

Quality Control Plan

Project title	Development of master curricula for natural disasters risk management in Western Balkan countries
Project acronym	NatRisk
Project reference number	573806-EPP-1-2016-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP
Coordinator	University of Nis
Project start date	October 15, 2016
Project duration	36 months

Reference no and title of workpackage	5.2 Development of the quality control plan
Institution	Middlesex University
Author(s)	Mike Dawney, Milan Gocic, Nada Zorboska
Document status	Final
Document version and date	v.03, 03/03/2017
Dissemination level	Internal

Project number: 573806-EPP-1-2016-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

"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"

Contents

1. Work package and partner reports	4
2. QAC reports	4
3. Independent monitoring evaluations	4
4. Interproject coaching.....	5
5. Academic quality assurance	5
6. Quality assurance tasks	5
7. Quality plan schedule.....	5
Annexes.....	6
ANNEX Q - Work Package self-assessment report form	7
ANNEX R - Partner self-assessment report form	10
ANNEX S - Check list for review of deliverables	13
ANNEX T - Work Progress summary report form.....	15
ANNEX U - Internal project quality evaluation form	17
ANNEX V - Internal project quality evaluation report	22

List of abbreviations

BOKU	University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences, Vienna
ENQA	European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education
HEI	Higher Education Institution
KPI	Key Performance Indicator
MUHEC	Middlesex University Higher Education Corporation
NatRisk	Development of master curricula for natural disasters risk management in Western Balkan countries
OE	Óbuda University
PMC	Project Management Committee
QAC	Quality Assurance Committee
UNI	University of Nis
WP	Work package

To ensure the quality of the NatRisk project, internal work quality standards and procedures will be agreed upon and established for the Consortium partners by the Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) which is established to monitor project performance. The QAC has four members from Partner HE institutions (University of Nis - UNI, University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences, Vienna - BOKU, Middlesex University - MUHEC, Óbuda University - OE). The lead Partner for the Quality Plan Work Package (WP5) is Middlesex University.

1. Work package and partner reports

The QAC will organize qualitative reviews to be conducted twice yearly by each WP and by Partner institutions. Each work package will be expected to have realised a minimum of 65% of planned outcomes for the year at the end of project year 1 (14 October 2017), 90% of planned outcomes for years 1 and 2 by the end of project year 2 (14 October 2018) and to meet all planned outcomes by the end of the project (14 October 2019). Appropriate spending is to be achieved within the above parameters.

WP and Partner reports will use a critical self-assessment forms (Annex Q and Annex R) and will be evaluated in conjunction with other management tools such as the Review of Deliverables (Annex S) and the Work Progress Summary Report Form (Annex T). The principle of the QACs approach to Quality Assurance for the project will be light-touch self-evaluation, with the main purpose of identification of short-fall in the direction of the project and any issues that might militate against the full achievement of project objectives.

2. QAC reports

Following the biannual reviews, the QAC will prepare evaluation reports for the Project Management Committee (PMC), which will, in turn, notify all the partners on the issues related to project quality. The QAC reports will focus on Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) set for the activities of each package and the whole project (outputs, outcomes). QAC reports will also consider performance measures such as participation levels in meetings and activities against those planned, for both staff and students, an assessment of effective communication within the partnership, including the website, and the effective management of the project (Annex V).

3. Independent monitoring evaluations

Evaluation of the project activities and results will also be performed by independent external expert(s) who will carry out independent comprehensive monitoring evaluations to review, and report upon, the progress of the project at the mid-point of the project and six months prior to the end of the project. The evaluations will be made to make sure that the project is carried out according to plan and to provide advice to improve the quality of the project realization. External monitoring of quality will take place twice during the project and Financial evaluation will take place during the final year.

4. Interproject coaching

Interproject Coaching will be arranged in the second project year to explore synergies with similar projects in the region.

5. Academic quality assurance

QAC is not responsible for quality assurance of the academic content of project outcomes. However, it will be expected that the WPs responsible for these outcomes will ensure that the quality standards of National Quality Agencies for countries implementing in the project are met, within the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (2015), established by ENQA.

6. Quality assurance tasks

Quality assurance tasks are as follows:

- Establishing the internal work quality standards and procedures,
- Monitoring and reviewing reports from WP coordinators and contact persons on behalf of the Project Management Committee,
- Preparing regular reports to the Project Management Committee,
- Arranging and establishing independent monitoring evaluations by expert(s) (mid-term and end).

7. Quality plan schedule

Quality plan schedule is presented in the following table:

Reference no and title of WP5 activity	Expected deliverable	Due date
5.1 Regular Quality Assurance Committee meetings	Reports	May/October annually
5.2 Development of the quality control plan	Plan	February 2017
5.3 External review of the project	Reports	14-05-2018 and 14/07/2019
5.4 External financial control	Report	14-07-2019
5.5 Inter-project coaching	Event	14-05-2018

Annexes

Different supporting documents have been elaborated for the overall enhancement of the project quality plan:

- Annex Q - Work Package self-assessment report form (biannual)
- Annex R - Partner self-assessment report form (annual)
- Annex S - Check list for review of deliverables (to be completed on completion of identified deliverable)
- Annex T - Work progress summary report form (short report to be submitted by all partners to Management group every 3 months as indicated)
- Annex U - Internal project quality evaluation form (annual)
- Annex V - Internal project quality evaluation report (annual)

ANNEX Q - Work Package self-assessment report form

WORK PACKAGE SELF-ASSESSMENT REPORT¹

Project title	Development of master curricula for natural disasters risk management in Western Balkan countries
Project acronym	NatRisk
Project reference number	573806-EPP-1-2016-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP
Coordinator	University of Nis
Project start date	October 15, 2016
Project duration	36 months

Work Package reference number and title	
Work Package Lead Partner	
Name of the responsible person	

Project number: 573806-EPP-1-2016-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

"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 This form concerns quality issues of NatRisk project. WP leaders should complete this form twice a year, in consultation with other active members of the WP team, and submit the report by email to s.priest@mdx.ac.uk and natriskuni@gmail.com by March 30th and Sept 30th each year. The reports will be reviewed by the Quality Assurance Committee and a short report will be prepared and submitted to the Project Management Committee.

1. Activities and achievements

Fill in the outputs/outcomes and indicators as per the Logical Framework Matrix of the WP during the review period. In the column “Achieved to date” describe all activities done in order to achieve the indicated output/outcome. Provide a short comment if necessary.

Outputs/ outcomes - LFM code	Indicator	Achieved to date	Comment

2. Problems encountered

Describe the main problems encountered and recommend a solution if possible

Outputs/ outcomes	Description of problem	Recommendation

3. Changes

Present all changes to WP plans including postponing implementation deadlines

Outputs/ outcomes	Change of plan and likely implication for WP activities	Suggested actions	Date of notification to NatRisk coordinator

4. Brief summary

Summarize progress of activities against the implementation schedule (up to 100 words)

Summarize progress against specific objective indicators from the logical framework matrix (up to 200 words)

Summarize main problems encountered and recommendations (up to 200 words)

Location, date

Signature

ANNEX R - Partner self-assessment report form

PARTNER SELF-ASSESSMENT REPORT²

Project title	Development of master curricula for natural disasters risk management in Western Balkan countries
Project acronym	NatRisk
Project reference number	573806-EPP-1-2016-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP
Coordinator	University of Nis
Project start date	October 15, 2016
Project duration	36 months

Partner name	
Acronym	
Contact person	

Project number: 573806-EPP-1-2016-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

"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"

² This report concerns quality issues of NatRisk project. The contact person from each partner institution should complete this form annually, in consultation with the members of the partner institution project team, and submit the report by email to s.priest@mdx.ac.uk and natriskuni@gmail.com by Sept 30th each year. The reports will be reviewed by the Quality Assurance Committee and a short report will be prepared and submitted to the Project Management Committee.

1. Partner contributions

Please describe shortly your contribution to the project within each of activities defined by LFM and comment if necessary. If it is not foreseen to take part in some of activities, please mark it with n/a. If some activity has not started yet, please indicate that. If your team didn't accomplish some task, please give the reasons.

Activities - LFM code	Achieved to date	Comment

2. Changes

Please indicate any changes in project realisation from the partner institution during the report period and comment on any likely impact on the project and suggest remedial actions

Changes to the planned contributions to the project	Likely implication for WP activities and suggested actions	Date of notification to NatRisk coordinator

3. Financial matters

Please indicate amounts of received instalments, expenditure within budget lines, and status of financial reporting on NatRisk management platform. Please comment any variation in the expected pattern of spending. This report will be considered in conjunction with the Financial Table on the NatRisk Management Platform.

Received	No. of the instalment	Amount	Date	Comment
	1.			
	2.			
	3.			
	4.			
Spent		Spent from Erasmus+ grant	Comment	
	1. Staff Costs			
	2. Travel Costs			
	3. Costs of Stay			
	4. Equipment Costs			
	5. Subcontracting Costs			
	6. Special Mobility Strand			
	Total			
Reported		Yes	Partially	No
	Financial excel table on the NatRisk platform filled-in			
	ITR, Time Sheets and Staff Convention forms completed			
	Supporting documents provided and uploaded to the NatRisk platform			

Location, date

Signature

ANNEX S - Check list for review of deliverables

CHECK LIST FOR REVIEW OF DELIVERABLES³

Deliverable title	
Work package	
Author	
Date	

Project number: 573806-EPP-1-2016-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

"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"

³ This questionnaire concerns quality issues of NatRisk upon completion of each deliverable. Please complete the form and submit it by email to Project Coordinator (natriskuni@gmail.com) and WP leader. The achieved results will be useful for the project's risk management. They will also make part of the QAC final report, as well as of the Coordinator's progress and final reporting to EACEA.

Assurance point	Issues to be addressed	Assessment	Comments	Reccomendations
Compliance with NatRisk objectives	<i>Does the deliverable comply with the overall objectives of the project?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Compliance with the specific objectives of the WP	<i>Does the deliverable comply with the WP Objectives as specified in the WP description?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Correspondence with the description of work of the relevant activity	<i>Does the deliverable correspond with the activity description as specified in the Application Form?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Compliance with the deliverables format	<i>Is the deliverable presented using the Project's deliverable format – Annex B?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Adequacy of complementary information	<i>Examples of complementary info:</i> - Sources used, - Bibliography, - List of contacts, - Methodology used.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Adequacy of written language	<i>Level of written English</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Poor		
Overall assessment and suggestions for improvement				
Deadline for submission of amended version of the deliverable				

ANNEX T - Work Progress summary report form

WORK PROGRESS Summary Report form⁴

Work progress information

Date	
Author(s)	
Lead institution of WP5	
Work packages	
Period included	
Description of the work done	

⁴This form concerns quality issues of NatRisk project. It needs to be filled by WP5 leader, every 3 months after receiving Work Progress Report from all NatRisk partners, and then sent on e-mail address: natriskuni@gmail.com. The report will be reviewed by the Quality Assurance Committee and a short report will be prepared and submitted to the Project Management Committee.

Please indicate your suggestions for project work improvement:

Location, date

Signature

Project number: 573806-EPP-1-2016-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

"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"

ANNEX U – Internal project quality evaluation form

INTERNAL PROJECT QUALITY EVALUATION FORM⁵

Project title	Development of master curricula for natural disasters risk management in Western Balkan countries
Project acronym	NatRisk
Project reference number	573806-EPP-1-2016-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP
Coordinator	University of Nis
Project start date	October 15, 2016
Project duration	36 months

Project number: 573806-EPP-1-2016-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

"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"

⁵ The form serves as one of the tools of internal quality evaluation of NatRisk project. All project team members of all NatRisk partners should complete this form at the end of project year and submit it by email to s.priest@mdx.ac.uk and natriskuni@gmail.com by Sept 30th each year.

Structure of the project

Grading	Poor	OK	Good	Very Good	Excellent
I share a common understanding of what the project is about	1	2	3	4	5
I am familiar with the project's aims and objectives	1	2	3	4	5
I am familiar with the project's target groups	1	2	3	4	5
I know about all the partners' tasks in the project	1	2	3	4	5
I know my organisation's tasks in the project	1	2	3	4	5
The project has a clear structure. The workflow follows a logic sequence.	1	2	3	4	5
The work process is quite clear to me	1	2	3	4	5

Comment:

Implementation of the project activities

Grading	Poor	OK	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Project activities comply with the overall objectives of the project	1	2	3	4	5
Deliverables comply with the WP objectives as specified in the WP description	1	2	3	4	5
Deliverables correspond with the activity description as specified in the Application Form	1	2	3	4	5
It's possible to realize all project activities till the end of the project	1	2	3	4	5

Comment:

Dissemination

Grading	Poor	OK	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Web site of the project gives precise and updated information on the project objectives and activities	1	2	3	4	5
Promotional materials reflect the visual identity of the project	1	2	3	4	5
Project is well presented in the media	1	2	3	4	5

Comment:

Management of the project

Grading	Poor	OK	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Communication channels are sufficient to achieve excellent project results	1	2	3	4	5
Coordinator informs all partners on all aspects of activity implementation	1	2	3	4	5
Coordinator informs all partners on financial aspects of the project realization	1	2	3	4	5
If conflict arose, the partners were able to solve it	1	2	3	4	5
Project events (project meetings, workshop, trainings, and study visits) are well structured	1	2	3	4	5
Project events have good prepared agendas sent on time	1	2	3	4	5
Project events provide enough opportunities to discuss and exchange ideas	1	2	3	4	5
Project events prepare us well for the next steps of the project work	1	2	3	4	5
The SC, PMC, QAC meetings are usually concise and informative	1	2	3	4	5

Comment:

Partnership

Grading	Poor	OK	Good	Very Good	Excellent
All members of the consortium put much effort in their tasks	1	2	3	4	5
All members of the consortium take responsibility for project activities and results	1	2	3	4	5
All members of the consortium are acknowledging skills and expertise of other project members	1	2	3	4	5
The partnership motivates us to collaborate with the partners in the future projects	1	2	3	4	5

Comment:

Exploitation

Grading	Poor	OK	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Exploitation of the project is well determined	1	2	3	4	5
It's possible to extend project impact during and after project lifetime	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability of the project is provided	1	2	3	4	5

Comment:

Special Mobility Strand implementation

Grading	Poor	OK	Good	Very Good	Excellent
I am well informed about Special Mobility Strand	1	2	3	4	5
Special Mobility Strand activities are well planned	1	2	3	4	5
Your participation in Special Mobility Strand	1	2	3	4	5

Comment:

ANNEX V – Internal project quality evaluation report

INTERNAL PROJECT QUALITY EVALUATION REPORT⁶

Project title	Development of master curricula for natural disasters risk management in Western Balkan countries
Project acronym	NatRisk
Project reference number	573806-EPP-1-2016-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP
Coordinator	University of Nis
Project start date	October 15, 2016
Project duration	36 months

Reporting date	
Report author(s)	

Project number: 573806-EPP-1-2016-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

"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"

⁶ This form concerns quality issues of NatRisk project. The report is based on internal project quality evaluation forms. It should be prepared by QAC and send on e-mail address: natriskuni@gmail.com till October 10th.

Evaluation details

Results of evaluation of the structure of the project

Description
Table(s)/Figure(s)

Results of evaluation of implementation of the project activities

Description
Table(s)/Figure(s)

Results of evaluation of dissemination

Description
Table(s)/Figure(s)

Results of evaluation of management of the project

Description
Table(s)/Figure(s)

Results of evaluation of partnership

Description
Table(s)/Figure(s)

Results of evaluation of exploitation

Description
Table(s)/Figure(s)

Results of evaluation of Special Mobility Strand implementation

Description
Table(s)/Figure(s)

Please indicate your suggestions for further project improvement:

Location, date

Signature
