

WP5 Quality Assurance Committee Report, October 2017

Sally Priest - Middlesex University

Overarching comments

- A QAC report was delivered to the management committee in April 2017 – no specific comments were received.
- Revisions to the QAC plan – this was reviewed and revised following the external review
- Discussion was undertaken about ensuring the quality of deliverable– the WP leaders should be responsible for reviewing this with oversight by the QAC

Monitoring report on partner self-assessment reports (Annex R)

The first partner self-assessment reports were due for submission on 30th September 2017. Reports were requested early to enable review prior to the Messina partner meeting. 10 reports were received from partners although all have been subsequently delivered.

In general, partners reporting working well on the project and felt that in the past few months many activities have been realized, in particular with the training and study visits. Some key issues that arose included:

- Some partners were still waiting for institutional agreements relating to the mobility strand to be sent to them for signing. This was a key issue for discussion at the Messina meeting with a plan developed to ensure that they are realised.
- There appeared to be some curriculum development activities ongoing and realised since the Vienna meeting, but some EU partners had heard little about the content of the potential programmes and therefore were unsure about how to input on these matters.
- The issue of accreditation was raised and this was one of the key issues that was raised in the first QAC, with regard to the joint accreditation is now not relevant as it has been decided that this will now longer go ahead.

Monitoring report on self-assessments from Work Packages (Annex Q)

The second assessment reports for Work Packages were due for submission on 30th September 2017. Reports were received from all WPs prior to the meeting and they all clearly focussed on the activities of the WP and so the issues of understanding the purpose of these reports have been resolved.

Summary of findings:

WP 1: Successful completion of the WP and deliver of the catalogue of competencies. Successful workshops held in Vienna in April 2017. No issues.

WP2: The Aims, competencies and learning outcomes of the Masters programmes have been developed in August 2017. The process of defining more specifics about the courses and the syllabi has started. In particular there has been a lot of progress on WP2.3 with a series of training visits being hosted by EU partners. OE, MUHEC, TUC and UNIME hosted Balkan partners between May and September 2017 and the last meeting is scheduled next month (October) in Vienna. All training visits were well received as demonstrated

by the high scores from the visit evaluations. The purchasing of laboratory equipment and software is progressing. Key issue – There has been a delay in UBL and UNSA launching a tendering call for the purchase of equipment/software, however this has been recognised and procedures are in place to speed it along.

WP3: WP3.1. Delivered its report on citizen and public awareness. WP3.2 parallel to the training visits, study visits have been successfully held by EU partners in OE, MUHEC, TUC and UNIME (May to Sept 2017) and will be held in Vienna in October. These were equally well received as the training visits. WP3.3 training with 331 participants was held in June 2017 for both citizens and public sector organisations and those involved in the WP continue to prepare materials. No major issues and the WP remains on track.

WP4 activities are not scheduled to start until later in 2018 as the curricula are implemented, apart from participating in workshops and meetings which has taken place satisfactorily.

WP5: The Quality Control Plan was revised and reviewed following external evaluation. The first QAC report was written following the Vienna meeting. Quality reporting was undertaken by all partners, both on partner contributions (Annex R) and by work package (Annex Q), these reported no major issues and tasks are mostly on track. An Internal Quality Evaluation was also undertaken in Sept 2017 utilising Annex T questionnaires and an Internal Quality Report provided. External evaluation was also realised. Plans for the inter-project coaching and how to attract participants was discussed at the Messina meeting. The external evaluation identified the need to ensure quality of deliverables. WP5 team will ensure that all deliverables have an associated Annex S review completed and discussion at the QAC suggested that WP leaders should be responsible for review of the quality of deliverables- with oversight of the QAC, with a review box to be added to Annex S template. Key issues: attracting participation in the inter-project coaching event in April 2018 and ensuring quality reporting is undertaken in good time to inform the next QAC meeting.

WP6 has updated the dissemination plan and strategy, although there is the need to ensure that all partners are familiar with it and also undertaking and reporting on any dissemination. Promotional material created along with a social media presence. Key issues: ensuring partners awareness of the strategies and that all elements are followed – an item to be added to all meetings.

WP7 has delivered a revised sustainability plan in August 2017. The key issue with this WP is realising the mobility strand activities for staff and students are realised. This is in process with each partner nominating a mobility strand champion and an administrator for the mobility strand. Additionally, progress on the signing of institutional agreements is being closely monitored and will be followed up

WP8: Strong leadership has been shown in the project so far and the WP leaders have provided clear support and guidance to project partners. All necessary tasks have been realised and fulfilled within this challenging role. WP8 remains effective in keeping the project on track and ensuring the effective delivery of outputs. Key issues: It was suggested by partners that the meetings can feel quite far apart and if more day to day communications were required then bilateral skype meetings on specific issues would be welcomed.

QAC – September 2017.