



ALLVET

ERASMUS+ PROGRAMME

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

Editor(s): David Allen (EHU)

Responsible Partners: Edge Hill University (EHU), UK
Russian Register (RR), Russian Federation



QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

Version	Date	Amendments	Responsible Partner
Version 1	04.03.2020	First draft	QA Agency "Russian Register"
Version 2	27.05.2020	Second draft	QA Agency "Russian Register" and QA officers
Version 3	27.05.2020	Third draft	Edge Hill University DSTU (as RF country Coordinator)

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

CONTENT

1. INTRODUCTION	4
1.1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION	5
1.2 COMMUNICATION TOOLS	10
2. QA STRATEGY	12
2.1 INTERNAL QA	13
2.2 EXTERNAL QA	15
2.3 QA MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE	15
2.4 QA REPORTING	17
3. QA MEASURES & CRITERIA	19
3.1 QA MANAGEMENT APPROACH	19
3.2 MILESTONES AND INDICATORS	23
3.3 QUALITY OF PROJECT DELIVERABLES	44
4. RISK MANAGEMENT AND CONTINGENCY PLAN	44
ANNEX 1: DISTRIBUTION LIST	49
ANNEX 2: ALLVET QA OFFICERS	50
ANNEX 3: CONTACT PERSONS	51
ANNEX 4: EVENT EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE	53
ANNEX 5: WORK PACKAGE COMPLETION QUESTIONNAIRE	57
ANNEX 6: SIX-MONTH REPORT QUESTIONNAIRE	58
ANNEX 7: GLOSSARY	59

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

1. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this Quality Control Plan (QCP) is to act as a central source of QA information for the project partners on QA policies, procedures, measures, indicators, criteria and risks to provide QA control for Erasmus + Project 609952-EPP-1-2019-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP (2019-2022/001-001) “HE and VET alliance establishment according to Bologna Principals implementation via VET teachers’ capacity building”. This QCP defines the general approach to quality control and internal and external evaluation, and outlines the procedures to be followed by the partners communicate effectively and to produce and document the Project deliverables.

QCP is developed in the scope of the WP 3 (Quality Plan) of the Project in compliance with the Project description and all applicable rules and guidelines. The QA Strategy and Risk Mitigation Plan are integral parts of the QCP. The QCP enables an efficient collaboration among the project partners and the delivery of project results and outcomes, whereas the risk assessment analysis is necessary for evaluation and control of potential project risks, focusing on their precautionary diagnosis and handling.

The QCP defines the quality control and quality assurance activities carried out throughout the project in order to ensure smooth implementation, continuous monitoring, and high-quality outcomes. The following illustrates the main aims of the QCP:

- To assess the coherence of the planned activities against the designed activities
- To ensure that the correspondence of the activities is carried out against the objectives of the planned activities
- To monitor the on-time assessment of the planned project results
- To assess the quality of the project results.

This document, therefore, outlines the strategy for how the quality control mechanisms can be applied so that the operational, management and working procedures are comprehensively monitored and improved throughout the project’s duration. The QCP also contains a set of scheduled activities and defines the objectives, roles, responsibilities,

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

measurement indicators and criteria. The QCP identifies established indicators and outlines the project's methodology, including the procedures for the evaluation of the project's activities. For each task, it determines the responsible partner(s), the time frame and tools to be implemented, the expected results or products, and the respective quality criteria.

Although the QCP is prepared by Russian Register in collaboration with Edge Hill University, all partners need to revise and update it. It forms a single point of reference on the quality to be governed during the lifetime of ALLVET project. All consortium partners should understand the QCP and be able to use it effectively as an active document. Therefore, this QCP will be subject to regular improvements and updates in the event of any new rules and procedures implemented. The purpose of this is to provide an accurate depiction of the project during its lifetime, and to reduce the potential for ambiguity, confusion, and/or misunderstanding, as well as to avoid any omissions in the implementation of the project's aims.

1.1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

In the SWOT analysis, questions RF and KZ raised a concern of poor-quality VET programmes due to the lack of a suitable TUNING methodology. The sustainable Pedagogical ECTS/ Tuning modular system modules and Network, however, can clearly meet the needs of the Kazakh and Russian partners, particularly in relation to the development of pedagogical knowledge for VET teachers.

The project aims to contribute to the Bologna tools implementation through establishing a HE and VET alliance. One specific objective of ALLVET, however, is to promote the development of vocational education through the implementation of an ECTS/TUNING METHODOLOGY as this standardises the delivery of the vocational education, thus raising its quality. To achieve this, the project seeks to do the following:

1. Establish a long-term platform/network for HE & VET cooperation via transparent, national and international educational standards and comparable learning tools, thus ensuring that teaching standards are implemented in accordance with the Bologna criteria.

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

2. Train an expert pool of individuals, competent in designing and delivering pedagogical ECTS/Tuning Modules for vocational learning within higher education.
3. Establish ALLVET webspace for raising awareness of the importance of strengthening the link between education and training to suit the labour market.

Furthermore, the Partner Country stakeholders are expected to benefit at both regional and national level through the acquisition and development of the following aspects:

- The high-quality provision of contemporary and innovative vocational training methods for pre-service and in-service colleagues
- Staff who are better trained in current teaching approaches and technology-enhanced learning
- Improved resources and services
- Greater opportunities to identify critical concerns
- More effective communication, including oral and written skills.

Regional stakeholders will also be involved more in the operation of the project and the training of staff where there is demand. Each Partner Country institution will have designed, or contributed to, a series of modules that can continue to be developed. After the project is completed, the target groups will primarily be supported through the ALLVET webspace, wherein they can communicate with other institutions and share pedagogical knowledge.

It is envisaged that larger numbers of Partner Country vocational students will be better prepared for internationalized education, internships and employment. Staff can be engaged in international activities with better skills in the various faculties and departments. The high standards of instruction can result in the attraction of international firms and significant investment, thus internationalising education in Russia and Kazakhstan.

The Russian Federation

- For Russia, the emergent need for the ALLVET project is illustrated through its current reform strategy for vocational education that is being prepared by the Ministry of Science and Higher Education. The establishment of regional centers

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

will not only encourage vocational learning for school leavers, it will also cater for the needs of adults returning to learning, thus embracing the ideas of Life Long Learning. ALLVET will contribute to this process through the provision of necessary fundamental training to address the vocational skills shortages, specifically aligning with the criteria of the Bologna system and the Dublin Descriptors. Experts from the Center for the Economics of Continuing Education have estimated that vocational education will be an increasingly popular option for new applicants. According to forecasts, by the year 2024, 3.2 million people will study at vocational schools, a third more than the current figure.

- The financial support of vocational education is decreasing. For example, in 2016 the budget was 25% lower than that of 2010 and subsequently further decreased in 2017. The retraining of existing teaching staff is thus another priority.
- The experts at the Ministry of Science and Higher Education also stated that the development of vocational education is complicated by the lack of formation of the all-Russian system for QA of vocation education, the closeness of the results of the activities of vocational schools, the opacity of monitoring of this activity, and the lack of the framework. Russia joined “WorldSkills” standards in 2012 as it was deemed extremely important for its system of vocational education to meet with the highest international standards, to take into account global changes, and to be built in to LLL. As such, the introduction of the ECTS/TUNING methodology for the purposes of vocational education is in urgent need.
- Using the Pedagogical ECTS/Tuning modular system, university staff will deliver QA English for Specific Purposes to in-service vocational teachers. All these objectives are realistic and feasible because institutions realize the benefits and sustainability of the ECTS/Tuning methodology for educational and financial development, as well as how it supports internationalization.

The Republic of Kazakhstan

- The goal of the project is fully consistent with the main goal of the “National Program for the Development of Education in the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2011–2020”. This confirms the importance and relevance of this project for the

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

system of academic and vocational education for the Republic of Kazakhstan. The objectives outlined in the National Program can be seen below:

- Modernization of the vocational education system in accordance with the demands of society and the industrial and innovative development of the economy, including its integration into the global educational arena.
 - The achievement of a high level of quality of higher education that meets the needs of the labor market.
 - The achievement of the objectives of the industrial-innovative development of the country and its individuals, corresponding to the best international practices in the field of education.
 - The operationalisation of a lifelong learning system.
 - The generation of opportunities for high-quality education, in accordance with the best international standards and thus based on the principles of the Bologna process.
- The project allows:
 - the introduction of the ECTS pedagogical system and tuning methodology in various sections of the vocational training system;
 - development within the framework of the ALLVET project of academic mobility of students, faculty and staff, as well as new partnerships with the universities participating in the project.
 - contribution to the promotion of the strategy of internationalization of higher education.
 - development of innovative and demanding educational programs in the labor market. The results of the project will make it possible to improve the methodological principles and approaches to the design of training courses.
 - dissemination of the experience of the ALLVET project will be carried out at an accelerated rate among the universities of Central Asia that participated in the TuCAHEA Central Asia project (34 universities of Central Asia). The results of the project will be also distributed to the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan.
 - At regional level 3, the university partners from Kazakhstan represent universities of Almaty (53 universities) and Almaty region (21 universities).

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

Accordingly, the dissemination of the experience and results of the ALLVET project will be available at regional level.

- At institutional level, the ALLVET project will be introduced into academic processes, particularly those departments responsible for educational and methodological developments. Vocational and university staff will gain qualifications and will improve professionally through training, consultation and additional support within the project. This will be introduced into KZ Competency Development Centers which are integral academic units providing professional development courses four times per year.
- VET web platform has the opportunity to be implemented through digitalization maintenance of KZ Universities.

Tangible results of the project

The following tangible results are expected to be achieved at the end of the project's activities:

1. English for Specific Purposes training (vocabulary, language and soft skills) and ECTS/Tuning Modular training for PCs with English Language Tests to determine language levels.
2. 10-Module Curricula comprising ECTS/Tuning training, with the aim of studying the pedagogical experience of EU universities, ECTS/ Tuning practices, new methods of practice-oriented training, ECTS/ Tuning assessment, and new approaches to benchmarking and validation in the learning/ teaching environment.
3. PCs developed the 10-Module Curricula ECTS/ Tuning using training from EU colleagues. These modules will be developed, piloted, and published online, with teaching materials printed as hard copies. EU reports on piloting will be available in both electronic and printed versions. The 10 modules will be accredited after they have been piloted three times. For the accreditation procedure, reports will be produced on monitoring of RF and KZ practices in teacher training, and on the monitoring of tools, methodologies, and approaches implemented in HE. Academic content will be delivered in English in RF and KZ.
4. ECTS/ Tuning teaching standards in accordance with Bologna criteria professional competences descriptors are elaborated and published online.

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

5. Reports produced on PC practices in the ECTS/ Tuning modular system training, recognising competence and enhancement. This will be based on an evaluation of RUS and KZ practices in ECTS/ Tuning modular systems and the implementation regarding student-centred methodologies. The report will be approved by the consortium and uploaded to the online platform.
6. A report on EU best practice in ECTS/ Tuning modular system training and competence enhancement and teacher enhancement approaches. The report will be approved by the consortium and uploaded to the online platform.
7. The stakeholder surveys will be analyzed (students and staff) collected from 20 Russian and 15 KZ Non-Partner Universities (At least 50 each PC HEI).
8. 40 universities involved with a PC survey (All PC Universities and non-partner Universities).
9. VET webspace designed and populated.
10. Dissemination reports approved by the consortium and uploaded to the online platform.
11. 120 staff from PCs trained through Home multiplication training.
12. 8 EU staff participated in monitoring visits during piloting of courses.
13. 3 QA Evaluation of Curricula Modules approved by consortium and uploaded to the online platform.
14. Regular work management reports approved by consortium and uploaded to the online platform.
15. The audit report on External QA Audit approved by consortium and uploaded to the online platform.
16. A high number of people participating in the National Awareness Day Conference and Final International Conference. People registration lists will be taken.
17. Final international conference proceedings published and distributed.
18. Inter-university agreements signed.

1.2 COMMUNICATION TOOLS

Clear and pragmatic communication pathways are an integral part of decision-making and prompt reporting mechanisms as communication difficulties among the partners can produce unnecessary risks. ALLVET has a clear QA monitoring and management structure to ensure

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

permanent and effective communication and reporting. The Coordinator, the University of Kragujevac, takes a central and proactive role in ensuring effective communications on this project.

The Steering Group, the main management body of the project, measures the progress and results of all activities during their realisation in each HEI using performance indicators. These indicators will be established by the Internal Evaluation Working group (IEWG), created specifically for QA control and the monitoring of the project's activities (see 2.2 INTERNAL QA for more detailed description).

The meetings of IEWG will coincide with the project's regular events or will be conducted via Skype every 3 months. These meetings are designed to discuss the performance of the project in relation to its indicators, to assess possible risks, and to identify and address problematic areas from QA perspective. IEWG collaborates with QA officers nominated in every partner University (see Annex 2). The officers are separate to (yet will collaborate with) IEWG and are responsible for QA at every partner university.

Strong QA measures will be in place, such as planning and management, to limit the potential for conflict. In case of problems during the fulfilment of the project, special Steering Group online meetings are arranged. The Steering group steers the project & mediates what is necessary to readjust the project to the original aim and ensures consistent communication between partners. In case the problems cannot be solved via online communication, cross-university assessment is introduced to study the problem, meets with the rector, offer consulting and prepare the report for the Steering Group to make a decision about the solution of the problem.

Day-to-day communication channels are set in order to ensure information reach of all appropriate audiences via e-mail, skype & telephone, as well as other messengers. However, the most important decisions are made during the Steering Group meeting, taking place face-to-face 3 times during the project and regularly via skype. Decisions of the Steering Group meeting, national meetings headed by the National coordinators and the events are fixed in the protocols (minutes) with the indication of all participants and their

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

signatures when possible and uploaded to the project website in the partner area as a downloadable PDF through the whole lifetime of the project.

2. QA STRATEGY

The main aim of the QA Strategy is to ensure that the activities performed in the project are completed in time and with desired high level of quality. Moreover, the project is to be systematically evaluated to assess and improve the planning, implementation and impact of the project.

Three main tasks are to be performed can be seen below:

- 1) Internal quality assurance and monitoring is created and refined through cooperation between partners.
- 2) The project is systematically evaluated by QA experts to identify design flaws or missed opportunities in the project.
- 3) External quality assurance of the project is conducted to understand the usefulness of the intervention for all participating countries.

Objectives:

- evaluate the impact, relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and long-term sustainability of the project;
- confirm that the tasks of WPs of the project are fulfilled and the project work can move on;
- give opportunities for project members to learn and to improve the results of the project based on evaluation reports;
- give opportunities to open discussion and reflection on project performance;
- conduct an expert evaluation to improve the project's results;

The quality assurance and monitoring takes place during the whole lifespan of the project. The quality plan is refined in a QA workshop together with all partners next to the kick-off

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

meeting at the beginning of the project. The quality plan is uploaded to the project website. Regular online and face-to-face meetings support the aims and objectives of WP3.

2.1 INTERNAL QA

For internal QA control and monitoring of project activities, the Internal Evaluation Working group (IEWG) will be created. The main aims of the project monitoring and quality control are:

- to assess the coherence of the planned activities with the designed activities;
- to monitor the correspondence of the activities carried out with the planned activities and the on-time assessment of the planned project results;
- to assess the quality of the project results.

The IEWG consists of the lead partners for WP3 Quality Plan, that is Edge Hill University (EHU) and QA Certification Agency “Russian Register” (RR), the lead partners for RF and KZ and the representative of National Research Ogarev Mordovia State University (MRSU) due to its prior experience in Erasmus+ initiatives in the area of QA. The IEWG collaborates with QA officers nominated in every partner University who are responsible for QA at every partner University. QA officers collaborate with the IEWG but are not part of it to avoid interference with the reporting.

The meetings of the IEWG members coincide with the project's regular seminars and face-to-face/Skype meetings. Joint meetings are undertaken every 3 months in order to discuss performance of the project, including its indicators, and to assess possible risks and problematic areas from a QA perspective. This establishes the methodology, select criteria, and the performance indicators for the control of procedures and processes through regular surveys (i.e. Needs Analysis, Awareness, and Satisfaction Surveys). The group also prepares monitoring and quality reports every six months.

QA and monitoring process are guaranteed from the Kick-off meeting through the forming of IEWG and QCP with the criteria for the performance of internal QA, based on the indicators for progress elaborated by IEWG on the basis of the LFM.

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

The everyday monitoring of the project activities and its outcomes, including the timetabling, and fulfilment of specific activities in each organisation, are measured by the Steering Group using performance indicators set by the IEWG within the regular work management procedures. The IEWG evaluates all possible incoming problems and their potential to impact on the project's activities. It addresses and evaluates such problems as delays, lack of resources, underestimated necessary efforts, and any other risks or problems, and proposes possible solutions to the Steering Group for conflict resolution.

Furthermore, the Steering Group and its EU conduct monitoring of the quality of project deliverables, such as training and piloting, which is ensured initially via the visits within the QA Evaluation of the 1st, 2nd and 3rd piloting. Reports are also produced for the piloting.

Based on the QA indicators developed by IEWG, PC institutions monitor the project's effectiveness in relation to their own institution and reports are completed by each country. Liaisons can take place termly via video conferencing and through face-to-face meetings where appropriate and depending on the Covid19 situation of each country. Evaluations comprise inter-partner observations and interviews with the participants of the project, such as the PC university's administration representative (vice-rector or dean) who supports and controls the project's activities at the university.

An internal quality evaluation is created and distributed among partners in the form of surveys (Event Evaluation Questionnaire, Six-Month Report Questionnaire, Work Package Completion Questionnaire), qualitative reports (i.e. answers to questionnaires, meeting the specified deadlines, achievement of targets and indicators) and quantitative reports (based on the long- and short-term indicators and QCP criteria). It is also performed through self-evaluation and peer monitoring. The surveys and reports are executed on a half-year basis per project year, after the events and upon the completion of the work packages. Altogether, 5 six-month reports will be performed and the results will be uploaded to the project's website. The results of the internal quality evaluation are discussed face-to-face in yearly quality assurance meetings in order to improve good practice and to avoid pitfalls. The managerial group participates in the yearly quality assurance meetings.

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

2.2 EXTERNAL QA

An external QA Audit is done in year 3 by an External Quality Control Team that is not related to the partners of ALLVET. It reviews the performance of the project and all the deliverables throughout its lifetime. External experts are not formed from consortium members as the work is subcontracted. The experts are representatives of local authorities, private companies, and/or national QA Agencies.

The audit report on the External QA audit is approved by the consortium and is uploaded to the online platform. The external evaluation provides the project with a higher degree of objectivity into the evaluation work and adds to the credibility of the project. It also enhances the accreditation processes in HEIs inside and outside the project consortium. At the Final Conference, both IEWG and External Quality Control Team participates in order to provide the QA report.

2.3 QA MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE

The QA Management Structure is presented by the Steering Group headed by Project Coordinator. Within the regular work management procedures, the Steering Group is responsible for the everyday monitoring of the project activities and its outcomes, including timetabling and the fulfilment of specific project activities for each PC University. The Group is also responsible for coordinating the project activities listed in the LFM and workplan.

PC institutions conduct QA control on local and national level. Each partner takes part in the efficient implementation of the project, to cooperate, perform and fulfil all of its obligations, and to notify promptly, in accordance with the governance structure of the project, any significant information, problem or delay likely to affect the project so that corrective measures can be taken in due time. Partners provide project effectiveness in their own institution on the bases of QA indicators developed by the IEWG and Steering Group. They support and control the project's activities at the university and nominate contact persons in all relevant areas (see Annex 3):

- The contact person, or Project Officer (if different from contact person), is responsible for running the project at their partner university

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

- QA officer
- Publicity officer
- Module team leader

The role of the Coordinator (University of Kragujevac) is to ensure sound management of the project and to perform the duties of authorising. The Coordinator takes a central and proactive role in ensuring effective communications in this project and ensures the effectiveness of the project's internal information services.

In all project matters related to the financial activities, the Coordinator has the overall decision and can block those of the Steering Group should they contradict the Grant Agreement or the financial regulations of the Agency. The Coordinator organises the project's resources and controls the project's budget. It handles the financial aspects of the project (contracts, payments) in collaboration with the National Coordinators to guarantee the compatibility with the national legislation. All other decisions are taken by the majority of the Steering group members through voting.

The Coordinator works with the Steering group and together they monitor the quality of the project's deliverables, training and piloting. They control the schedule of activities (time-plan of the tasks, critical tasks) and the allocation of manpower. They also supervise the development of the ECTS/ Tuning Modules conducted by PC and conduct a QA Evaluation of these ECTS/ Tuning Modules before the 1st piloting. The Coordinator receives all the reports made by EU partners after each piloting (1, 2&3) for their inclusion in the Annual Project Planning report and Coordination Annual Report. After Piloting 1 & 2, the Steering group and the Coordinator develop the improvement plan for the next round of piloting. Together with the WP2 Lead Partner (UOD), the Coordinator ensures that all the necessary amendments are made and the adjusted ECTS/ Tuning Modules are uploaded to the website in advance for next piloting.

To promote impartial reporting, the Coordinator is not a member of the IEWG. The IEWG develops and refers its reports (Event Evaluation report/six-month reports/Work package completion reports) to the Coordinator. Based on the reporting, the IEWG makes recommendations on the best-practices and lessons-learned registry. The coordinator

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

receives the recommendations and employs corrective actions to improve the situation, where needed. The Coordinator, the Steering group and IEWG discuss the results of all internal QA reports to improve good practice and performance and to avoid pitfalls.

The Coordinator resolves conflicts between partners, according to the agreed-upon rules, extending them if necessary (see RISK MANAGEMENT AND CONTINGENCY PLAN). The Coordinator develops annual Project Planning reports and a Coordination Annual Report, and collects the data and submits both Interim and Final reports.

2.4 QA REPORTING

IEWG prepares the following reports:

- The reports based on Event Evaluation Questionnaire, which is the feedback that all the participants provide regarding the event in which they have participated.
- Five six-month reports based on the questionnaires filled by PC institutions. Institutions monitor the project's effectiveness in relation to their own institution and produce reports for their own country.
- The work package completion report, which is based on the WP completion questionnaire.

Based on the reporting received from the project partners, the IEWG develops recommendations on the best-practices and lessons-learned registry (see QA MEASURES & CRITERIA).

The results of all the internal QA reports are discussed face-to-face (where appropriate) in yearly quality assurance meetings to improve good practice and performance and to avoid pitfalls.

The Steering Group monitors the quality of project deliverables, training and piloting. After the development of ECTS/ Tuning Modules for PC, but before the 1st piloting of ECTS/Tuning Modules, EU and PC partners conduct a QA Evaluation. This is an online activity and the evaluation report and all ECTS/ Tuning Modules materials are uploaded onto

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

the website. The piloting evaluation reports are produced from the visits of EU experts within each QA Evaluation of the 1st, 2nd and 3rd Piloting. These reports are compiled through agreements with PC partners then forwarded to the Coordinator for inclusion in the annual Project Planning and Coordination Annual Report and uploaded to the project website. Institutions and the modules descriptions are assessed against the project's QCP and Bologna Process ECTS/Tuning compatibility. Necessary adjustments are implemented based on teachers', students' and observers' questionnaire feedback. The evaluation report is presented, and the improvement plan is developed by the Steering group. Adjusted ECTS/Tuning Modules are uploaded to the website in advance for next piloting.

Each WP is evaluated during the implementation as well as at the end of the WP work. During the WP work a short quality review concerning the WP quality measures drafted by the lead partner are discussed in connection with the Steering Group meetings. After the completion of the WP, the lead partner drafts a report of the WP which is discussed in Quality meetings. As several partners contribute to the same WP performing specific tasks, the WP leader takes care of collecting and integrating the contributions of the other participants to achieve performance indicators. Proposals for reviewing and updating the indicators table can be put forward by the WP leaders if required.

The external QA audit is done in year 3 by the External Quality Control Team which is not involved in the project (subcontracted). The experts are not involved in the consortium but are representatives from local authorities, private companies, or national QA Agencies. They review the performance of the project and all deliverables in the course of the project. The audit report on External QA Audit is approved by the consortium and uploaded to the project website.

The Coordinator develops the annual Project Planning reports and the Coordination Annual Report, collects the data, and submits the Interim and Final reports.

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

3. QA MEASURES & CRITERIA

3.1 QA MANAGEMENT APPROACH

QA measures and criteria in QCP are based on the procedures described in ISO 21500 Guidance on Project Management, ISO 21001:2018 standard “Educational organizations, management systems for educational organizations, requirements, including application guidelines an innovative for educational organizations tool”, ISO 9001:2015 Quality Management Systems – Requirements, a Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK® GUIDE), carefully selected and adapted to the specific features of the ALLVET project. The procedures are selected based on their compatibility to any educational organization that uses curricula to sustain competence through study or research, regardless of the type, size or methods of performing of these activities.

The QCP considers the QA methodology as a system of practices, techniques, procedures, and rules used by those who participate in the project implementation. It identifies a subset of QA management tools that are generally recognized as good practice, determining the appropriate combination of processes, inputs, tools, techniques, and outputs to “tailor” the application to the needs of the project’s life cycles. It is a foundation used by the partners to build methodologies, policies, procedures, rules, tools and techniques, and life cycles needed to practice project management. It includes the processes for incorporating the partners’ quality policy regarding planning, managing, and controlling project and product quality requirements in order to meet the objectives of the stakeholders. The QCP also supports continuous improvement activities, as undertaken on behalf of the performing organization.

The QCP methodology employs QA Management as a process of identifying quality requirements and/or standards for the project and its deliverables, and of documenting how the project will demonstrate compliance with quality requirements and/or standards. The QA management components include, but are not limited to, a risk management strategy which is described further on as a contingency plan. The risk management plan provides the approach for identifying, analyzing, and monitoring risks. The information in the risk management plan and QA management work together to successfully deliver product and

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

project success. The risk management plan provides the approach for identifying, analyzing, and monitoring risks.

Stakeholder engagement, another tool of QCP methodology, is a part of the internal quality evaluation procedures. The stakeholder engagement provides the method for documenting the stakeholders' needs and expectations that provide the foundation for quality management. The stakeholder register helps to identify stakeholders who have a particular interest in or impact on quality, with the emphasis on the customer and project sponsor needs and expectations. Stakeholder engagement is described as a part of the ALLVET application to ensure an engagement of the target audience of the project and non-participants. The stakeholder register will be created automatically through engagement activities and helps to identify stakeholders who have a particular interest in or impact on quality, with the emphasis on the customer and project sponsor needs and expectations.

QA Control is the process of monitoring and recording the results of executing the quality management activities to assess performance and ensure the project outputs are complete, correct, and meet customer expectations. The key benefit of this process is to verify that project deliverables and work meet the requirements specified by key stakeholders for final acceptance. QA Control process determines if the project outputs do what they were intended to do. Those outputs need to comply with all applicable standards, requirements, regulations, and specifications. This process is performed throughout the project.

Project documents that may be updated as a result of carrying out this process include, but are not limited to, the Lessons learned register. The lessons learned register can include the category and description of the situation and may also include the impact, recommendations, and proposed actions associated with the situation. The lessons learned register may record challenges, problems, realized risks and opportunities, or other content as appropriate. It is created as an output of this process early in the project. Thereafter, it is used as an input and updated as an output in many processes throughout the project. The persons or teams involved in the work are also involved in capturing the lessons learned. Knowledge can be documented using videos, pictures, audios, or other suitable means that ensure the efficiency of the lessons captured. At the end of a project or phase, the information is transferred to an organizational process asset called a "lessons learned" repository. The

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

lessons learned register is updated with information on the source of quality defects and how they could have been avoided, as well as approaches that worked well. The requirement of “lessons learned” is incorporated into the Event evaluation questionnaire (See Annexe 4).

The QA measures include the appropriate tools, devised to assess on an ongoing basis for project relevance, efficiency and impact, to,

- measure progress throughout the project’s life cycle;
- determine if the project responds to the main target groups’ needs;
- measure the level of satisfaction of beneficiaries of project activities;
- determine how the project impacts on social communities;
- evaluate unexpected results;
- control all processes.

The tools are delivered to the appropriate target groups over the project duration, according to the activity schedule. The full list of the QA measures in reference to the relevant events and their outcomes can be seen in Part 4.2 MILESTONES AND INDICATORS.

Performance Criteria and indicators of achievements are the principles employed to optimize the fulfilment of QA measures. They can be found in Part 4.2 MILESTONES AND INDICATORS.

The questionnaires presented in the Annexes are meant to check and measure processes and outputs during the project development and evaluate it at the end. Different categories of tools are devised for the questionnaires, in accordance to what is described in QCP. The full set of tools includes, but is not limited to Logical Framework Matrix (see original project document). It represents a control list to assess any progress and the rate of success of project activities in relation to specific objectives and expected results. Evaluation questionnaires (See Annexes 4 and 5), which are used as means to assess the outcomes of specific project activities, will be completed to address, through a bespoke action plan, any critical concerns that arise.

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

Five six-month progress reports (See Annex 6), and an external QA audit report will be compiled, including a narrative section in which the advancement within the different tasks, any problems within the partnership, the communication and visibility of actions launched, and the interchange of knowledge and experience will be described. Moreover, any modification to the initial planning will be noted, including the reasons for any changes or delays, as well as the identifying of the measures to be adopted for addressing such difficulties or delays. Moreover, the degree of achievement of the project indicators, strategic indicators and specific project indicators will be measured on occasion through the interim and final reports.

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

3.2 MILESTONES AND INDICATORS

The QCP of ALLVET project ensures that quality is planned for both the deliverables and activities. It provides the methodology on implementation of the project, reviews the quality of project outputs in the framework of quality indicators and criteria approved by all the partners. The monitoring of project progress and quality of outputs in each WP ensures the high quality of project outcomes and guarantees the compliance of project results with project objectives.

Work Plan year 1

Events	Expected Deliverable/Results/ Outcomes	QA measures	Risks
1.1 TUD/All PC and EU partners in the Project will contribute to this action. Due date			
Kick-off Meeting Kragujevac			
Criteria and procedures for communications between partners, management and decision-making structures and the functions of Working Groups, local project coordinators will be agreed. All partners will sign the Consortium agreement which will	Quality Control Plan Contingency Plan aimed at mitigating identified and perceived risks. Consortium agreement which will rule relations of all partners. Communication lists of email, skype as well as landline work and mobile phone will be	Monitoring the coordination of draft documentation and training on QA, assessing the quality of their content, expectations and satisfaction of all partner parties. Feedback: Reviews, checklists, modified drafts. Monitoring the timeliness and completeness of the information	Conservative approach and unwillingness to introduce new teaching methods by PC university administration and faculty. The lack of qualified teaching staff able to deliver academic content in English.

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

<p>rule relations, methods of cooperation, disagreements. Creating a project quality management structure. QA levelling test of potential participants. The PC trainings and the EU/PC Action Plan will be drawn up for preparation of the EU training and PC piloting involving EU and PC co-operation. Emphasis will be placed on ECTS/Tuning modular formats and compliance with Bologna Process criteria.</p>	<p>created for each partner within Separate Steering Groups of EU and of PC partners. Test material/needs analysis. Agreed and finalized trainings and a plan for their implementation (within a week after the meeting). Report on all processes and agreements (within a week after the meeting).</p>	<p>provided to create the QA structure of the project. Note on the structure of the QA project and its distribution to all project partners. Monitoring timely and objective analysis of the test results and compilation of information and recommendations to the Steering Group. Monitoring adjustments. The act of approving the plan for the preparation and content of the Training, check lists, modified drafts. Ensuring the timeliness and completeness of reporting on the initial meeting. Monitoring partner satisfaction with the organization and meeting results. Checklists, correspondence</p>	
1.2 Bologna club. Due date 01-03-2020			
Initiation development of ALLVET web-space			
<p>Analysis of the needs of the ALLVET web space to download all educational and administrative documentation. Initiate ALLVET Web Space Development.</p>	<p>ALLVET Web Space Analysis Help The technical task for Creating an ALLVET Web Space</p>	<p>Analysis of the results (references and technical tasks). Feedback from target groups regarding their expectations for the ALLVET web space. Check lists</p>	<p>Conservative approach and unwillingness to introduce new teaching methods by PC university administration and faculty.</p>

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

			The lack of qualified teaching staff able to deliver academic content in English.
1.4 TUD/ All PC and EU partners in the Project. Due date 01-12-2020			
Preparation of Curricula materials using ECTS/ Tuning modular system and division of modules among PCs			
	<p>The curricula materials are developed by the PC partners (who have successfully participated in the English for specific purposes, ects/ tuning modular system and teaching methodology training) stages for piloting with support from EU partners.</p> <p>PC partners will decide on who prepares which modules bearing in mind that all modules need to be piloted in all PC institutions.</p> <p>Colleagues from the EU will be central to the negotiation and development of the proposed curricula training materials programme. all negotiations will be carried out through video-conferences, emails and telephone conversations between partners.</p>	<p>Feedback from module developers and experts. Check lists (minutes or protocols)</p> <p>Examination of modules, benchmarking.</p>	<p>Supporting continuous communication and interaction between specialized subgroups (subgroups based on the tasks' fragmentation).</p>

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

	All proposed EU training packages including proposed curricula modules described in project activities and methodology section.		
2.1 Deusto University/ All EU and PC countries. Due date 30-06-2020			
EU Training of QA English for Specific Purposes Training (Thessaloniki)			
EU Training of QA English for Specific Purposes Training (1 week) in Thessaloniki Posting course content on the ALLVET web space.	List of participants Assessment and formalization of training results.	Formal Feedback from participants in the training. Check lists Selective interviews (phone, skype) of the training participants. Monitoring the timeliness of course content on the ALLVET web space.	Concepts are new
Pedagogical ECTS/ Tuning modular system training (1 week) in Bilbao			
Pedagogical ECTS/ Tuning modular system training (1 weeks) in Bilbao Posting course content on the ALLVET web space.	EU TRAINING PACKAGES List of participants Assessment and formalization of training results.	Formal Feedback from participants in the training. Monitoring satisfaction from the training. Check lists Assessment of the results of the training. Selective interviews (phone, skype) of the training participants. Monitoring the timeliness of course content on the ALLVET web space. QA semi-annual report	Concepts are new

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

4.2 Bologna club/ ALL EU and PC institutions. Due date 30-10-2020			
National PC Conference Awareness Day			
Conducting a national conference on project status for all partners (Saransk).	Status Report to non project Stakeholders including open-ended questionnaire feedback Content of the created trainings and Pedagogical ECTS/ Tuning modular system, information on training, methodological and didactic materials to support teachers and evaluation results are presented.)	Selective interviews (phone, skype) of the conference participants. Feedback from target groups regarding their expectations and satisfaction with the event. Check lists Report analysis Strategic planning for the next year «Lessons learned register», SWOT-analysis	Poor visibility of the project and its results.
2.2 Deusto University/ All EU and PC countries. Due date 10-12.2020			
PC Home Multiplier Factor Training Inputs of ESP and Pedagogical ECTS/ Tuning modular system training			
Local and regional HEIs not in project are invited to training report is forwarded to Lead Partner for inclusion in Year 1 Project Planning and Co-ordination Annual Report.	Report Feedback questionnaires	Formal Feedback from participants in the training. Check lists Assessment of the results of the training. Selective interviews (phone, skype) of the training participants. Report analysis. Lead Partner Recommendations	Concepts are new
3.1 EHU +QA agency Russian Register/ All Eu and PC partners. Due date 01-12-2020			
EU & PC QA Evaluation of 10 Pedagogical ECTS/ Tuning Modules			

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

<p>QA Modules Evaluation. Definition of areas of responsibility for piloting modules. All ECTS/ Tuning Modules materials will be uploaded onto the Website A report is forwarded to Lead Partner for inclusion in Year 1 Project Planning and Coordination Annual Report.</p>	<p>Report Development of ECTS/ Tuning Modules for PC QA Modules Evaluation</p>	<p>Formal Feedback from module developers and experts. Check lists Examination of modules, benchmarking. Report analysis Monitoring the timeliness of course materials on the ALLVET web space.</p>	<p>Delays in receiving data from the Consortium.</p>
<p>4.1 Bologna club/ ALL EU and PC institutions. Due date 30-12-2020</p>			
<p>ALLVET web-space promotion and maintenance during the 1st year project running</p>			
<p>Continued development of the ALLVET web space: preparation, development, distribution and operation</p>	<p>Site for posting materials</p>	<p>Interviews, Feedback from the developers of the site Monitoring the satisfaction of partners as consumers and users of the website Monitoring of the website and its content, comparison with technical task and QA plan every 3 months, timing control. Checklists, conclusion Monitoring the timeliness of course materials on the ALLVET web space.</p>	<p>Poor visibility of the project and its results.</p>
<p>5.2 University of Kragujevac / All project partners. Due date 30-12-2020</p>			
<p>Regular Steering Group management meetings to review objectives, monitor progress and ensure QA compliance in Year 1</p>			

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

Daily coordination. Internal Steering Group meetings monthly. Conducting special webinars or inter-university assessments, intra-university meetings, consultations with the coordination group in case of problems and to solve them.	Meeting decisions. Intercollegiate Assessment. Meeting Records	Meeting minutes. Monitoring the implementation of decisions and corrective actions. Report Analysis.	Communication difficulties among the partners. Delays in foreseen timetable due to unavailability of some partners. Funding delays. Inexperience of some PC Partners
5.3 University of Kragujevac / All project partners. Due date 30-12-2020			
1st year Project Planning and Coordination with Annual Report			
Annual analysis of the development of the project. Uploading Reports to the online platform.	Reports on the financial activities of the project and the results of activities of partners	Report Analysis. Project website monitoring. Selective monitoring of the results of the project 1 year. QA Plan Implementation Report 1-year QA	Communication difficulties among the partners. Delays in foreseen timetable due to unavailability of some partners. Funding delays. Inexperience of some PC Partners

Work Plan year 2

Events	Expected Deliverable/Results/ Outcomes /	QA measures	Risks
5.6 University of Kragujevac / All project partners. Due date 01-01-2022			

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

2nd year Project Planning and Coordination Report			
Project Planning and Coordination Report for the 2nd year. Adjustment of Trainings and Training Plan.	Planning and Coordination Report Agreed and finalized trainings and a plan for their implementation.	Analysis of the report with recommendations to the project management taking into account 1 year risk management. Assessment of satisfaction with the organization of the test by its participants. Monitoring adjustments. The act of approving the plan for the preparation and content of the Training, check lists, modified drafts. Analysis and comparison of the results of adjustments 1 and 2 years	Communication difficulties among the partners. Delays in foreseen timetable due to unavailability of some partners. Funding delays Inexperience of some PC Partners
2.3 Deusto University/ All EU and PC countries. Due date 02-04.2021			
First Piloting of 10 Pedagogical ECTS/ Tuning Modules			
Test out pre-agreed Curricula ECTS/ Tuning modular system to a selected pilot group of pre-service (student trainee teachers) and in-service teachers over the semester. Local and regional HEIs not in project are invited to training Presentation of the results on the 1st Piloting (Ormskirk, UK) Report is forwarded to Lead Partner for inclusion in Year 1	Educational plans. Training protocols. First Pilot Report. Pilot Improvement Plan.	Monitoring the expectations and satisfaction of participants in pilot groups. Selective interview (phone, skype). Check lists. Analysis of the pilot improvement plan and report to the Lead Partner.	Concepts are new

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

Project Planning and Co-ordination Annual Report.			
3.2 EHU +QA agency Russian Register / All Eu and PC partners. Due date 01-06-2021			
EU & PC QA Evaluation of 1st Piloting (Ormskirk, UK)			
Evaluation of the First Piloting of ECTS/ Tuning Modules Adjusted ECTS/ Tuning Modules are populated on the web-site. Evaluation report. Development of the improvement plan of Piloting	Educational plans. Training protocols. First Pilot Report. Pilot Improvement Plan.	Monitoring the expectations and satisfaction of participants in pilot groups. Selective interview (phone, skype). Check lists. Analysis of the pilot improvement plan and report to the Lead Partner.	Delays in receiving data from the Consortium.
3.3 EHU +QA agency Russian Register / All Eu and PC partners. Due date 04.2021			
First Round of QA monitoring visits by EU partners with Master-Classes Inputs			
Visit of representatives from EU partners. Master Class. QA Observation Reports are distributed to PC partners for subsequent evaluation and forwarded to Lead Partner. Travel of EHU+SEERC go to Kazakhstan and DU+TUD go to Russia	Meeting minutes. Reports	Monitoring the expectations and satisfaction of participants monitoring visit from both sides. Selective interview (phone, skype). Check lists. Assessment of the results of visits. SWOT analysis of the first round of monitoring visits. Report analysis. Lead Partner Recommendations	Delays in receiving data from the Consortium.
5.4 University of Kragujevac / All project partners. Due date 01-10-2021			
Interim Project Planning and Coordination QA Meeting in Kragujevac			

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

<p>Holding a meeting. Review of financial statements. Presentation of results and project.</p>	<p>Meeting minutes. Financial reports. Presentations</p>	<p>Monitoring expectations and satisfaction of meeting participants. Selective interview (phone, skype). Check lists QA Plan Mid-Year Report</p>	<p>Communication difficulties among the partners. Delays in foreseen timetable due to unavailability of some partners. Funding delays Inexperience of some PC Partners.</p>
2.4 Deusto University/ All EU and PC countries. Due date 15-12-2021			
Second Piloting of 10 Pedagogical ECTS/ Tuning			
<p>Implementation of the pre-agreed modules selected pilot group. Local and regional HEIs not in project are invited to training. Report is forwarded to Lead Partner for inclusion in Year 2 Project Planning and Co-ordination Annual Report. Presentation of the results on the 2d Piloting in TUD (Dresden)</p>	<p>Modules. Training protocols. Report on the results of the first piloting and module evaluation. Pilot and Module Enhancement Plan. Modules on the site.</p>	<p>Monitoring the expectations and satisfaction of participants in pilot groups and students. Selective interview (phone, skype). Check lists. Analysis of the pilot improvement plan and report. Recommendations to the Lead Partner.</p>	<p>Concepts are new.</p>
3.4 EHU +QA agency Russian Register / All Eu and PC partners. Due date 15-12-2021			
EU & PC QA Evaluation of Piloting (Dresden)			
<p>EU and PC partners undertake evaluation of the 2d Piloting of ECTS/ Tuning Modules</p>	<p>Modules. Training protocols. Report on the results of the first piloting and module evaluation.</p>	<p>Monitoring the expectations and satisfaction of participants in pilot groups and students. Selective</p>	<p>Delays in receiving data from the Consortium.</p>

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

Adjusted ECTS/ Tuning Modules are populated on the web-site Evaluation Report improvement plan will be developed at a special seminar at TUD	Pilot and Module Enhancement Plan. Modules on the site.	interview (phone, skype). Check lists. Analysis of the pilot improvement plan and report. Recommendations to the Lead Partner.	
3.5 EHU +QA agency Russian Register / All Eu and PC partners. Due date 01-12-2021			
Second round of monitoring visits by EU partners			
Representatives from EU partners (2 representatives) to visit each of the target partners. QA Observation Reports are distributed to PC partners. Travel of UNIKG +SEERC to Kazakhstan and TUD + EHU to Russia.	Meeting minutes. Reports	Monitoring the expectations and satisfaction of participants monitoring visit from both sides. Selective interview (phone, skype). Check lists. Assessment of the results of visits. SWOT analysis of the second round of monitoring visits in comparison with the first. Analysis of dynamics and results. Report analysis. Lead Partner Recommendations.	Delays in receiving data from the Consortium
4.3 Bologna club/ ALL EU and PC institutions. Due date 30-12-2021			
ALLVET web-space promotion and maintenance during the 2nd year project running			
Filling the site with project results materials	Project materials on the site according to the work plan and QA	Interviews, feedback from the developers of the website. Monitoring of VET Web Space Promotion Results. Monitoring the satisfaction of partners as consumers and users	Poor visibility of the project and its results.

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

		of the website. Check lists. Selective interview. Monitoring of the website and its content, comparison with the work plan and QA every 3 months, timing control. Checklists, conclusion. Monitoring the timeliness of course materials on the ALLVET web space.	
4.4 Bologna club/ ALL EU and PC institutions. Due date 30-10-2021			
Regular meetings of the leadership of the Steering Group to review goals, monitor progress and ensure compliance with quality requirements during the 2nd year (online)			
National PC Conference Awareness Day of 2nd year project running concerned	Minutes and Decisions of Meetings and Meeting Records	Analysis of Protocols and meeting reports. Monitoring the implementation of decisions and corrective actions. Selective interviews.	Poor visibility of the project and its results.
5.5 University of Kragujevac / All project partners. Due date 30-12-2022			
Regular Steering Group management meetings to review objectives, monitor progress and ensure QA compliance in Year 2			
Day-to-day coordination of the project activities. Domestic Steering Group meetings on a monthly basis. Partners' reports on all current issues of the project.	Reports. Meeting minutes	Analysis of reports and meeting minutes. Feedback from target groups. Selective interviews and a survey of partners. Check lists. Monitoring of Project website maintenance.	Communication difficulties among the partners. Delays in foreseen timetable due to unavailability of some partners. Funding delays.

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

Additional meeting held between Lead Partner and EU and PC Steering Group Leaders		Selective monitoring of the project results 2 years. QA Plan Implementation Report 2 year vs 1 year	Inexperience of some PC Partners.
---	--	--	-----------------------------------

Work Plan year 3

Events	Expected Deliverable/Results/ Outcomes /	QA measures	Risks
2.5 Deusto University/ All EU and PC countries. Due date 30-03-2022			
Third Piloting of 10 Pedagogical ECTS/ Tuning Modules			
Testing of pre-agreed modules on a selected pilot group of pre-service (student trainee teachers) and in-service teachers. Training of local and regional HEIs not in project. Report is forwarded to Lead Partner for inclusion in Year 3 Project Planning and Co-ordination Annual Report	Test results of selected pilot group of pre-service (student trainee teachers) and in-service teachers. Third Pilot Test Materials. Feedback Forms. Training protocols	Monitoring the expectations and satisfaction of participants in pilot groups and students. Selective interview (phone, skype). Check lists. Examination of modules, benchmarking. Analysis of the pilot report.	Concepts are new
3.6 EHU +QA agency Russian Register / All Eu and PC partners. Due date 30-06-2022			
EU & PC QA Evaluation of Piloting			
Evaluation of the Third Piloting of the ECTS/ Tuning Modules.	Quality Assurance Documentation. Materials for posting on the site	Monitoring the expectations and satisfaction of participants in pilot groups and students. Selective	Delays in receiving data from the Consortium

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

Review of evaluation documentation and report of recommendations to the consortium Adjustments of materials Materials are populated on web-site. Beginning of the official accreditation process		interview (phone, skype). Check lists. Examination of modules, benchmarking. Analysis of the pilot report.	
2.6 Deusto University/ All EU and PC countries. Due date 30-06-2022			
Home Multiplier Staff Training of Pedagogical ECTS/ Tuning Modules			
Expansion of the number of participants trained in the PC countries. Training of other non-project HEI stakeholders in their respective regions.	Training plan EDUCATIONAL PACKAGES List of participants Assessment and formalization of learning outcomes. Report to the Steering Group.	Monitoring the expectations and satisfaction of non-project participants from the training. Check lists Assessment of learning outcomes. Selective interviews of non-project participants (telephone, skype) of the training participants. QA plan semi-annual report	Concepts are new
5.8 University of Kragujevac / All project partners. Due date 30-07-2022			
2nd Interim Project Planning and Coordination QA Meeting (in Saint-Petersburg)			
The project is being completed effectively. All financial reports will be reviewed. Presentation of the project outcomes and outputs.	Financial reports. Presentation of project results. Meeting minutes	Analysis of reports and meeting materials. Feedback from target groups. A selective interview and a survey of partners regarding expectations and satisfaction with	- Communication difficulties among the partners. - Delays in foreseen timetable due to unavailability of some partners.

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

		the results and progress of the project. Check lists. Selective monitoring of project results 3d year. QA Plan Mid-Year Report.	- Funding delays - Inexperience of some PC Partners
4.6 Bologna club/ ALL EU and PC institutions. Due date 30-11-2022			
Sustainability – ECTS/Tuning Modular program Accreditation via Inter-university Module Recognition Agreements. – Action Group & creation of Strategic Plan			
Begin of the official accreditation process. Establishment of an Action Group in the respective PC country. Joint EU-PC activity in preparation of modules according to Bologna Process norms The official accreditation process is conducted and agreements are officially signed	Workgroup Lists. Inter-University Agreements. Modules. Reports Strategic Plan for the Accreditation Process and Strategic Development	Analysis of accreditation reports. Feedback from target groups. A selective interview and a survey of partners on sustainable development of the project regarding expectations and satisfaction with the results and progress of accreditation Check lists	Poor visibility of the project and its results.
4.5 Bologna club/ ALL EU and PC institutions. Due date 30-12-2022			
ALLVET web-space promotion and maintenance during the 3rd year project running			
Populating Pedagogical ECTS/ Tuning modular system materials populating all teaching, training and Learning materials	Project Materials. Educational and teaching materials. Evaluation and finally completed module.	Feedback from the developers of the site. Check sheets. Monitoring the satisfaction of partner parties as consumers and users of the site. Check lists. Selective interview. Monitoring of the ALLVET web space and its timely population,	Poor visibility of the project and its results.

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

		comparison with the work plan and QA every 3 months. Monitoring of VET Web Space Dissemination Results	
5.7 University of Kragujevac / All project partners. Due date 30-12-2022			
Regular Steering Group management meetings to review objectives, monitors progress and ensure QA compliance in Year 3			
Coordination of the project activities Domestic Steering Group meetings on a monthly basis. Partner reports in relation to all on-going project issues. Additional meeting between Lead Partner and EU and PC Steering Group Leaders.	Steering Group Monthly Records Reports on current issues of the project	Analysis of meeting minutes and reports Quarterly Monitoring of the implementation of decisions and corrective actions 1-2 years of work.	Communication difficulties among the partners. Delays in foreseen timetable due to unavailability of some partners. Funding delays Inexperience of some PC Partners
5.9 University of Kragujevac/All project partners. Due date 01-11-2022			
Management Preparation for Final Conference (Nursultan)			
Preparation activity for the final Project Report Activities and agenda for the Final Conference are agreed upon.	Conference Plan and Agenda. Conference program	Monitoring the timeliness and completeness of the preparation of documents	Communication difficulties among the partners. Delays in foreseen timetable due to unavailability of some partners. Funding delays. Inexperience of some PC Partners
4.7 Bologna club/ ALL EU and PC institutions. Due date 15-12-2022			

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

Final Project Conference (Rostov-on-Don)			
All academic and administrative activities have been achieved. Agreement signing. Preparation of final financial and operating reports. Discussion of future cooperation.	Conference proceedings. Agreement signing. Financial and operational reports	Analysis of reports and meeting materials. Feedback from target groups. A selective interview and a survey of partners regarding expectations and satisfaction with the results and progress of the project. Check lists. Selective monitoring of project results 3d year. Final Report of the QA Plan. Recommendations for future cooperation.	Poor visibility of the project and its results.

The following performance criteria (quantitative and qualitative) and indicators of achievements are set for all QA measures.

QA measure	Performance Criteria	Indicators of achievements
A selective interview and a survey of partners	Insolvent of EU & PC partners 100% approved evidences	Fully compatible with QCP At least 3 partners from both from PC and EU partners according to the plan of the interview
Analysis	Timeliness Accuracy Independence Sufficiency 100% approved evidences	Fully compatible with QCP Not less than 80 % of positive responses in the checklist

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

Assessment of learning outcomes (the participants of the Pilotings and ESP training)	Objectivity Independence Competence 100% approved evidences	The participants reach and exceed 51 % out of 100 at summative assessment
Evaluation of satisfaction	Objectivity Independence Competence Scope of the respondents 100% approved evidences	Not less than 75% of the respondents show 80% of the level of satisfaction according to the questionnaire
Assessment of the results	Objectivity Independence Competence Scope of the participants 100% approved evidences	Not less than 75% of the test takers show 80% of satisfaction level according to the questionnaire
Final QA External Audit	Timeliness Accuracy Independence Sufficiency 100% approved evidences	Fully compatible with QCP Availability of 100% of all required documents by WP and QA indicators Not less than 100 % of positive responses in the checklist
Feed-back	Timeliness Scope of the respondents 100% approved evidences	Fully compatible with QCP At least 80% of the respondents provided the feedback
Monitoring	Timeliness Independence Accuracy Sufficiency 100% approved evidences	Fully compatible with QCP Not less than 80 % of positive responses in the checklist

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

Short-term and long-term impact indicators (borrowed from the project Application) define target groups, project outputs, products, and results. It describes how the target groups is reached and involved during the life of the project.

Short term impact	Target groups/potential beneficiaries	Quantitative indicators	Qualitative indicators
QA English for Specific Purposes Training	All faculty teaching personnel, later students and other staff preparing for methodology training	250-350 participants involved (including on-line and blended learning if needed) (Calculations are based on about 40-60 people from each PC HEI during the life time of the project)	Self-managed capability to participate effectively in project with awareness, soft skills and writing gained.
Design of 10 Modules Pedagogical ECTS/ Tuning	All pre-service trainee student teachers and in-service teachers	10 Modules are developed, evaluated and uploaded to the project website as a handout	Developing skills of pedagogics improves quality of vocational college teaching
Pedagogical ECTS/ Tuning modular system training (within Piloting)	All university vocational teaching personnel	Project target number of teaching personnel trained (around 130-150 people) (Calculations are based on about 25 people from each PC HEI during the life time of the project)	Better quality of teaching vocational teaching. Better academic writing skills of our students
Organisation of a series of training workshops (Home Multiplier training sessions on ESP, general pedagogics)	All vocational teaching staff & external participants in region	Approximately 350 participants (including on-line and blended learning if needed) (Calculations are based on about 40-60 people from each PC HEI)	Enhancing regional vocational education, Improving the target audience's skills in practical implementation of academic methodology

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

		during the life time of the project)	
ALLVET web-space	All stakeholders	Approx. 3000 participants	Access to downloadable modules & information on project

Long term impact	Target groups/potential beneficiaries	Quantitative indicators	Qualitative indicators
Ongoing training of Faculty/Department staff and student teacher target group	Teaching personnel, pre-service student teachers	Approximately 400-700 people from all PC partners during the life-time of the project (Calculations are based on about 120 people from each PC HEI during the life time of the project)	Self-managed capability to teach subject area using modern teaching approaches & ICT
Inter-university Agreements and international co-operation	Students, teachers of other institutes/faculties, teachers from other departments and universities of the region/country	New degree programmes (modules, minors) in vocational methodology, country can attract new industry	High quality of teaching
Introduction of the courses, syllabi, textbooks and guidelines in standard university programs	Graduate and post-graduate students, university staff	Thousands of graduate full- and part-time students, post-graduate students, university researchers	High quality of teaching, innovation
Action Groups develop Strategic Plan for post-project focus	All stakeholders but especially staff and students with lower levels of English	Approx. 300 persons trained annually including especially staff and students with lower levels	Staff and students with lower levels of English able to participate in courses taught on vocational education

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

		of English via ESP Pathway Program	
Creating new website/link on Vocational Methodology	Students and scholars in different education institutions/universities	Approx. 1000 people visiting the website not from PC HEIs	Raised awareness, confidence
Presentations at conferences	Lecturers in different education institutions/universities	Approx. 1000 people audience during the lifetime of the project	Excellence in preparing research articles on vocational education to be published in international journals

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

3.3 QUALITY OF PROJECT DELIVERABLES

The quality of project deliverables is evaluated through a set of indicators. Evaluation indicators vary according to the result or process which is being evaluated. The project is going to use both qualitative and quantitative indicators. Indicators help to get information in progress on the project effectiveness in achieving the objectives and efficiency in the optimal use of resources, and the relevance of the project activities to the needs identified. The quality assurance activities are based on qualitative data (i.e. meeting the specified deadlines, achievement of targets and indicators) and on quantitative data (i.e. answer to questionnaires and reports). Data are gathered from all project partners and key stakeholders.

4. RISK MANAGEMENT AND CONTINGENCY PLAN

Risk management and contingency plan provides the approach for identifying, analyzing, and monitoring risks in order to successfully deliver product and project success.

The project environment may impact project performance and success. ALLVET project considers the following potential factors:

- factors outside the organizational boundary, such as socio-economic, geographical, political, regulatory, technological and ecological;
- factors inside the organizational boundary, such as strategy, technology, project management maturity, resource availability, organizational culture and structure.

Although the factors inside the organizational boundary are considered in the above-mentioned quality and monitoring processes, the factors outside the organizational boundary must be carefully analyzed (through a so-called risk analysis), as they may have an impact on the project by imposing constraints or introducing risks affecting the project. Although these factors are often beyond the control of the project manager, they should still be considered.

Project Risk Management includes the processes of conducting risk management planning, identification, analysis, response planning, response implementation, and monitoring risk on a project. The objectives of project risk management are to increase the probability and/or impact of positive risks and to decrease the probability and/or impact of negative risks, in order to optimize the chances of project success.

Project Risk Management aims to identify and manage risks that are not addressed by the other project management processes. When unmanaged, these risks have the potential to cause the project to deviate from the plan and fail to achieve the defined project objectives. Consequently, the effectiveness of Project Risk Management is directly related to project success.

Project Risk Management aims to identify and manage risks that are not addressed by the other project management processes. When unmanaged, these risks have the potential to cause the project to deviate from the plan and fail to achieve the defined project objectives.

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

Consequently, the effectiveness of Project Risk Management is directly related to project success.

The risk management and contingency plan is to be developed as part of the project kick-off meeting or a specific planning meeting may be held. Attendees may include the project manager, selected project team members, key stakeholders, or team members who are responsible to manage the risk management process on the project. Others outside the organization may also be invited, as needed, including customers, sellers, and regulators. A skilled facilitator can help participants remain focused on the task, agree on key aspects of the risk approach, identify and overcome sources of bias, and resolve any disagreements that may arise.

Identifying risks is the process of highlighting individual project concerns that pose a threat to the implementation of the project. An assessment is also made on the overall risk for the project risk. The key benefit of this process is the documentation of existing individual project risks and the sources of overall project risk. It also brings together information, so the project team can respond appropriately to identified risks. This process is performed throughout the project. Identify Risks is an iterative process, since new individual project risks may emerge as the project progresses through its life cycle and the level of overall project risk will also change. The frequency of iteration and participation in each risk identification cycle can vary by situation, and this can be defined in the risk management plan.

On completion of the Identify Risks process, the content of the risk register may include but is not limited to the list of identified risks. Each individual project risk is given a unique identifier in the risk register. Identified risks are described in as much detail as required to ensure unambiguous understanding. A structured risk statement may be used to distinguish risks from their cause(s) and their effect(s).

In risk mitigation, action is taken to reduce the probability of occurrence and/or impact of a threat. Early mitigation action is often more effective than trying to repair the damage after the threat has occurred. Adopting less-complex processes, conducting more tests are examples of mitigation actions. Where it is not possible to reduce probability, a mitigation response might reduce the impact by targeting factors that drive the severity.

In relation to this project, we received a list of identified risks and then devised the Contingency Plan.

Contingency Plan

Risks	Measures to risks mitigation	Objective evidences
Logical Framework Matrix – LFM (section 1, 2)		
R1: Social environment in the PCs potentially see the integration of the new Core	R1: Presentation of project activities at the international and national conference	Conference proceedings, handouts and printing of conferences, programmes and dissemination materials, attendance lists

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

Curricula as a threat at national/institutional level.	R1: Presentation of project activities for the government commissions and educational agencies	Minutes of meeting, attendance lists, feed-back and references
	R1: Cooperation with representatives of Partner Countries Ministries of Higher Education and VET and inclusion of government representatives in the project activities	The stakeholder register, the stakeholder engagement plan, WP lead-partner reports, photo-reports, project news
R2: Delays in receiving data from the Consortium and missing deadlines.	R2: Continuous harmonization of the work plan between the partners by regular online communication	E-letters, the updated work plan, WP lead-partner reports
R3: Administrative change of key persons and/or team members without permission.	R3: Defining and presenting project teams with team members responsibilities continuously	Minutes of meeting, WP lead-partner reports
R4: Readiness of university teaching staff to build their educational competence (skills).	R4: Presentation of project activities to target population of university teaching staff and providing support for their professional development	Minutes of meeting, attendance lists, feed-back and references, certificates of competency
Logical Framework Matrix – LFM (section 3)		
R1: Poor Participation/take up for survey completion to detect needs	R1: Continuous communication of task' coordinator with researchers of PC needs, regular briefing	Digital traces of communications, needs analyses reports, minutes of meeting, documented recommendations
R2: Appropriate level of English to participate effectively in project	R2: Using communication on the other and regional languages	Digital traces of communications
R3: As inputs have a key post-project sustainable and dissemination role, it is imperative that their effectiveness is reviewed particularly given its membership of key players	R3: Using reflexive approach and deductive methodology to inputs selection	Kick-Off meeting agenda, materials of QA workshop
R4: PC partners may recommend some changes in the evaluation of	R4: Consistent implementation of action research methodology	Documented evaluation model integrated with Bologna principles, Dublin descriptors and Tuning

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

Curricula modules relating to local conditions	and basic principles of evaluation	modular system, assessment reports, recommendations
R5: Disagreement regarding approaches selected	R5: Supporting creative approaches and respecting diversity; Establishing rules of win/win strategies	Minutes of meeting, documented negotiations, attendance lists
R6: Getting used to materials	R6: Differentiated presentation of materials to specific user groups supported by examples of good practice	GP materials, recommendations, lists of participants
R7: Communication difficulties among the partners	R7: Developing communication time plan and communication networks between participants (unified group and subgroups mailing lists, cloud storage and file sharing)	Communication time plans, unified group and subgroups mailing lists, digital traces of communications, providing access to cloud storage, cloud storage content
R8: Delays in foreseen timetable due to unavailability of some partners	R8: Regular briefings and online communication (videoconferencing etc.) among participants	Schedule of briefings and online communication, briefing agenda, minutes of meeting
R9: Funding delays	R9: Making realistic financial and action plan, harmonizing dynamics of funding and dynamics of activities	Updated financial and actions plans, payment confirmations, WP lead partner reports
R10: Inexperience of PC Partners	R10: Supporting continuous communication and interaction between specialized subgroups (subgroups based on the tasks' fragmentation)	Digital traces of communications for Q&A

Additionally, the last row shows a set of objective evidence. It is understood that evidence confirms the implementation of a measure to risk mitigation.

Risk monitoring is a regular activity that is continued throughout the project. In order to perform the risk management and control function successfully, the circumstances which may produce a threat should be promptly identified and prioritized. The WP3 Leaders hold responsibility for conducting regular formal reviews on such matters. In doing this, it is hoped that the level of risk embedded within the project can be minimized, and when action is required, contingency plans can be carried out in a timely manner.

The WP3 Leaders hold responsibility for conducting regular formal reviews on such matters in order to prevent the possible consequences of the risk embedded into the project, and,

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

when action is required, to activate contingency plans to be carried out in a timely manner. Steering Group provides inputs to the Project Coordinator on this issue to be included in the periodic monitoring reports.

However, in case of force majeure situation, an unforeseeable exceptional situation or event beyond the participant's control and not attributable to error or negligence on his/her part, the partners can be prevented from completing their planned activities abroad due to a case of "force majeure". The performance of the activities in this situation is the matter of further instructions provided by the European Commission's Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (Executive Agency).

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN
ANNEX 1: DISTRIBUTION LIST

This Quality Control Plan is distributed to all the Project Partners:

	Signature of the person responsible for the project coordination	Partner
1.		University of Kragujevac
2.		Technical University of Dresden
3.		SEERC
4.		Don State Technical University
5.		Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University
6.		National Research Ogarev Mordovia State University
7.		Bologna club
8.		Certification Association "Russian Register"
9.		Narxoz University
10.		Suleyman Demirel University
11.		International IT University
12.		Edge Hill University
13.		University of Deusto

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN
ANNEX 2: ALLVET QA OFFICERS

ALLVET QA officers (partner countries)

Don State Technical University	Sergey Makov makovserg@yandex.ru (cc dstu_projects@mail.ru)
Ogarev Mordovia State University	Olga Safonkina olga.safonkina@gmail.com
Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University	Violetta Philippova VIUrkevich@kantiana.ru
Bologna Club	Liudmila Kazadaeva oms.internal@yandex.ru
Narxoz University	Denis Polenov denis.polenov@narxoz.kz
International IT University	Roza Utesheva ruteshova@mail.ru
Suleyman Demirel University	Talgat Yechshzhanov talgat.yechshzhanov@sdu.edu.kz

ALLVET QA officers (programme countries)

Technical University Dresden	Margret Schaeffer Margret.Sch@online.de
University of Deusto	Ivan Dyukarev ivan.dyukarev@deusto.es
SEERC	Kelly Pasmatzki kpsmatzi@citycollege.sheffield.eu
University of Kragujevac	Marjan Milošević allvetproject@gmail.com

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN
ANNEX 3: CONTACT PERSONS

Don State Technical University	
Contact person	Natalia Gasparyan dstu_projects@mail.ru
Project Officer (if different from contact person)	Irina Maevskeya irina_1004@yahoo.com (cc dstu_projects@mail.ru)
QA officer	Sergey Makov makovserg@yandex.ru (cc dstu_projects@mail.ru)
Publicity officer	Natalia Gasparyan dstu_projects@mail.ru
Module team leader	Svetlana Ponomareva kristina-sulimova@mail.ru (cc dstu_projects@mail.ru)
Ogarev Mordovia State University	
Contact person	Olga Safonkina olga.safonkina@gmail.com
Project Officer (if different from contact person)	Natalia Burenina bureninanv@mail.ru
QA officer	Olga Safonkina olga.safonkina@gmail.com
Publicity officer	Ekaterina Kapustina kapustina.ket@gmail.com
Module team leader	Ruslan Zhalnin zhalnin@gmail.com
Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University	
Contact person	Elena Zimovina zimelena@yandex.ru
Project Officer (if different from contact person)	Milyavskaya Natalya NMilyavskaya@kantiana.ru
QA officer	Philippova Violetta VIUrkevich@kantiana.ru
Publicity officer	Gulina Aleksandra AKGulina@kantiana.ru
Module team leader	Elena Zimovina zimelena@yandex.ru , EZimovina@kantiana.ru
Narxoz University	
Contact Person	Aigul Dzhondelbaeva - dzhondelbaeva.aigul@narxoz.kz Gaini Mukhanova - gaini.mukhanova@narxoz.kz
Project Officer (if different from contact person)	Gaini Mukhanova - gaini.mukhanova@narxoz.kz
QA officer	Denis Polenov - denis.polenov@narxoz.kz
Publicity officer	Tansholpan Ibatolla - 23tansholpan@gmail.com
Module team leader	Madina Subalova - madina.subalova@narxoz.kz
International IT University	
Contact person	Gulnara Zakirova, gulzak@mail.ru, gzakirova@fulbrightmail.org
Project Officer (if different from contact person)	
QA officer	Roza Utesheva, ruteshova@mail.ru
Publicity officer	Aigul Niyazgulova, nijasgulova@mail.ru
Module team leader	Galym Omarov, g.omarov@iitu.kz
Suleyman Demirel University	
Contact person	Adilzhan Anay adilzhan.anay@sdu.edu.kz

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

Project Officer (if different from contact person)	
QA officer	Talgat Yechshzhanov talgat.yechshzhanov@sdu.edu.kz
Publicity officer	Saltanat Karimsattar saltanat.karimsattar@sdu.edu.kz
Module team leader	Talgat Zhussipbek talgat.zhussipbek@sdu.edu.kz
Russian Register	
Contact Person	Aleksandra Zvezdova: zvezdovaab@gmail.com
Project Officer (if different from contact person)	
QA officer	Evgenia Korneva: Korneva@rusregister.ru
Publicity officer	Anna Shmakova: shmakova@rusregister.ru
Bologna Club	
Contact person	Svetlana Shvedova svshvedova@yahoo.com
Project Officer (if different from contact person)	Svetlana Shvedova svshvedova@yahoo.com
QA officer	Kazadaeva Liudmila oms.internal@yandex.ru
Publicity officer	Olga Kostina oms.internal@yandex.ru
Technical University Dresden	
Contact person	Gerard Cullen: Gerard.Cullen@tu-dresden.de *
Project Officer (if different from contact person)	
QA officer	Margret Schaeffer: Margret.Sch@online.de
University of Deusto	
Contact person	Ivan Dyukarev ivan.dyukarev@deusto.es
Project Officer (if different from contact person)	Ivan Dyukarev ivan.dyukarev@deusto.es Assistant: Paula Sánchez paula.sanchez@deusto.es
QA officer	Ivan Dyukarev ivan.dyukarev@deusto.es
Edge Hill University	David Allan david.allan@edgehill.ac.uk
Contact person	
Project Officer (if different from contact person)	
QA officer	
SEERC	
Contact person	Vicky Papachristou, vpapachristou@citycollege.sheffield.eu
Project Officer (if different from contact person)	Nikos Zaharis nzaharis@seerc.org
QA officer	Kelly Pasmatzki, kpsmatzi@citycollege.sheffield.eu
University of Kragujevac	
Coordinator	Danijela Milošević, allvetproject@gmail.com
QA officer	Marjan Milošević

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

ANNEX 4: EVENT EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

ALLVET Event Evaluation

Please submit feedback regarding the event you have just completed

Please select your role:

Host

Participant

For the host of the event	For the participant of the event
Please, answer these questions only if you hosted the event	Please, answer these questions only if you were a participant of the event
1. University of Kragujevac 2. Dresden University of Technology 3. SEERC 4. Don State Technical University 5. Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University 6. Ogarev Mordovia State University 7. Bologna club 8. Certification Association "Russian Register" 9. Narxoz University 10. Suleyman Demirel University 11. International IT University 12. Edge Hill University 13. University of Deusto	

Questions for the host of the event

Before the event:

The participants provided the information about their attendance of meeting leaving enough time to make all arrangements and recommendations relevant for the meeting

Yes

No

Other...

The draft of the agenda was prepared and distributed for comments/additions

Yes

No

Other...

The tasks according to the agenda were allocated among the participants leaving enough time for the tasks to be prepared

Yes

No

Other...

The objectives of the meeting were clear (in accordance with the draft agenda)

Yes

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

No

Other...

Relevant data/information was collected in due time

Yes

No

Other...

During the event:

The time was effectively managed, based on the agreed agenda

Yes

No

Other...

The time was effectively managed, based on the agreed agenda

Yes

No

Other...

Meeting objectives were achieved, key issues were clarified and all the agenda' issues were covered

Yes

No

Other...

Each participant delivered their input

Yes

No

Other...

Disagreements (if any) were cordially solved

Yes

No

Other...

An accurate minutes' record of discussions and decisions was taken and the minutes were distributed among the partners

Yes

No

Other...

Meeting results contribute to the achievement of project objectives according to the LFM

Yes

No

Other...

What are the lessons which can be learned for "Project Register of Lessons Learned" (how future events can be further improved)?

Yes

No

Other...

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

For the participant of the event

Before the event:

The communication between the partners and the host was enough to make all the arrangements relevant for the meeting

Yes

No

Other...

The date and the location were confirmed leaving enough time to make up travel arrangements

Yes

No

Other...

The draft of the agenda was prepared and distributed for comments

Yes

No

Other...

The objectives of the meeting were clarified in accordance with the draft agenda

Yes

No

Other...

The tasks according to the agenda were allocated among the participants at the point convenient for the tasks to be carried out

Yes

No

Other...

The participants received travel recommendations relevant for the meeting

Yes

No

Other...

During the event:

The goals of the event were clear

Yes

No

Other...

The time was effectively managed, based on the agreed agenda

Yes

No

Other...

Meeting objectives were achieved, key issues were clarified and all the agenda issues were covered

Yes

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

No

Other...

Each participant was given an adequate opportunity to contribute their input to the event (the meeting was not dominated by the loudest/most talkative)

Yes

No

Other...

Supporting materials were distributed (materials could be distributed online)

Yes

No

Other...

Disagreements (if any) were cordially solved

Yes

No

Other...

Agreement was reached (by consensus or vote) on key actions that needed to be taken

Yes

No

Other...

An accurate record of discussions and decisions was taken and the minutes were distributed among the partners

Yes

No

Other...

The results of meeting contributed to the achievement of the project objectives according to LFM

Yes

No

Other...

What are the lessons which can be learned for "Project Register of Lessons Learned" (how future events can be further improved)?

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

ANNEX 5: WORK PACKAGE COMPLETION QUESTIONNAIRE

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN
ANNEX 6: SIX-MONTH REPORT QUESTIONNAIRE

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN
ANNEX 7: GLOSSARY

QCP	Quality Control Plan
QA	Quality assurance
IEWG	Internal Evaluation Working Group
HEI	higher Education Institution
LFM	Long frame matrix
Wp	Work Package
PC	Partner countries
QA body	Quality Assurance Body
Timeliness	As a QA body, IEWG conducts QA procedures in a timely manner. Timeliness is determined by its compliance of LFM and WP Plan
Accuracy	When conducting QA procedures, IEWG seeks to collect and analyze only reliable information that tends to reflect the objects of assessment & evaluation with the necessary accuracy. The accuracy of the information characterizes the degree of approximation of this information to the real state of the event, outcome, process, or any other deliverable or a document relevant to the project.
Independence	As a QA body, IEWG, acts independently from the object of the evaluation/ assessment. In its activities, IEWG excludes any possibility of exerting administrative, commercial, financial and other pressure by the objects of the assessment to influence the evaluations and the objectivity of the results. IEWG as a Quality Assurance Authority excludes any activities that may affect the independence of judgment and the impartiality of its activities. IEWG is aware of the threats to its impartiality and takes all necessary actions to eliminate them. IEWG ensures and monitors the lack of personal financial interest of IEWG members and outsourced specialists in the results of the assessment procedures. IEWG requires its members to immediately report a potential conflict of interest or a possible threat to the impartiality of IEWG.
Sufficiency	In its activities, IEWG seeks to ensure the sufficiency of the information collected. This means that the information contains a minimal but sufficient set of evidence for making an objective decision. At the same time, IEWG avoids collecting redundant information by carefully treating its own resources and those of the objects of the assessment.
Objectivity	IEWG makes decisions based on objective evidence of compliance (or non-compliance) and ensures that other interests and other parties do not influence decision making. IEWG ensures the objectivity of its assessments based on: 1. Independence of IEWG as well as subcontracted experts as QA body; 2. Professionalism and competence of IEWG members;

QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

	<p>3 Evaluation & assessment based on objective evidences only;</p> <p>4. Application of uniform requirements, procedures, methodologies for conducting QA procedures;</p> <p>5. Transparency and reproducibility of the results of evaluation& assessment, and storage of the results of the evaluations.</p> <p>IEWG takes responsibility for reviewing a sufficient number of objective evidences in order to make a decision on the outcome of the assessment.</p> <p>Based on the results of the assessment, IEWG makes a positive decision in the case of sufficient evidence of compliance, and negative in the case of insufficient evidence of compliance.</p>
Competency	<p>IEWG sees competency as an ability to apply knowledge and skills. The competence of IEWG as a QA body is ensured by the ability to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. achieve and maintain sufficient qualifications of IEWG members; 2. show the information supported with the documents to provides a reasonable level of confidence in the result of the QA procedures; 3. provide regulatory and technical support of the assessment procedures