



QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

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"

PROJECT INFO

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| 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 |
| Funding scheme | Erasmus+ Capacity building in the field of higher education |
| Web address | www.natrisk.ni.ac.rs |
| Coordination institution | University of Nis |
| Project duration | 15 October 2016 – 14 October 2019 |

DOCUMENT CONTROL SHEET

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Work package | WP5 Quality assurance and monitoring |
| Ref. no and title of activity | 5.2 Development of the quality control plan |
| Title of deliverable | Quality Control Plan |
| Lead institution | Middlesex University |
| Author(s) | Sally Priest, Mike Dawney, Milan Gocic, Nada Zorboska |
| Document status | Final |
| Document version and date | v.05, 08/15/2017 |
| Dissemination level | Internal |

VERSIONING AND CONTRIBUTION HISTORY

| Version | Date | Revision description | Partner responsible |
|---------|------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| v.01 | 02/21/2017 | Document creation | MUHEC |
| v.02 | 02/23/2017 | Second draft | UNI, MUHEC |
| v.03 | 03/03/2017 | Third draft | UNI, MUHEC |
| v.04 | 04/10/2017 | Fourth draft | UNI, MUHEC |
| v.05 | 08/15/2017 | Final version | UNI, MUHEC |
| | | | |

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Introduction..... | 5 |
| 1. Quality assessment and assurance..... | 5 |
| 1.1 Quality assurance tasks | 6 |
| 1.2 Quality Assurance Committee meetings and reporting | 6 |
| 2. Tools and procedures for quality assurance..... | 7 |
| 2.1 Quality of the NatRisk project implementation..... | 7 |
| 2.2 Quality review of the NatRisk deliverables..... | 7 |
| 2.2.1 Quality of produced NatRisk documents | 8 |
| 2.2.2 Quality of promotional materials..... | 8 |
| 2.2.3 Quality of website and other computer-mediated tools..... | 8 |
| 2.2.4 Quality of events..... | 9 |
| 3. Internal monitoring | 10 |
| 3.1 Responsibilities for internal monitoring of deliverables..... | 10 |
| 3.2 Impact assessment of the project activities | 11 |
| 3.3 Periodic and summative internal project quality evaluation report..... | 12 |
| 4. External monitoring | 13 |
| 4.1 Terms of reference for external evaluation | 14 |
| 4.2 Criteria for the selection of external evaluator | 15 |
| 4.2.1 Description of the external evaluation task | 15 |
| 4.2.2 Profile of the external evaluator | 15 |
| 4.2.3 Responsibilities of the external evaluator | 15 |
| 4.2.4 Evaluation budget | 16 |
| 4.3 Academic quality assurance | 16 |
| 5. Inter-project coaching | 17 |
| 6. Quality plan schedule..... | 18 |
| Annexes..... | 19 |
| ANNEX Q - Work Package self-assessment report form | 20 |
| ANNEX R - Partner self-assessment report form | 23 |
| ANNEX S - Check list for review of deliverables | 26 |
| ANNEX T - Internal project quality evaluation form..... | 28 |
| ANNEX U - Internal project quality evaluation report..... | 33 |

List of abbreviations

| | |
|---------|--|
| BOKU | University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences, Vienna |
| EACEA | Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency |
| ENQA | European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education |
| HEI | Higher Education Institution |
| MST | Mobility Strand Team |
| 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 |

Introduction

The Quality Control Plan defines the main procedures to be followed by the partners of the NatRisk project to ensure the optimal quality of the project activities, results and management in line with the NatRisk project Grant Agreement, the NatRisk Partnership Agreements and Guidelines for the Use of the Grant (version 01: 08 December 2016).

The plan defines procedures for internal and external monitoring, quality management and quality requirements for the project deliverables. It provides five templates as annexes of the Plan.

1. Quality assessment and assurance

Assessment and assurance of the NatRisk project quality defines quality standards, methods for quality assessment and methods for detect and correct the occurred problems during the project realization. Internal and external monitoring of the NatRisk project will be used to ensure the project efficiency, progress and constant improvement in line with defined standards and time schedule. According to the recommendations derived from permanent quality control, corrective actions will be taken on time keeping project on right direction.

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 consists of four members from Partner HEIs (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.

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 critical self-assessment forms (Annex Q and Annex R) and will be evaluated in conjunction with the Review of Deliverables (Annex S). 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.

1.1 Quality assurance tasks

Quality assurance tasks are as follows:

- Establishing the internal work quality standards and procedures;
- Monitoring and reviewing reports from WP leaders 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),
- Reviewing of financial,
- Analysing of EACEA evaluation and monitoring reports.

1.2 Quality Assurance Committee meetings and reporting

MUHEC will encourage the discussion of items related to quality assurance (challenges, shortcomings, open questions compromising the quality of deliverables, etc.) via QAC meetings and reports that are followed up together with the Project Coordinator and partners. QAC meetings will take place during a project meeting with all partners. If it is needed, meetings will be organised via Skype with individual partners on a specific topic.

The role of MUHEC is to prepare and moderate the meeting together with the Project Coordinator, while partners are responsible to contribute to the meeting by preparing questions and solutions. The QAC meetings will happen regularly (e.g. twice a year) in order to discuss and establish patterns on quality in the project. The results of the QAC meetings and field visits will be included into the Interim and Final project reports. The drafts of the meetings reports will be discussed with the Project Coordinator and the final version made available to all partners. The reports should include an analysis of the current status of development and quality of project deliverables, conclusion and recommendations for the upcoming project period.

2. Tools and procedures for quality assurance

Tools and procedures for quality assurance have to ensure

- the quality of the NatRisk project implementation, and
- the quality of the NatRisk project deliverables.

2.1 Quality of the NatRisk project implementation

All partners are responsible for quality of the NatRisk project implementation in order to achieve overall broader and specific objectives. They should respect defined procedures and tools for quality assurance, in fully respect to the signed partnership agreements.

The quality of achieved NatRisk objectives i.e. development of new master curricula in the field of natural disasters risk management in line with the Bologna requirements and national accreditation standards with incorporated Special Mobility Strand and development of educational trainings for public sector and citizens will be evaluated using defined templates for self-evaluation of master curricula, self-evaluation of trainings and student and staff mobility reports which will be filled by target groups. Summary of these evaluations will be part of the Interim and Final reports. Results of evaluations of master curricula and trainings will be used for further improvement and assurance of sustainability of project results.

The NatRisk management structure consisting of Steering Committee (SC), Project Management Committee (PMC), Mobility Strand Team (MST) and Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) is responsible for the quality of entire NatRisk project implementation.

The quality control of the project progress will be done every 6 months by the Consortium and/or SC resulting in critical assessment of realized activities till then and planning efficient implementation of activities in the following period. Consortium partners will send work progress reports on 3-month basis and Project Coordinator produces summary report. The results of these activities will be agreed upon, compiled and published in the Interim and Final reports.

2.2 Quality review of the NatRisk deliverables

The NatRisk activities will result in documents (reports, publications, manuals, plans, learning materials for professionals), promotional material (brochures, flyers, notebook, roll-up, folder, pen, etc.), printed materials regarding organization of events (meetings, workshop, trainings, study visits), and website and other electronic tools for dissemination purposes.

Quality of deliverables will be assessed regarding to what extent they reached relevance of project objectives with the possibility of their future improvement.

2.2.1 Quality of produced NatRisk documents

All partners will use a consistent format for all documents (reports, publications, manuals, plans, word document, power point presentations) in order to ensure a common appearance of deliverables as well as to ensure that a minimum amount of information will appear consistently in all documents produced by the NatRisk project. Templates are provided at the website www.natrisk.ni.ac.rs.

Learning materials for professionals will be assessed by QAC and stakeholders who will participate at trainings.

All documents will be stored on NatRisk website and platform for visibility and use for all partners when needed.

When partners produce documents, they are obliged to put Erasmus+ logo consisting of sentence "Co-funded by Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union" on the cover or the first page. They must use following disclaimer on the inner pages:

"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."

2.2.2 Quality of promotional materials

The Project Coordinator is responsible for design and print of all promotional material such as flyers, poster, roll-up, folder, notebook, brochure, etc. for dissemination during the NatRisk project events (partners meetings, study visits, workshop, consortium meetings, etc.) and other general events such as conferences, symposia, workshops, open days, etc. The draft version will be sent to all partners for comments and suggestions, before printing, publishing and distribution. The materials will be disseminated by all project partners at events which are relevant to reach the project's target groups.

2.2.3 Quality of website and other computer-mediated tools

The Project Coordinator will be responsible for setting up and maintaining the NatRisk web-site (www.natrisk.ni.ac.rs) with all information and materials received from project partners. All partners are asked to promote the NatRisk project on their websites and social networks such as Facebook, Twitter and LinkedIn profiles/groups by providing short description of the project, logo, and link to the NatRisk website. Following the project's web dissemination strategy, news about the NatRisk project will be published in different languages English, Serbian, German, Hungarian, Italian, Greek, and Bosnian.

All partners should regularly provide information for dissemination on website. Web site will be linked to all partners' web sites and other interested stakeholders and social networks. Quality of website and other computer-mediated tools will be partly assessed using Google analytics.

2.2.4 Quality of events

Quality of events (meetings, trainings, workshop, study visits, etc.) is assured by an accurate defined documents and procedures for preparing, realization and post-event activity.

In preparation phase, organizer of event is obliged to provide participants with all necessary information (draft agenda, letter of invitation and note on venue, traffic, and hotels) several weeks before the event. The draft agenda should be circulated for partner's opportunity to add items relevant for them. The final agenda should be sent out in advance on time. Power point presentations should be prepared using defined template. It is highly important that partners send representatives to events who are able to contribute to the event or benefit from it (e.g. in case of workshop and trainings). Participants should come well informed and prepared for the events.

During the event, NatRisk participants should be registered using participation list with the ability to get printed material. Posters, roll-up and other promotional materials shall be displayed during the event. Event must respect the scheduling time. Some event details will be recorded.

Events should be evaluated based on a template (evaluation list) filled by the participants of the event.

After the event, minutes of meetings and event report need to be created by event organizer and available as soon as. Event report should include the collected statistical data, a summative narrative of the data and recommendations for the implementation of upcoming events within the NatRisk project. The results of the evaluation may be presented at the following event for further improvement of upcoming events.

Based on obligations of the beneficiaries defined in article I.10.8 and II.7, of the Grant Agreement, related to information requirements, the partners should inform the public, press and media (Internet included) of the event which must visibly indicate "*with the support of the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union*" as well as the graphic logos of the project and Erasmus+ Programme.

3. Internal monitoring

The aim of internal monitoring is to steer the NatRisk project into the right direction through the defining of the effective methods for quality assessment, controlling and improving project implementation. Internal quality monitoring concerns all aspects of the NatRisk project including financial and administrative, management, deliverables, dissemination, academic dimension, impact and relations with EU. It involves teaching staff, students, administrative and technician staff, professionals from local bodies and representatives from agencies in the field of NDRM. Internal quality monitoring will be conducted by using adequate tools such as evaluation forms, questionnaires and different evaluation reports.

All partners are responsible for regular internal monitoring and assessment of compliance with the Logical Framework Matrix (LFM), work plan and budget. The Project Coordinator will inform on regular basis partners about evaluation results and agree remedial actions.

Risk monitoring, as a part of internal quality management, is the process that should anticipate issues that could jeopardize the successful project realization (potential financial risks, project management risks, postponing of defined deadlines) and define controlling mechanism and solutions. Contingency Plan, as a separate NatRisk document, defines how to minimize the possible risks of the NatRisk project realization. Comprehensive and effective quality control mechanism of all segments and phases of NatRisk project realisation is established and incorporated in Contingency Plan to identify deviations from the work plan, results of internal and external evaluation, student evaluation, regular reporting, and financial audit.

Management structure of the NatRisk project is obligate to judge objectively project achievements and give recommendations for improving project quality standards. 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 the project outputs and outcomes and consider performance measures of all project activities.

3.1 Responsibilities for internal monitoring of deliverables

Chain of responsibilities for internal monitoring of deliverables starts with the authors of deliverables, leaders of task and WPs, followed by reviewers of deliverables appointed by QAC, Project Coordinator control and SC supervising and adoption of deliverables on SC meeting.

The Task Leader appointed by responsible partner with the corresponding WP Leader should guarantee the quality and timeliness of the deliverables. The deliverables should be in line with the prescribed NatRisk Application Form and the deliverable's template. The Task Leader is responsible for assigning parts of the work to other partners involved in the activity and their coordination and also for the submission of the draft deliverable to the WP Leader, QAC and the Project Coordinator. It should report to the WP Leader for any problems occurring during the implementation of the activity.

The QAC assigns realized deliverable to appointed reviewer, who is not an author of the deliverable. Within two weeks, the reviewer should prepare a review report with comments in accordance with the Check list for review of deliverables (Annex S) and send to the Task Leader. The Task Leader in cooperation with authors has one week more to implement the reviewer comments, prepare a corrected draft delivery and send written objections to the reviewer. In this case, the reviewer will have another one week to send back final comments to the Task Leader. If final reviewer's comments are adequately applied in new deliverable version, the Task Leader sends it as a final deliverable version to the WP Leader, the Project Coordinator and SC.

The Project Coordinator has an opportunity to give comments on draft deliverable. In case of profound disagreement between reviewers and Task Leaders, the Project Coordinator will undertake the necessary actions to intensify the solution and has right to make the final decision.

The Steering Committee as the highest level of final decisions accepts and officially approves the deliverables. When deliverable has passed all previous controls with the need for major modifications and got the adoption status by SC, it can be treated as the final deliverable and included in the project.

3.2 Impact assessment of the project activities

The term impact is used to assess intermediate and long-term effects of a project contributing by all NatRisk partners. The satisfaction of the project beneficiaries will be investigated because of its crucial role in controlling the project results. Targeting analyse will take into account purpose of project activities (new master curricula, educational trainings and all NatRisk events) and specificity of target groups (students, training participants, event participants and stakeholders). Feedback's templates (Self-evaluation list of master curriculum and Self-evaluation list of trainings for citizens and public sector) are tailored in order to get complete analyse of target group satisfaction. Different project events (workshop, training of teaching staff, study visits, meetings) will be evaluated by the NatRisk participants using Event evaluation form. The statistical evaluation with graphical presentations of acquired information will be included into the reports (Self-evaluation report of master curriculum, Self-evaluation report of trainings for citizens and public sector and Event report).

The time allowed for providing feedback will be communicated in advance and should relate to the size and complexity of the document and to the resources needed for review. It is advised to take into account that partners may not be available to provide feedback over religious or national holidays.

3.3 Periodic and summative internal project quality evaluation report

Gathering information for measurements of all project performance during the project implementation i.e. tools for verification of project realization and results in line with work plan and Logical Framework Matrix are defined through the different kind of evaluation and reporting documents.

Periodic internal quality control is ensured with: quarterly Work Progress Reports of each project partner and quarterly Work Progress Summary Report, Work packages self assessment report, Partner self-assessment report, Check list for review of deliverables, Technical and Financial reports.

The tool that serves to evaluate comprehensively the quality of

- structure of the project, implementation of the project activities,
- dissemination,
- management of the project, partnership efforts, exploitation, and
- Special Mobility Strand implementation

is template “Internal project quality evaluation form” (Annex T). It should be filled annually by all involved participants into NatRisk project realization. QAC will prepare annually Internal project quality evaluation report (Annex U) based on previous collected data using Annex T.

4. External monitoring

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.

The external monitoring of the project includes assessment of various project aspects:

- relevance - is the project still relevant in terms of its goals and achievements,
- efficiency - are the activities within the work-packages done on time,
- effectiveness - how well are the project specific objectives met,
- impact - at the level of departments, faculty, university, and
- sustainability - what would stay after the project is finished.

The external monitoring performed by the National Erasmus Office (NEO) and EACEA comprises three types of monitoring, based on the deliverable achievement:

- preventive (in the first project year),
- advisory (after the first project year), and
- control (after the end of the project – sustainability check).

Considering all aspects and findings within the course of the three subsequent types of monitoring, the NEO will send a report to EACEA.

The external evaluation of the project aims to:

- Provide an outside critical view of the project approach and methodology and give suggestions for their improvement during and after the project implementation;
- Monitor the effectiveness of the project activities and the quality of the project results during and after the project implementation;
- Evaluate the project progress and overall satisfaction measurement of all partners involved with project management and financial handling;
- Evaluate the single phases of the project;
- Evaluate the milestones of the project (e.g. creation of the Guidelines and Plans);
- Measure the impact of the project activities.

4.1 Terms of reference for external evaluation

MUHEC will coordinate the implementation of external evaluation. To this end MUHEC will work out the Terms of reference (ToR) together with the Project Coordinator and communicate with the external evaluator throughout the implementation of the external evaluation. The Project Coordinator and MUHEC will support the external evaluator by the following means: provision of data and information, support to establishing of content and timeline of the evaluation.

The ToR includes the following sub-chapters:

- **Background and rationale:** provision of the context and summary of project description; any account of already proven challenges and risks;
- **Specific objectives of the evaluation and key questions:** description of objectives and key (main parameters) of the external evaluation which should be complementary to the internal quality assessment carried out by MUHEC;
- **Scope of the evaluation:** description of limits of the evaluation, focus areas; description of key activities/areas and related resources expected to be needed for the external evaluation;
- **Approach and methodology:** short description of key methodological approaches - if applicable: the consortium may decide to leave this open for the external evaluator to decide in his/her role as evaluation expert; he/she may make a suggestion for the methodological approach which will be discussed and agreed upon by the Project Coordinator and MUHEC as coordinator of WP5.
- **Guiding principles and values:** description of the guiding principles and core values to be respected throughout the external evaluation by the project consortium and the external evaluator;
- **Responsibilities:** full list of contact persons involved in the external evaluation and their expected roles, the main contact person with UNI as project coordinator and MUHEC, as coordinator of WP5;
- **Professional qualifications:** short description of the necessary profile for carrying out of the external evaluation
- **Deliverables and schedule:** short description of expected deliverables of the external evaluation and the expected delivery dates;
- **Budget and payment:** breakdown of working days per activity within the external evaluation and budget overview including working days, travel resources and other resources if applicable. The external evaluator should participate in one meeting at least.

- **Existing references or resources:** the external evaluation will be built on quality assessment carried out to date. Any items already produced for quality review shall be made available to the external evaluator well on time.

4.2 Criteria for the selection of external evaluator

4.2.1 Description of the external evaluation task

The external evaluator (person not involved in the NatRisk project Consortium) 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/she will also be included in e-mail correspondences for monitoring of partnership activity and will have access to 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 six months prior to 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. The external evaluator is furthermore expected to be available for virtual meetings with the coordination team and/or the whole consortium.

This involvement of the external evaluator will take place from March 2018 to October 2019.

4.2.2 Profile of the external evaluator

The potential candidate should have a strong background in project related topics and objectives such as development of master curricula. He/she should demonstrate in his/her application that he/she has sound knowledge and understanding of the project topic and field of activity. Prior involvement into the implementation of EU-funded projects connected to the project's topic as coordinator or partner, past experiences with projects addressing the project's partner countries (Serbia, Kosovo* and Bosnia and Herzegovina) as well as involvement with National Authorities responsible for Higher Education are highly appreciated. Past experience conducting external evaluation or as reviewer is an asset. A candidate should also have excellent knowledge of English language (both verbal and written).

4.2.3 Responsibilities of the external evaluator

The main responsibilities of the external evaluator of the project will be to:

- Prepare an external evaluation plan along with the necessary questionnaires and documents, needed for the plan implementation;

- Consult the internal evaluation reports;
- Participate in at least one coordination meeting within the project;
- Prepare the evaluation reports, including recommendations to the partners for improvement of performance and overall assessment of the project implementation and impact.

4.2.4 Evaluation budget

UNI will subcontract the external audit agency(ies) (bodies not involved in the NatRisk project Consortium) for the purpose of external review of the project and for external financial control. The NatRisk project allows for a maximum contract price of EUR 5.000 (incl. all related costs) for the external evaluation for quality and the same price for the financial evaluation. The tender procedure will be transparent, fair and based on principles of equal treatment, which also means candidates are able to propose different financial offers according to their own estimated costs. All candidates are expected to specify at least the following items in their offer planned working days for (1) interim external evaluation report, (2) final external evaluation report, (3) (virtual) meetings with coordination team, (4) per month in order to follow the projects progress. Candidates will be requested to specify his/her VAT status. The contract will be awarded to the bid offering best value for money (best price-quality ratio).

4.3 Academic quality assurance

QAC is not responsible for quality assurance of the academic content of project outcomes (new master curricula). WP2, WP4 and WP7 Leaders for these outcomes must ensure that the quality standards defined in the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (2015), established by ENQA will be met. National Quality Agencies (Commission for accreditation and quality assurance) in WB countries involved in the project (Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo*) will carry out external quality assurance of new master curricula and make approval decision for their future exploitation.

5. Inter-project coaching

Inter-project Coaching will be arranged in the second project year to explore synergies with similar projects in the region. The purpose of this meeting is to share ideas, discuss complementarities and eventually review activities. Consortia will contact the members of running and/or completed projects in a similar field in order to use their accumulated expertise and to undertake a peer review.

6. Quality plan schedule

Quality plan schedule of WP5 is presented in the following table:

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

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 - Internal project quality evaluation form (annual)
- Annex U - 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"

¹This 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 September 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"

²This 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 September 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"

³This questionnaire concerns quality issues of NatRisk upon completion of each deliverable. Reviewer appointed by QAC completes the form and submits it by email to WP leader, Task leader and Project Coordinator (natriskuni@gmail.com). 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 | Recommendations |
|---|--|--|----------|-----------------|
| 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 A?</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 – Internal project quality evaluation form**INTERNAL PROJECT QUALITY
EVALUATION FORM⁴**

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| 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"

⁴The 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 September 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 U – Internal project quality evaluation report

INTERNAL PROJECT QUALITY EVALUATION REPORT⁵

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| 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"

⁵This 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
