

<b>Work package type and ref.nr</b>	<b>QUALITY PLAN</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Title</b>	<b>Quality Assurance and Evaluation</b>	
<b>Related assumptions and risks</b>	<p>Assumptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feedback openly given from beneficiaries and partners.</li> <li>• Common understanding, motivation, and commitment among partner members.</li> <li>• Collaborative and engaged approach from participants to provide the information requested.</li> <li>• Efficient data management.</li> <li>• Adequate and continuous dialogue with stakeholders and beneficiaries.</li> <li>• Effective quality review mechanism responding timely to any adjustment needs.</li> <li>• Both Russian and Armenian educational systems are subject to integration processes in education but suffer an acute deficit of fresh ideas and methods for improving education quality.</li> </ul> <p>Risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unforeseen shifts in national legislation context or policy environment demanding realignment of quality specifications. The risk is mitigated with thorough monitoring of changes to national legislation in HE, direct communication of partners with policy makers and employers.</li> <li>• Different understanding of what is meant or required of a task among Partners. The risk is mitigated with the regular meetings of SC and TC where all tasks are discussed clearly.</li> <li>• Different estimations on the benefits of single measures/recommendations within the partnership. The risk is mitigated with the careful specification of all deliverables in advance.</li> <li>• Difficulty of quality estimation of the project's indicators and, as a consequence, realizing Quality Assurance &amp; Evaluation Plan. Risk is mitigated that the task of indicators approval will start from the onset at Kick off meeting.</li> </ul>	
<b>Description</b>	<p><b>Work Package Aims:</b></p> <p>The aim of this WP is to ensure that the project processes and outcomes will match the expected quality standards and indicators. More specifically this WP aims to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) establish quality specifications for project outcomes with specific focus on the following deliverables: in-service training courses, open e-learning platform and exploitation; (cp. Task 3.1)</li> <li>(2) evaluate the train-the-trainers programme to impact on professional development; (cp. Task 3.2)</li> <li>(3) collect the input and feedback from beneficiaries via structured measures throughout the project to ensure relevance to target groups; (cp. Task 3.2 and 3.5)</li> </ol>	

(4) monitor project progress and changes in the operational context throughout the entire time-line, identifying any areas for further improvement and maximizing the effectiveness of the project results; (cp. Task 3.6)

(5) evaluate the overall quality and impact of the project both internally and externally (by an external evaluator/auditor) (cp. Task 3.3 & 3.4).

**Description of Methodology:**

Internal Quality Control Mechanism

Based on the Technical Committee's recommendations with the support of the WP 2, WP 4 and WP 5 leaders, the WP 3 leaders will create a Quality Assurance & Evaluation Plan including quality specifications for the major project deliverables: in-service training courses, open e-learning platform and sustainability planning. Additionally, the capacity building effect will be examined to ensure the professional development of trained teachers. Specific criteria will be clarified for the professional development analysis.

The TC will determine the quality specifications and evaluation criteria. The Quality Assurance & Evaluation Plan (3.1) will also include specifications for collecting stakeholder and beneficiary feedback for quality assurance purposes.

The WP 3 leaders will present an initial draft of the Quality Assurance & Evaluation Plan during the Kick-off meeting (M2), using definitions of Quality as understood by UNICEF, UNESCO and ENQA. The Plan will be reviewed and finalised by SC at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Transnational meeting (M8) focusing specially on quality assurance. Quality Assurance & Evaluation Plan compliance will be reviewed during each transnational meeting and updates will be made based on feedback from beneficiaries and stakeholders.

WP 3 Quality Assurance will provide a framework for evaluation and feedback collection from beneficiaries when developing the training courses and modules via the e-platform and implementing test-runs. WP 2 experts together with the WP 3 leaders will design a Quality Assurance Manual for in-service training courses. The manual will guide the evaluation process of the test-runs and can be adjusted, if needed, based on the lessons learned during the test-run evaluations. The 2<sup>nd</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> transnational meetings on Quality assurance will review issues to guide the test-runs prior to launch. After each iteration, the module developers and teachers will meet jointly online to share experiences and agree on any adjustments together with WP 2 mentors, and WP 3 and WP 4 leaders. A special quality review session will take place at the 7<sup>th</sup> Transnational meeting (M24).

	<p>The WP 2, WP 4 and WP 5 leaders will be responsible for the accomplishment of the quality specifications. The WP 3 leaders will compile a Quality Evaluation Report for each Steering Committee (SC) meeting based on the quality specifications and input from WP leaders. Also, the WP 3 leaders will plan and coordinate the collection of feedback and input from the beneficiaries. YKSUG (P8) will handle the collection and analysis jointly with the relevant WP leaders and will report on accomplishments to each Steering Committee and Technical Committee meeting (3 annually) based on the milestones outlined in Quality Assurance &amp; Evaluation Plan.</p> <p>The bundle of SC's sessions will serve as a Quality Review Mechanism (QRM) responsible for reviewing and evaluating project results and adjusting implementation plans if needed. SC will confirm the accomplishment and agree on any adjustments to deliverables if they do not meet the quality specifications. The WP 3 leaders are in charge of monitoring and reporting on the implementation of the Quality Assurance &amp; Evaluation Plan.</p> <p><u>External Evaluation:</u>  Apart from Internal Quality Control, an external evaluator will be subcontracted to carry out external evaluations and to write an External Evaluation Final Report, looking at both outputs and processes. This includes project management, communication and collaboration, and the quality of outputs and outcomes. The project evaluation criteria against which the project will be evaluated are as follows: Impact, Sustainability, Effectiveness, and Validity. A Final Evaluation Report will be produced at the end and will be communicated to EU officials.</p>
<p><b>Tasks</b></p>	<p>(1) Quality Assurance Plan – Quality Requirements/Specifications for each major deliverable and a procedure for evaluation in collaboration with WP leaders. (M1-M36).</p> <p>(2) Quality Assurance Manual for online modules and training courses - Feedback and input collection from beneficiaries and stakeholders (M17, 28)</p> <p>(3) Internal Quality Monitoring and reporting (M8, M12, M14, M17, M20, M24, M32, M36)</p> <p>(3) WP leaders utilise the quality evaluation tools and procedures continuously as a part of coordination of the WP activities. This is monitored by the project coordinator LIEPU (P1). (M8-M36).</p> <p>(4) External Evaluation/Audit – Interim Report (M18) and Final Report (M1-M36). Responsibility: External Contractor. Subcontracting budget under LIEPU(P1).</p> <p>(5) Assessment of the quality of in-service training courses by</p>

	representative of stakeholders; (6) Quality Review Mechanism (SC meetings) (M8, M12, M14, M17, M20, M24, M32, M36)		
<b>Estimated Start Date (dd-mm-yyyy)</b>	M1	<b>Estimated End Date (dd-mm-yyyy)</b>	M36
<b>Lead Organisation</b>	P8 (YSULS); Co-leaders P7 (ATI) & P6 (PSU)		
<b>Participating Organisation</b>	P1 (LIEPU): Role in activities 3.1-3.5, especially in 3.4 P2 (KU): Role in 3.1-5 P3 (PH-Linz): Role in 3.1-5 P4 (TvSU): Role in 3.1-5 P5 (DSTU): Role in 3.1-5 P6 (PSU): Responsible for leading activities 3.1-5 in Russia especially in 3.3 P7 (ATI): Responsible for leading activities 3.1-5 in Russia especially in 3.2 P8 (YSULS): Responsible for leading activities 3.1-5 in Armenia P9 (GSU): Role in 3.1-5 P10 (NUACA): Role in 3.1-5 Associated partners take roles as experts and speakers in all Dissemination Activities		
<b>Costs</b> <i>Please explain the necessary costs for this WP: What travels are necessary? If equipment is requested, explain why it is required. If subcontracting is necessary, explain why the task cannot be performed by the partner.</i>	We ask subcontracting for LIEPU (P1) for External Evaluator/Auditor (Interim Evaluation Report & Final Evaluation Report) and Financial audit. These costs cannot be covered by co-financing due to the institutional restrictions and absence in corresponding budget provision of the university.		