to all information relevant for the overall project implementation;*
- (4) *Partners have a coherent understanding of the project, its methodical approach and terminology used;*
- (5) *Partners are actively involved in all relevant project processes; and*
- (6) *Partners' interests and needs are continuously considered and integrated into the projects implementation.*

In order to follow the combined quality concept as outlined above these indicators will be integrated in the implementation processes defined below. Nonetheless regular evaluations are undertaken in order to evaluate the effectiveness of the methods and tools applied and therefore to provide the basis for possible improvement. This will be done at the regular project management meetings (not at WP and intermediate meetings) in order to evaluate the previous project phase in between prior and current project meeting. The questionnaire used for this purpose is available in the [annex](#). The QA-manager is in charge of the implementation.

## (2.2)

## Project implementation processes

Standard project implementation processes are defined for:

- (1) *Agreement and decision making on work package implementation plans incl. methodological approach and division of tasks (in order to incorporate the individual work packages into the overall project with its aims and objectives and to ensure necessary links between work packages).*
- (2) *Agreement and decision making within WP implementation (in order to incorporate individual WP implementation steps into the overall work package and to ensure necessary links other WP and project elements).*

The following quality indicators represent the qualitative dimension of these formal processes. They are to be integrated into and addressed in all steps of the process and by all project partners involved in order to ensure that they are not reduced to formal processes but have an added value for the projects continuous improvement and progression:

Quality indicators on the methodological approaches applied:

- (1) *Implementation drafts/proposals are in coherence with the overall projects and the specific WP/deliverable aim and objectives;*
- (2) *Links and interfaces with other work packages are considered in the implementation of a specific WP and/or WP step/element;*
- (3) *Specific interests and characteristics of the different partners involved in the project/ WP/ step/element implementation are considered;*
- (4) *Project and project results validity and sustainability are assured;*
- (5) *Stakeholders are involved to a high extend at all possible and defined stages of project implementation;*
- (6) *The applied procedures and instruments are critically reflected regarding their objectivity, reliability and validity, and;*
- (7) *The methodological approach applied is appropriate for the involved partners and stakeholders.*

WP leaders and partners responsible for the development and implementation of relevant WP/steps/elements are asked to discuss these indicators and their integration into the WP/step/element during the WP discussions at project meetings.

This is to be documented within the meeting minutes.

The following process is defined for agreement and decision making on the overall workpackage implementation approach/plan:

	<b>What:</b>	<b>Timeline for orientation:</b>	<b>Who:</b>
1.	Provide comprehensive work package implementation proposal draft to project partnership	Prior to first WP discussion/introduction (most likely during partner meeting) <sup>1</sup>	WP leader
2.	Clarify, discuss and provide feedback on implementation draft to WP leader	At project meeting and within 5 days after the meeting	All partners involved in the WP
3.	Integration of feedback into the draft and finalisation of the WP implementation plan	Within 10 days after feedback deadline	WP leader
4.	Final discussion and approval of WP plan between WP leader and project coordinator	Within 15 days after final version is available	WP leader and Coordinator
5.	Final WP implementation plan is send to project partners and posted on project website/in virtual project space <sup>2</sup>	Within 30 days after project meeting	WP leader

A similar approach is applied for decision making and approval on/of crucial WP steps and elements such as research grids, questionnaires, interview guidelines or programmes<sup>3</sup>:

	<b>What:</b>	<b>Timeline for orientation<sup>4</sup>:</b>	<b>Who:</b>
1.	Provide draft of WP step/element to project partners	at the latest 20 days before planned implementation	Partner responsible <sup>5</sup>
2.	Clarify, discuss and provide feedback on draft to responsible partner	Within 5 days after draft has been provided <sup>6</sup>	All partners involved in the WP
3.	Integration of feedback into the draft and finalisation of WP step/element	Within 10 days after feedback deadline	Partner responsible
4.	Final discussion and approval of WP plan between WP leader and project coordinator	Within 5 days after final version is available	Partner responsible WP leader, Coordinator
5.	Final WP element/step is send to project partners for implementation and posted on project website/ in virtual project space	As agreed in the WP implementation plan	Partner responsible

<sup>1</sup> Meetings should be scheduled in a way that allows this procedure, nevertheless if this is not possible, the draft has to be send by e-mail to the overall project partnership. A virtual meeting is conducted within 10 days after sending the draft in order to clarify, discuss and provide feedback. Next steps remain the same.

<sup>2</sup> There is no second feedback loop and final approval by partners integrated, nonetheless on partner request WP leader and coordinator provide further information how partner feedback has been considered in the finalisation process. If there are serious doubts regarding the WP implementation plan, an additional feedback and revision loop is always possible on partner request.

<sup>3</sup> If doubts arise regarding the necessity to apply this procedure on a specific step/element, the QA-manager takes the decision.

<sup>4</sup> Except differently agreed on in WP implementation plan.

<sup>5</sup> Defined in WP implementation plan.

<sup>6</sup> Dependent on the nature of the WP element/step a virtual meeting can and should be scheduled to facilitate this step.

Differences between quality assurance and project management processes are fluent in this regard. Therefore, also PM processes need to be considered as part of the quality assurance activities. It is the task of the responsible partner and/or the WP leaders to implement and document these processes. The QA-manager provides a documentation template (*annex*) to be filled and provided by the WP leader after completion of the respective WP. If necessary, the QA-manager initiates (*missing*) steps.

## (2.3)

## Project partner meetings

Project partner meetings are a key factor within a high-quality project implementation and especially with regard to a smooth and high-quality implementation of project processes. They are therefore subject of separate evaluation and quality assurance processes. The following quality indicators apply.

### Quality indicators on the realisation of project partner meetings:

- (1) *Project meetings are prepared and managed in the most (resource) efficient way in order to make best use of the available meeting time;*
- (2) *Partner representative's needs are considered and addressed within the overall meeting realisation;*
- (3) *All partners are actively involved and actively contribute to the project partner meetings;*
- (4) *(Inter-)Cultural aspects are sufficiently considered in the meeting realisation;*
- (5) *Meeting documentation is sufficient to ensure comprehensibility of meeting discussions, decisions and decision making processes also beyond the group of partner representatives attending the meeting and over the whole time of project implementation;*
- (6) *Meetings make a considerable contribution to the overall project realisation and success;*
- (7) *Meetings make a considerable contribution to team building and smooth interaction between and among partners also besides the project meetings;*
- (8) *All partners (if applicable) send representatives to the meetings.*

*The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents which reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.*

Those indicators are realized through the implementation of the following meeting processes:

	<b>What:</b>	<b>Timeline for orientation:</b>	<b>Who:</b>
1.	<i>Meeting is scheduled under involvement of all partners concerned</i>	<i>At the latest 6 months before the meeting is supposed to take place</i>	<i>Project coordinator</i>
2.	<i>Meeting information (agenda, travel information, etc.) is provided to partners</i>	<i>At the latest 2 months before the meeting takes place</i>	<i>Project coordinator/ meeting host</i>
3.	<i>Meeting preparatory documents (WP status reports, draft deliverables, draft WP plans, etc.) are provided to the meeting participants for preparation</i>	<i>At the latest 1 week prior to the meeting</i>	<i>Project coordinator/ WP leaders</i>
4.	<i>Draft meeting minutes (incl. handouts provided at the meeting, presentations used, etc.) are prepared and circulated among partners for feedback (and silent approval)</i>	<i>At the latest 10 days after meeting took place</i>	<i>Project coordinator</i>
5.	<i>If applicable, revised meeting minutes are circulated among partners</i>	<i>At the latest 20 days after meeting</i>	<i>Project coordinator</i>

Further quality indicators are evaluated based on an evaluation questionnaire to be filled by all meeting attendees and partner representatives after the meeting took place.

*The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents which reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.*



**(3)****Product quality**

Product quality assurance will primarily be implemented by defining standards, products (*primarily deliverables prepared for publication such as reports, papers, products/services*) have to comply with, and a peer review process for such project deliverables. Particular quality assurance procedures are outlined for events.

**(3.1)****Products/Deliverables prepared for publication**

All project products/deliverables prepared for publication such as reports, papers, products/services go through a review and authorization process that involves project partners, members of target group and experts. The following quality indicators are considered at different stages of this process.

Quality indicators on products/deliverables prepared for publication:

- (1) *The product(s)/deliverable(s) complies with the formal criteria displayed in the provided templates (annex) regarding its layout and structure.*
- (2) *The product(s)/deliverable(s) is in coherence with the deliverable description in the project proposal and fulfils its planned purposes in the framework of the WP and the overall project.*
- (3) *The product(s)/deliverable(s) sources of data/information are clearly described.*
- (4) *The product(s)/deliverable(s) proves objectivity, reliability and validity in terms of data provided and used, analysis results, argumentations, reasoning and conclusions.*
- (5) *The product(s)/deliverable(s) reflects the recent status of development in terms of its content.*
- (6) *The product(s)/deliverable(s) is structured and/or written in a way that facilitates its (results) use by its target group(s).*
- (7) *The product(s)/deliverable(s) contains relevant information for the target group.*
- (8) *The product(s)/deliverable(s) provides an added value to the current status of development/discussion on its topic.*
- (9) *The product(s)/deliverable(s) contains innovative elements to an extent that can be expected from its description in the proposal.*
- (10) *The product(s)/deliverable(s) overall concept and results promise high potential for sustainability.*

The review and authorisation process involves the following stages:

	<i>What:</i>	<i>Timeline for orientation<sup>7</sup>:</i>	<i>Who:</i>
1.	<i>Provide draft product deliverable to partnership</i>	<i>30 days prior to planned delivery date in project/WP implementation plan</i>	<i>Partner responsible</i>
2.	<i>Clarify, discuss and provide feedback on draft to responsible partner based on quality indicators above</i>	<i>Within 5 days after availability of draft</i>	<i>Project partners</i>
3.	<i>Integration of feedback into the draft deliverable and provision of the deliverable to the QA-manager</i>	<i>Within 10 days after feedback deadline</i>	<i>Partner responsible</i>
4.	<i>Review of deliverable regarding formal criteria and coherence with deliverable description in the project proposal<sup>8</sup></i>	<i>Within 5 days after revised version has been provided</i>	<i>QA-manager, WP leader, Coordinator</i>
5.	<i>In case of public papers, preliminary version is posted on the projects website</i>	<i>As soon as deliverable is reviewed regarding formal criteria and coherence (step 4)</i>	<i>Coordinator</i>
6.	<i>Expert review of deliverable/product regarding quality indicators above (except coherence with deliverable description and compliance with formal criteria)<sup>9</sup></i>	<i>Within 10 days after last version has been provided</i>	<i>Content expert, target group representative, project partner (led by QA- manager)</i>
7.	<i>Review of the deliverable based on expert review results</i>	<i>Within 10 days after expert review has been completed</i>	<i>Partner responsible</i>
8.	<i>Final authorisation/validation of deliverable (incl. replacing on public part of project website, if necessary)</i>	<i>Within 5 days after final review by responsible partner</i>	<i>QA-manager, WP leader, Coordinator</i>

The QA-manager is responsible for the moderation of this process. If necessary, the QA-manager initiates the steps.

<sup>7</sup> Except different agreed on in WP implementation plan.

<sup>8</sup> In case of major doubts regarding conformity of the product with project description an additional revision by the responsible partner can be added.

<sup>9</sup> See annex for review template.

This review process is applied to the following deliverables/products and has the nature of a minimum evaluation for quality assurance purposes. Partners are asked to identify a stakeholder and/or expert and/or to conduct the project internal part of review step 5. Work package, deliverables, BE-OPEN tasks and outcomes are defined, and content experts, target group, peer's reviews are to be specified at a later stage of the project lifetime.

<b>BE-OPEN TASKS</b>
<b>WP1</b>
<b>MAPPING THE CURRENT OPEN SCIENCE POTENTIALS AT SERBIAN UNIVERSITIES</b>
<b>P1</b>
<i>Analyse the existing national legislatives and institutional policies related to the implementation of OSP in research and education</i>
<b>P2</b>
<i>Analyse the current state of affairs regarding the infrastructure interoperability and technical support for the implementation of OSP at the Serbian HEIs</i>
<b>P3</b>
<i>Analyse the attitudes towards and knowledge of OSP among university officials, researchers, journal editors, and PhD students</i>
<b>P4</b>
<i>Building a technological infrastructure to support the implementation of open science principles at Serbian universities</i>
<b>WP2</b>
<b>DEVELOPING AND ADJUSTING GUIDELINES, POLICIES, AND INCENTIVES</b>
<b>A1</b>
<i>Conduct a study visit to transfer know-how regarding national legislatives and institutional strategies for open science in EU countries</i>
<b>A2</b>
<i>Define a set of guidelines and directives for successful implementation of OSP in research and education at the national level</i>
<b>A3</b>
<i>Prepare policies and adjust bylaws at the institutional level to support the defended national directives related to the implementation of OSP</i>
<b>A4</b>

<i>Provide recommendations for the national action plan for improving the impact and accountability of publicly-funded research through the implementation of open access principles</i>
<b>WP3</b>
<b>INFRASTRUCTURAL SUPPORT FOR THE OPEN SCIENCE PRINCIPLES</b>
<b>B1</b>
<i>Conduct a study visit to transfer experience and knowledge related to research data planning, sharing, and management</i>
<b>B2</b>
<i>Define the national standards and guidelines for the development of Web services, institutional repositories, and databases enabling the implementation of OSP</i>
<b>B3</b>
<i>Develop, standardize, and integrate institutional repositories as open science platforms at the Serbian HEIs</i>
<b>B4</b>
<i>Develop a Web service for the knowledge transfer between universities and industry</i>
<b>WP4</b>
<b>BUILDING CAPACITIES FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF OPEN SCIENCE PRINCIPLES</b>
<b>C1</b>
<i>Conduct a study visit to transfer experience and knowledge related to the university-industry linkages and the evaluation of research impacts</i>
<b>C2</b>
<i>Build the registry of private foundations and non-government research funders for open science research</i>
<b>C3</b>
<i>Organize workshops and seminars for the education of researchers, journal editors, and possible funders in using institutional repositories and open science sources</i>
<b>C4</b>
<i>Define the set of indicators to monitor and evaluate the effects of the implementation of OSP at the Serbian HEIs</i>
<b>WP5</b>
<b>QUALITY CONTROL OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES</b>
<b>Q1</b>
<i>Quality reports on project actions</i>
<b>Q2</b>
<i>Evaluation reports on project achievements by EU partner</i>
<b>Q3</b>

<i>Fine tuning of university procedures and regulations</i>
<b>Q4</b>
<i>External audit</i>
<b>WP6</b>
<b>DISSEMINATION AND EXPLOATATION</b>
<b>D1</b>
<i>Raising awareness on open science policies developed at national and institutional level</i>
<b>D2.1</b>
<i>Develop, design and maintain project website</i>
<b>D2.2</b>
<i>Develop, design and maintain open science webpage</i>
<b>D3</b>
<i>Promotional materials design</i>
<b>E1</b>
<i>National and institutional open science policies and strategies implemented at universities in Serbia</i>
<b>E2</b>
<i>Advanced support system for implementation of open science at Serbian universities</i>
<b>WP7</b>
<b>MANAGEMENT</b>
<b>M1</b>
<i>Setting up project management bodies and task management working groups</i>
<b>M2</b>
<i>Reports on project management</i>
<b>M3</b>
<i>Kick-off and Consortium meetings</i>
<b>M4</b>
<i>Reports on partners' activities</i>
<b>M5</b>
<i>Financial reports and bookkeeping</i>
<b>BE-OPEN OUTCOMES</b>
<b>WP1</b>
<b>MAPPING THE CURRENT OPEN SCIENCE POTENTIALS AT SERBIAN UNIVERSITIES</b>
<b>P1</b>
<i>Report on the existing national legislatives and institutional incentives related to the implementation of open science principles in research and education</i>

<b>P2</b>
<i>Report on the current open science practice in Serbia and the registry of institutional open science repositories and related information infrastructures</i>
<b>P3</b>
<i>Mapping the situation regarding the awareness and knowledge of open science principles within academic community</i>
<b>P4</b>
<i>Prerequisites for building technical solutions for open science at universities</i>
<b>WP2</b>
<b>DEVELOPING AND ADJUSTING GUIDELINES, POLICIES, AND INCENTIVES</b>
<b>A1</b>
<i>Study visit to the Leiden University and University of Udine to transfer know-how regarding on EU open science practices and transfer of know-how regarding the guidelines, mandates, and legislations underpinning open science in research and education</i>
<b>A2</b>
<i>Guidelines and directives for successful implementation of open science principles in research and education at the national level</i>
<b>A3</b>
<i>University policies and by-laws for the implementation of open science principles</i>
<b>A4</b>
<i>Recommendations to the national Action Plan for improving the impact and accountability of publicly-funded research through the implementation of open science principles (incorporated into National Strategy for Scientific and Technological Development)</i>
<b>WP3</b>
<b>INFRASTRUCTURAL SUPPORT FOR THE OPEN SCIENCE PRINCIPLES</b>
<b>B1</b>
<i>Study visit to London to transfer experience and knowledge related to research data planning, sharing, and management</i>
<b>B2</b>
<i>National standards and guidelines for the development of web services, institutional repositories and databases enabling the implementation of open science principles</i>
<b>B3</b>
<i>Development, standardization and integration of institutional repositories as open science platforms at the Serbian HEIs</i>
<b>B4</b>
<i>Development of web service for the knowledge transfer between universities and industry</i>
<b>WP4</b>

<b>BUILDING CAPACITIES FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF OPEN SCIENCE PRINCIPLES</b>
<b>C1</b>
<i>Study visit to the National Technical University of Athens to transfer experience and knowledge related to the university-industry linkages and the evaluation of research impacts</i>
<b>C2</b>
<i>Building the registry of private foundations and non-governmental institutions funding research</i>
<b>C3</b>
<i>Training of university staff, policy makers, journal editors, and research benefactors in use of open science platforms</i>
<b>C4</b>
<i>Evaluation methodology for monitoring the usage of open science platforms and the performance and impact of research at Serbian universities</i>
<b>WP5</b>
<b>QUALITY CONTROL OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES</b>
<b>Q1</b>
<i>Quality reports on project actions</i>
<b>Q2</b>
<i>Evaluation reports on project achievements by EU partner</i>
<b>Q3</b>
<i>Fine-tuning of university procedures and regulations conducted in line with feedback from all the stakeholders</i>
<b>Q4</b>
<i>External audit</i>
<b>WP6</b>
<b>DISSEMINATION AND EXPLOATATION</b>
<b>D1</b>
<i>Raising awareness on open science policies developed at national and institutional level</i>
<b>D2.1</b>
<i>Project website design and maintenance</i>
<b>D2.2</b>
<i>Open science webpage developed and updated</i>
<b>D3</b>
<i>Promotional materials design</i>
<b>E1</b>

<i>National and institutional open science policies and strategies implemented at universities in Serbia</i>
<b>E2</b>
<i>Advanced support system for implementation of open science at Serbian universities</i>
<b>WP7</b>
<b>MANAGEMENT</b>
<b>M1</b>
<i>Setting up project management bodies and task management working groups</i>
<b>M2</b>
<i>Project management</i>
<b>M3</b>
<i>Kick-off, Consortium meetings and Partner Country meetings</i>
<b>M4</b>
<i>Reports on partners' activities</i>
<b>M5</b>
<i>Financial reports and bookkeeping</i>

Extended or specified evaluation measures can be specified for major project products in order to for instance implement a wider evaluation of a product among its aspired target group. Further measures are to be agreed on by project coordinator, concerned WP leader and quality assurance manager and on request by any of the project partners.



*The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents which reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.*

**(3.2)****Events (seminars, workshops,  
conferences)**

All major events (seminar and workshops) will be evaluated against the following quality indicators by conducting a participant evaluation at the end of the event.

Quality indicators on multiplier events:

- (1) *The event(s) is structured/ implemented in a way that meets the target group's needs;*
- (2) *The event(s) provides relevant and reliable information to the target group;*
- (3) *The event(s) provides an added value to the current status of development/discussion on its topic;*
- (4) *The event(s) contains innovative elements that are of relevance for its target group;*
- (5) *The event(s) overall concept and implementation promises high potential for sustainability;*
- (6) *The event(s) has a clear European and intercultural dimension, and;*
- (7) *The event(s) provides information that it is part of the project Trans2Work project and has been funded by the ERASMUS+ programme.*

Events are to be evaluated based on a workshop evaluation form (*annex*) to be handed out to participants at the end of the event in paper/electronic version. Implementing partners ensure that about 50% of the event participants participate in the evaluation. The evaluation results are to be provided by the national partner responsible for the events organisation/ evaluation in a summarising table to be provided by the quality assurance manager. The individual evaluation forms are to be kept by the implementing partner at least until approval of the projects final report by the EACEA. The evaluation results and a (*scanned*) list of participants (*annex*) are to be provided within one month after the event electronically to the QA-manager for documentation and evaluation. These measures are applied to the all applicable events.

*The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents which reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.*

## (4)

## Impact and Sustainability

This quality dimension is cross-cutting through project processes and products and investigates the project performance in terms of measures to assure project sustainability. Sustainability indicators are defined and appropriate evaluation/documentation tools are provided below. The topic sustainability is already an integral part of the quality assurance areas, indicators and measures outlined above. In order to further emphasize the quality aspect sustainability, the following quality indicators are introduced complementary to the ones above for this specific topic.

### Quality indicators on project sustainability:

- (1) Relevant stakeholders are actively involved in project activities throughout the overall course of the project and are regularly consulted in the project implementation;*
- (2) Relevant stakeholders are regularly informed about project activities and results via appropriate communication channels;*
- (3) Project results are of use for and provide an added value to stakeholders on professional driver qualification;*
- (4) Project results are of use for and provide an added value to the project partner organisations;*
- (5) Project results and information about project activities are regularly disseminated within the partners own organisations and connected to the regular activities of the organisation;*
- (6) Partners develop individual and joined strategies for further use, development and dissemination of project results beyond the projects framework, and;*
- (7) The quality assurance measures in the quality plan are continuously implemented throughout the overall project duration.*

Regular partner evaluations are conducted by the QA-manager at the time of project meetings to evaluate project performance in terms of the sustainability indicators. The last indicator will only be subject of a meta-evaluation being part of the interim and final project quality report. An additional final evaluation at the projects end will be conducted by the QA- manager involving all project partners in order to identify a larger picture of the project performance and with a special focus on the quality dimension “sustainability”. The final evaluation will among others include a final measurement the quantitative and qualitative indicators defined by project management and partners jointly and being part of the logical framework matrix (*see project description*). This final evaluation will identify recommendations for future project work in terms of project management, follow up and project content/findings (*Final evaluation tools are developed close to the projects end, in order to consider the specific project characteristics of the project in the evaluation*).

## (5)

## External quality assessment

External quality assurance and evaluation will be procured at project start up. For this purpose, an external evaluator will be contracted, the evaluator has the following profile.

### Profile of the external evaluator:

- (1) *Evidence of past experience in Education or related to the projects activities;*
- (2) *Evidence of involvement in the implementation of EU-funded projects;*
- (3) *Evidence of involvement with National Authorities responsible for Higher Education;*
- (4) *Past experience conducting external evaluation or as reviewer is an asset;*
- (5) *Past experience with project partner/programme countries is an asset;*
- (6) *Evidence of good communication skills (both verbal and written) in English.*

### Tasks of the external evaluator are:

The external evaluator will have access to the internal reports from the partnership and will receive the project outputs in a sequence from alpha versions through beta versions to final products. He or she will also be included in e-mail correspondences for monitoring of partnership activity and will have access in the collaboration platform. The external evaluator will be responsible for giving feedback to the partnership after each report has been received and also for making recommendations that can be used for corrective actions to ensure best possible results. Two external Quality Assurance Reports will be delivered by the external quality evaluator at the middle and at the end of the project funded period. One Interim external evaluation report to be used for the project’s Interim Report and for making improvements and one Final Quality Assurance Report before end of the project funded period to be used for the project’s Final Report.

**(6)****Annexes**Annexes:

- (1) (Annex) Questionnaire for evaluation of partner cooperation and collaboration and adaptation for initial and final evaluation*
- (2) (Annex) Partner questionnaire on project impact and sustainability and adaptation for initial and final evaluation*
- (3) (Annex) Meeting evaluation form*
- (4) (Annex) Template for documentation of QA-relevant WP processes*
- (5) (Annex) Template for expert, stakeholder and peer review*
- (6) (Annex) Template event report*
- (7) (Annex) Event evaluation form*
- (8) (Annex) Event evaluation summary table*
- (9) (Annex) Meeting agenda template*
- (10) (Annex) Meeting minutes' template*
- (11) (Annex) Project deliverable template*
- (12) (Annex) Project presentation template*

*The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents which reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.*