# Edu4ALL

# Disability as diversity: The inclusion of students with disabilities in higher education

| Deliverable D3.1 | Defining the quality framework for the project |
|---|---|

| Work Package (WP) | WP3: Quality Plan |
|---|---|
| WP Leader | The University of the Basque Country |
| WP members | Palestine Technical University Kadoorie<br>National & Kapodistrian University of Athens<br>Irbid National University<br>Partners for Sustainable Development<br>The University of Jordan<br>Al-Ummah University College<br>Palestine Technical College<br>Int@E UG |
| Issue date | 20 September 2021 |
| Version/Status | Final |

## Project partners

Palestine Technical University Kadoorie
Palestine
*Coordinator*

National and Kapodistrian University of Athens
Greece

The University of the Basque Country
Spain

Irbid National University
Jordan

Partners for Sustainable Development
Palestine

The University of Jordan
Jordan

Al-Ummah  University College
Palestine

Palestine Technical College
Palestine

Int@E UG
Germany

## Project information

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project number** | 618103-EPP-1-2020-1-PS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP |
| **Action code** | CBHE-JP |
| **Project acronym** | Edu4ALL |
| **Project Title** | Disability as diversity: The inclusion of students with disabilities in higher education |
| **Funding scheme** | Erasmus+ KA2 |
| **Date of EC approval** | 31/07/2020 |

## Contact

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project Coordinator** | Dr. Eman Daraghmi, Associate Professor |
| **Address** | Palestine Technical University Kadoorie, Applied Computing Department, Kadoorie Circle 7, PS - 20030 Tulkarm West Bank, Palestine |
| **Phone** | +970-595765601 |
| **email** | e.daraghmi@ptuk.edu.ps |
| **Project Website** | https://www.ptuk.edu.ps/projects/edu4all/ |

**Edu4ALL D3.1. Defining the quality framework for the project**

## Document Data

| | |
|---|---|
| **Distribution List*** | PU |
| **Work Package** | WP3: Quality Plan |
| **Task** | 3.1 Defining the quality framework for the project |
| **Deliverable Title** | Defining the quality framework for the project |
| **Work Package Leader** | The University of the Basque Country |
| **Work Package Members** | Palestine Technical University Kadoorie<br>National & Kapodistrian University of Athens<br>Irbid National University<br>Partners for Sustainable Development<br>The University of Jordan<br>Al-Ummah University College<br>Palestine Technical College<br>Int@E UG |
| **Date of issue** | 20/09/2021 |
| **Total number of pages** | 42 |

*Choose from:
**PU** (Public)
**RE** (Restricted to a group specified by the Consortium (including the Commission Services)
**CO** (Confidential, only for members of the Consortium (including the Commission Services)

## Version History

| Version | Date | Author/Organization |
|---|---|---|
| V0.1 | 18/1/2021 | Riyahd Qashi /Int@E UG |
| V0.2 | 28/3/2021 | S. M. Espín-Tello, N. Garay-Vitoria, M.Arrue/ UPV-EHU |
| V0.3 | 10/04/2021 | S. M. Espín-Tello, N. Garay-Vitoria, M.Arrue/ UPV-EHU |
| V0.4 | 14/04/2021 | S. M. Espín-Tello, N. Garay-Vitoria / UPV-EHU |
| V0.5 | 27/04/2021 | S. M. Espín-Tello, N. Garay-Vitoria, M.Arrue/ UPV-EHU; E. Daraghmi, Y. Awwad/ PTUK |
| V0.6 | 19/05/2021 | S. M. Espín-Tello, N. Garay-Vitoria, M.Arrue/ UPV-EHU; E. Daraghmi, Y. Awwad/ PTUK; Georgios Kouroupetroglou/ UoA |
| V0.7 | 14/06/2021 | S. M. Espín-Tello, N. Garay-Vitoria, M.Arrue/ UPV-EHU; E. Daraghmi, Y. Awwad/ PTUK; Georgios Kouroupetroglou, Alexandros Pino/ UoA |
| V1 | 01/07/2021 | S. M. Espín-Tello, N. Garay-Vitoria, M.Arrue/ UPV-EHU, E. Daraghmi, Y. Awwad/ PTUK; G. Kouroupetroglou, A. Pino/ UoA, Riyahd Qashi /Int@E UG, INU, UJ, UUC, PTC, PSD. |
| Final | 20/09/2021 | S. M. Espín-Tello, N. Garay-Vitoria, M.Arrue, E. Larraza-Mendiluze / UPV-EHU, E. Daraghmi, Y. Awwad/ PTUK; |

| | | G. Kouroupetroglou, A. Pino/ UoA, Riyahd Qashi /Int@E UG, INU, UJ, UUC, PTC, PSD. |
| --- | --- | --- |

**Edu4ALL D3.1. Defining the quality framework for the project**

## Table of Contents

# 1   List of Tables

## 2    List of Acronyms

This table shows the acronyms used in this deliverable in alphabetical order.

| Acronym | Description |
|---------|-------------|
| EC | European Commission |
| EU | European Union |
| HE | Higher Education |
| HEI | Higher Education Institution |
| ICT | Information and Communication Technology |
| IE | Inclusive Education |
| JO | Jordan |
| LFM | Logical Framework Matrix |
| PC | Partner Country |
| PQAF | Project Quality Assessment Form |
| PrC | Project Coordinator |
| PS | Palestine |
| PTUK | Palestine Technical University Kadoorie |
| QA | Quality Assurance |
| QM | Quality Management |
| QP | Quality Plan |
| SC | Steering Committee |
| UoA | University of Athens |
| UPV/EHU | University of the Basque Country |
| WP | Work Package |
| WPL | Work Package Leader |
| WPLC | Work Package Leader Committee |

# 1   Executive Summary

In the scope of the Edu4ALL project, and particularly according to what is foreseen in the WP3 Quality Control and Monitoring, the consortium decided to develop several measures for estimating the quality of realized project objectives as a part of the Project Quality Plan, in order to enable high-quality management of the project.

The objective of this Quality Plan (QP)is to ensure concrete and high–quality results in line with the project plans.

In this context, the main purpose of the QP is to facilitate the project's management and guide all partners on the evaluation and quality issues, by establishing a coherent set of guidelines by which all aspects of the project are managed and measured.  The use of these guidelines ensures better collaboration among the consortium members, individuals and groups, ensures the responsibility and engaged activity of a consortium member for the realization of a corresponding project work package and ensures the realization of the planned project aims.

# 2   Introduction

## 2.1   The project

The study entitled *Disability as Diversity: The inclusion of students with disabilities in higher education* (Edu4ALL) is a three-year cross-regional joint project under EAC/A04/2019 call and Key Action 2, Cooperation for Innovation and the Exchange of Good Practices - Capacity Building in the Field of Higher Education. The wider objective is to mobilise the Higher Education (HE) capacity in Palestine (PS) and Jordan (JO) in order to establish "Inclusive Education Units". These units will contribute to the support of people with disabilities by increasing their participation in university programs.  The implementation of those units will follow the international standards with the objective of equality in Education, Activities and Services for Students with Disabilities. The target population are blind, deaf, or hard of hearing people and those with motor disability or low vision. The project has cross-regional nature to ensure learning from existing practices, exchanging successful experiences, and cooperation in the long run between the two regions and European Union (EU) partners.

The specific objectives of the project are:

1.   To raise awareness about inclusive education among students with disabilities;

2.   To build the capacity of staff to teach and to serve students with disabilities through professional development;

3.   To improve the level of competencies and skills of staff at PC Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) by (i) training visits for staff to EU partners to modernise Inclusive Education (IE) expertise in innovative learning, and (ii) providing research collaboration opportunities with EU staff through joint-supervision of students' projects;

4.   To support students with disabilities in HE;

5.   To modernise laboratories at PC HEIs so they are equipped with the needed assistive technologies to be used for teaching and research;

**Edu4ALL D3.1. Defining the quality framework for the project**

6. To enhance equality in education by including people with disabilities in university programs;

7. To empower people with disabilities and prepare them for future careers;

8. To create opportunities for collaboration between academia and industry;

9. To develop training tutorials for faculty and staff that are compatible with the best EU practice guides in order to be used for staff training;

10. To gain the required experience in the definition of the quality framework for the project, implementation of the project quality assurance control processes, and generation of the project quality reports;

11. To enhance the cooperation between universities in the region and EU partners since the Edu4ALL EU partners have a rich experience in IE, a successful track record of previous projects about this topic, and the expertise to ensure meeting the above objectives;

12. To establish the Inclusive Education Unit at PC HEIs; and

13. To modernise the disability statement at PC HEIs.

The principle outputs and outcomes of the project are:

1) Reaching the maximum number of students with disabilities, raising their awareness regarding the IE and increasing their participation in university programs;

2) Training staff to serve and to teach students with disabilities;

3) Developing Inclusive Education Units at PC HEIs to support disabled students and helping in providing Equitable Access and High-Quality education; and

4) Ensuring the sustainability of project results and outcomes beyond the lifetime of the project.

## 2.2 Work Package 3: Quality plan

The Work Package 3 (WP3) will work to ensure the adherence of all project pieces and outputs to the Quality Assurance (QA) procedures, through the QP. The QP is a key element for the successful development of the project, to achieve the objectives and outcomes beyond the lifetime of the project. The QP will ensure that all outputs and deliverables have good quality, and they will be designed and agreed upon early in the phase of the project along with the project coordinator and the consortium.

The objective of WP3 is to ensure the quality of the elaborated deliverables before their submission to the European Commission (EC). An internal review process will be implemented within the consortium which will assign review responsibilities to selected reviewers from the participating partners in this work package. The project coordinator (PrC) will be responsible to sub-contract an External Evaluator.

# 3 Objectives of the Deliverable

The objectives of the QP are:

- To clearly define the content, format, review and approval process of the project deliverables;
- To define the responsibilities of the project partners regarding those deliverables;
- To identify all the different tools and means to be applied throughout the project duration;
- To provide guidelines for adequate implementation and thereby assure that certain quality standards in the performance of our tasks are fulfilled;
- To define the quality requirements that must be obtained throughout the project lifecycle, those that the deliverables, actions and results must conform to; and
- To generate project quality reports.

The QP will be approved by the project Steering Committee (SC). The PTUK (project coordinator), along with the UPV/EHU (WP leader), will be responsible for ensuring compliance with the QA Plan by all partners.

This QP is a working document that can be updated in accordance with changing circumstances during the project. Potential changes are brought forward by UPV/EHU and/or PTUK, and are subject to mutual consent by all consortium partners.

## 4. Methodology

The Edu4ALL project follows a participatory design methodology that allows reviewing all developed reports, materials, and tutorials, and ensures they meet the specifications, guidelines and policies required. Further, the consortium aims to ensure the quality and successful achievement of the project by allocating a work package (WP3) dedicated to developing and implementing a QP for the project with clear QA procedures and criteria. The consortium also follows successful practices from previous Erasmus+ projects.

### 4.1. Project Management Structure/Responsibilities

Most partners of the Edu4ALL project will be involved in the management process for the effective delivery of outputs. Virtual meetings will be planned, as the main communication media, for coordinating project activities (thus a budget has been allocated for a reliable teleconference facility). This will enable regular meetings of the management team.

The project management promotes a sense of ownership and motivation for each of the partners.

The structure of the project management consists of:

- The Project Coordinator (PrC),
- The Project Steering Committee (SC),
- Work Package Leader (WPL).

A list of the members involved in the project management is shown in Deliverable 5.2. Project Management Committees.

**Edu4ALL D3.1. Defining the quality framework for the project**

### 4.1.1. Project Coordinator (PrC)

As the Project Coordinator, Dr. Eman Daraghmi (from the PTUK) is responsible for the overall operation of the project and its smooth running, financial and administrative management including the preparation of budget and reports, timeliness and accomplishment. The PrC supervises and coordinates all activities, ensuring that all partners are working towards the same objectives; contractually, technically and administratively and strictly collaborating with the Management Team. The PrC ensures that all partners' contributions meet the Work Plan expectations.

The PrC and Grant holder are responsible for:

- Representing the consortium towards the EC;
- Ensuring the effective flow of information between partners;
- Ensuring the implementation of the agreed action plan to the agreed standards and deadlines;
- Ongoing evaluation of project activities and reporting on project progress to the EU;
- Defining and identifying the project deliverables for the Commission from the inputs received by participants;
- Managing and monitoring the project activities and resources;
- Ensuring the collaboration and communication to EC and among partners;
- Ensuring the consistency between the development and the strategic objectives of the partners;
- Collecting and transmitting the project deliverables to the SC and the participants:
- Monitoring any significant difference between planned and actual advancement of participants' work, particularly with respect to project results and deliverables;
- Reviewing the reports (both scientific and financial ones) to verify consistency with the project tasks before transmitting them to the EC; and
- Use and distribution of financial means and budget control.

### 4.1.2. The Project Steering Committee (SC)

The SC, chaired by the PrC and composed of one member of each project partner university, supervises the implementation of the whole project plan.

The SC consists of the coordinator (Grant holder), project manager and WP leaders (or coordinators) and representative from each partner. SC will ensure timely coordination, direction, well-planned running of the project, adherence to EU and QA rules, financial management, project outputs and risk mitigation. The SC will meet quarterly to bring in the overall coordination of the project and to get reports from WP Leaders Committee, coordinator, and project manager.

The SC is the project operational decision-making and arbitration body, implementing the provisions of the Grant Agreement and deciding the following matters:

- Strategic orientation of the project;
- Identification of the foreground that could be the subject matter of protection and consequential decisions on dissemination and exploitation activities;
- Allocation of the co-ownership shares over foreground obtained by several participants; acquisition of rights from third parties, if applicable;
- Take all decisions required for the successful progress of the project;

- Review the internal documents to ensure their completeness, clarity and comprehensiveness;
- Implement the scientific decisions and orientations, taken by the coordinator, by redefining the work plan and schedule and/or re-defining partner roles, contributions and budgets;
- Elaborate progress reports on the state of advancement of each work package; monitor any significant difference between planned and realized advancement of participants' work, particularly with respect of project results and deliverables;
- In case of default by a contractor, to propose to the SC to review participants roles and budget as well as any new entity to replace the defaulting contractor.

### 4.1.3. Work Package Leader (WPL)

The WP Leaders Committee consists of the coordinator, the project manager, and all the WP leaders. This committee will meet fortnightly to follow up on the progress of tasks and activities and take executive decisions to allocate tasks, define task outputs, and resolve problems (technical, administrative, etc.). It will look at outputs of day-to-day affairs of the project, to ensure well-managed and planned activities, timely allocation of activities to staff, and mitigating risks in delays.

The day-to-day running of the project will be the responsibility of the grant-holder/PrC and the project manager, who will follow up on allocated activities with respective staff. WP leaders, PrC and project manager will report to WP Leaders Committee fortnightly and discuss and take decisions to ensure full coordination between WPs.

For each deliverable, one or more partners are defined as Work Package Leader/s (WPL) as more than one partner, depending on their role in the project, can be involved in the implementation of each WP and its subtasks.

Each WPL is responsible for the detailed coordination and reporting of a specific WP. If needed, meetings of the partners involved in the WP are organized and chaired by the Leader. For each deliverable within the WP, the Leader has direct responsibility, either himself/herself or an associate individual. In the first instance, the WPL is the person who is contacted by the PrC as part of the monitoring of progress towards completion of the deliverables and the assigned WP.

At the end of each project period, each partner has to report to the WPL where he is involved in and for which he has performed tasks during the reporting period, on the progress of the activities within the agreed work packages. The WPL has to forward a consolidated progress report to the Coordinator. He/she also prepares a report on the achievement of each milestone, describing the actual results obtained and discussing it in relation to the project-specific objective and a WP report at the completion of the WP. He/she describe the methodology used in order to obtain results for this deliverable.

## 4.2. Project WPs and subtasks

One of the basic project results is the establishment of an Inclusive Education (IE) Unit in each partner university, which targets lecturers, teachers and administrators, and students at universities in each PC, mainly students with disabilities, in order to improve the quality of teaching and learning, as well as improving skills and competences of administrative staff, lecturers and teachers. In order to obtain this main goal, the project uses a sequence of steps

**Edu4ALL D3.1. Defining the quality framework for the project**

that are depicted in a set of work packages (WPs). The WPs, divided into a set of subtasks, are the following:

### *WP1 - Preparation*

1.1 Investigating the rules and regulations of IE for students with disabilities in both partner countries HEIs (expected deliverable in month 5: Report)

1.2 Analysing the current practices of inclusive education for students with disabilities in EU and worldwide (expected deliverable in month 6: Report)

1.3 Forming the committee of practice in each institution at both PCs (expected deliverables in month 7: Report, Service/Product)

1.4 Organising Awareness Raising Workshop on "IE in HEIs" (expected deliverables in month 8: Event, Report)

### *WP2 - Development*

2.1 Defining and Setting the IE Unit Vision, Mission, Tasks, Members, Location, Objectives, and Goals (expected deliverable in month 16: Report)

2.2 Modernising a 'disability statement' for PC HEIs (expected deliverable in month 26: Report)

2.3 Professional Development and Capacity building of PC staff (expected deliverable in month 36: Event)

2.4 Lab modernisation with the needed assistive technologies at PC HEIs (expected deliverable in month 16: Service/Product)

2.5 Developing training tutorials for faculty and staff that are compatible with the best EU practice guides in order to be used for staff training (expected deliverables in month 20: Teaching material, Training material)

2.6 Defining delivery approaches and assessment (expected deliverable in month 15: Report)

### *WP3 – Quality Plan*

3.1 Defining the quality framework for the project (expected deliverables in month 5: Report, Service/Product)

3.2 Implementing project quality assurance control process (expected deliverable in month 36: Service/Product)

3.3 Generating project quality reports (expected deliverable in month 36: Report)

### *WP4 – Dissemination & Exploitation*

4.1 Planning dissemination strategy (expected deliverable in month 8: Report)

**Edu4ALL D3.1. Defining the quality framework for the project**

4.2     Organising a conference for opening the Edu4ALL to students with disabilities and launching the Inclusive Education Unit at both PC HEIs (expected deliverables in month 26: Event, Service/Product)

4.3     Developing project website to disseminate the project results (expected deliverable in month 4: Service/Product)

*WP5 - Management*

5.1     Project Coordination Meetings (expected deliverable in month 33: Event)

5.2     Formation of the project management committees (expected deliverable in month 2: Service/Product)

5.3     Project Financial administration and reports (expected deliverable in month 36: Report)

5.4     Development of a collaboration platform (expected deliverable in month 4: Report, Service/Product)

## 4.3. Overall Approach and Values

The general quality control mechanisms are the following:

1.  Participatory meetings/workshops plans will be determined in advance and will be documented. Taken actions and decisions will be followed-up by project management.

2.  Two management committees will be established with clearly defined responsibilities to ensure directional and executive actions are acted upon and closely followed.

3.  Leads for WPs are designated as well as their responsibility to follow-up on their respective WP's tasks and activities.

4.  Participatory activities and task outputs are documented and/or formulated as reports and shared in the project document collaboration space.

5.  Templates are created for different types of activities, deliverables and outputs, to ensure they follow a standardised format.

6.  Evaluation criteria, measuring indicators for tasks/activities will be clearly explained and defined to ensure measuring indicators are collected in time.

7.  An internal consortium review process will be set-up, from among consortium members, to review outputs, deliverables, tasks, and activities, to ensure quality project outputs and deliverables.

8.  WP3, led by UPV/EHU EU partner, will ensure the quality of the project, by establishing QA procedures based on EU standards.

9.  Industry advisors and government officials, legislators and subject experts who approve and accredit the developed programs in JO and PS will give extra input on the quality of the project work.

10. There will also be an external evaluation composed of an experienced external evaluator who has large experience in TEMPUS and Erasmus+ projects.

The following quantitative indicators will be used to measure the quality of the project:

- The number of organisations/institutions using the quality assurance control process and giving their feedback: Assessed by conducting a survey on organizations having utilized the quality assurance control process and giving their feedback.
- The number of stakeholders that have received the quality reports: Assessed by conducting a survey on stakeholders having received the quality reports.
- The number of students enrolled in the university programs after launching the IE unit: Assessed through an annual report about the number of students with disabilities enrolling in the university programs.
- The number of teachers/students/courses using the modernised and accessible labs: Assessed by conducting a study on using teachers/students/courses using the modernised labs.
- The number of staff trained and experienced on how to teach students with disabilities: Assessed by measuring the number of staff who successfully completed training or received intensive coaching or mentoring.
- The number of new projects between staff, students and EU universities: Assessed by measuring the number of new joint projects between universities in the region and EU partner universities.

The project will employ principled management to ensure a timely and successful outcome. The management structure will include two management committees: SC and WPLC.

The virtual kick-off meeting (held in January 2021) has been the formal event to establish SC and WPLC committees. This meeting has served to all participants to bring a common understanding of the project aims and objectives with well-defined clear time-scales and responsibilities. WP leaders will be responsible for managing the activities of their individual WPs and reporting progress regularly to the WPLC meetings.

Capacity building face-to-face workshops will be used to meet all project partners physically and cooperate on WPs tasks and working on the planning of the next phases of the project. These workshops will be at least twice a year and will be planned for training and dissemination. The rest of the meetings will take place virtually using a video conference facility.

The project tasks have been clearly specified, ensuring clarity on responsibility, delivery and roles which would certainly aid cooperation between partners. Meetings will be coordinated with tasks and milestones so the cooperation between partners is fully achieved. It will ensure the full participation of project partners with an increased commitment to the project and its objectives. Minutes of all meetings will be taken, in both virtual and face-to-face modalities. The generated documents will be uploaded in a shared location (WP5 is responsible for creating and managing it) for ensuring their availability to all partners. This is essential to fully maintain the celerity on progress and the communication between partners.

As part of the consortium agreement, conflict resolution will be specified and agreed upon between partners. Generally, any conflict between partners will be handled by the hierarchy of the management structure, from the coordinator to the project manager. The WPLC and SC will have the final decision to achieve a resolution, through negotiation, and ultimately voting.

The financial administration of the project will be the responsibility of the project manager. The project coordinator is responsible for managing academic outputs, in consultation with the SC, and when necessary, the EU project officer will ensure the implementation of the Erasmus+ rules within the financial procedures of the university.

If needed, the grand-holder and project manager will provide guidance to administrators at partner universities.

## 4.4. Project Quality Assurance

Although Quality Management (QM) is coordinated by an EU partner, the UPV/EHU, it will be also ensured that all partners take part in the related activities.

The duty of the QM is to monitor and evaluate the progress of the project and to ensure that all its activities are carried out properly according to European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance (QA) and ensuring proper execution of the project to achieve its objectives. The QM designs a proper evaluation process and is responsible for creating a set of indicators.

The QM monitors the project at different points using different types of evaluation practices and tools, such as questionnaires, interview grids and check-lists, devised to assess on an ongoing basis project relevance, efficiency and impact, to measure progress throughout its life cycle, to determine if the project responds to main target groups' needs, to measure the level of satisfaction of beneficiaries of project activities, and to evaluate unexpected results and control all processes.

### 4.4.1. Quality of the project processes

Assuring the project processes quality is prepared within the consortium via self-evaluation of the project partners, using the corresponding Project Quality Assessment Form (PQAF). For the evaluation of the project as a whole, a set of indicators have been established, which can be measured on a scale from 1 to 5, where 5 is very positive and 1 is very negative. The indicators are generally relevant to the quality of the project management, coordination, structure, support mechanisms, content, and resources.

The evaluation is primarily done by each partner, who must answer each question with an assessment of the performance of the consortium. The QM collects all the answers from the partners and integrates them into a report, using the technique and the approval limit described in 4.4.3., which reflect the views of the consortium on its progress. The QM draws out corresponding conclusions for further project work and realization of tasks. In case upon processing the results, the QM finds out that one or more of the results are below the expected performance, he notifies the PrC for setting forth problem-solving procedures.

The evaluation has to be performed via two project quality assurance, intermediate and final, reports, coinciding with the project management reports, or after reaching a work package milestone during the lifecycle of the project.

### 4.4.2. Quality of deliverables/WP results

The deliverables/WP results of Edu4ALL project consist of the results of the 5 WPs, as described in the work plan of the project, and included in section 4.2 of this document. Each WP may contain one or more subtasks.

In order to assure a high level of quality regarding the results of the project, each deliverable/WP result is evaluated for its completion in due time as well as for its completeness, clarity and comprehensiveness.

Regarding the on-time completion and the monitoring of the WPs, the PrC uses the PQAF-WP: Work packages monitoring form.

### 4.4.3. Quality evaluation

Depending on the nature of the activity implemented, for each WP and its subtask(s), the evaluation can be of two kinds: a. Internal or b. external. "Internal" means that responsible for the review of the document are specific or all the members of the consortium, while "external" means that the persons other than the partners of the project (e.g. the public, participants, trainees, beneficiaries (including the students with disabilities), etc.) evaluate the result. The evaluation is made with the aid of specific documents that are included in the Annexes section. Some WPs may include inherent evaluation tools, that are used for the evaluation instead of the specific documents included in the QP. The quality evaluation can last one-week maximum.

Besides this evaluation, each WPL takes also into consideration the indicators and respective objectives that are described in the approved proposal. The result of this evaluation that is made by the WPL is included in the deliverable/WP result report.

In case the deliverable/WP result is not accepted, necessary corrective actions are initiated by the WPL according to the results of the evaluation.

#### 4.4.3.1. Internal evaluation

Many of the deliverables/WP results of Edu4ALL are addressed to the partners of the consortium. These deliverables/results of the WPs and subtasks undergo an internal evaluation. The specifics of the internal evaluation, as regards the tools/forms used, the reviewer, the date of review, indicator(s), etc., are described in the PQAF-WP monitoring form.

Where appropriate, the documents are drafted with the use of Document Templates:

- Deliverables, by using Template "Edu4ALL_WP3_D3.1.1.docx",
- Reports, by using Template "Edu4ALL_WP3_D3.1.2.docx",
- Questionnaires, by using Template "Edu4ALL_WP3_D3.1.3.docx",
- Minutes, by using Template "Edu4ALL_WP3_D3.1.4.docx",
- Presentations (such as PowerPoint presentations), by using Template "Edu4ALL_WP3_D3.1.5.pptx",
- Excel files, by using Template "Edu4ALL_WP3_D3.1.6.xlsx", and
- Procedures, by using Template "Edu4ALL_WP3_D3.1.7.docx".

When a deliverable/WP result is finished, the WPL sends the "draft version" of the relevant document to the Project Coordinator (PrC) for an initial, more formal evaluation. The PrC examines the document for its compliance with the appropriate template (as listed above) and the general objectives of the project. After the document is approved by the PrC, it is sent by the WPL to the SC members for reviewing its completeness, clarity and comprehensiveness. In case the SC members are not able to review it, they delegate one of the study members of his/her team to do it. The evaluation, depending on the nature of the deliverable/WP result, is made primarily with the use of PQAF-DE (Deliverable Evaluation) spreadsheet or by other means as minutes of the meetings, contracts, lists of equipment, proof of purchase, etc. (as described at the PQAF-WP form). When the PQAF-DE document is used, it is filled in and sent by the reviewer(s) to the WPL, who is then responsible for amending the document according to the review results, if needed. The time for this amendment is agreed upon between the WPL and the PrC.

Minutes of the meetings are recorded in the Minutes of Meeting template (Template "Edu4ALL_WP3_D3.1.4.docx"). Project meetings and other meetings and workshops are evaluated by the participants. The host organization is responsible for writing and distributing

the meeting minutes, and collecting modifications, if any, from the participants within one week after the meeting. The WP3 leader will then evaluate the meeting using the Project Meeting and Workshop Evaluation form (PQAF-PE). To make sure about the evaluation of all the held meetings, the host organization is responsible to inform the WP3 leader about all the meetings that are going to be held.

Edu4ALL website and its Web pages are also evaluated by the participants. After they are launched, their evaluation is mainly made with the use of the PQAF-WQ (Website Questionnaire form) reporting template and the general objectives of the project.

Once the document is amended (if needed), its revised version is sent by the WPL to all members of the consortium. This procedure can last one-week maximum and the WPL is responsible for any changes or additions to the document.

In case the WPL considers the suggested improvements (by the reviewer(s)) as not relevant s/he has to present his reasons to the respective evaluator and ask for agreement.

The document that is finally approved takes the status of "final version/version 1" and is included by the PrC in the formal progress report/s of the project. WPL is also responsible to collect the PQAF-DE from all the partners and submit it to the PrC.

### 4.4.3.2.    External evaluation

Edu4ALL project includes some deliverables/WP results that are addressed to people out of the core of the consortium. These deliverables/results of the WPs and subtasks undergo an external evaluation. The specifics of the external evaluation, as regards the tools used, the reviewer, the dates of review, the indicator(s), etc., are described in the PQAF-WP form.

The evaluators of these activities are: staff, lecturers, teachers, students with disabilities, and administrators of the universities that are trained in competency-based learning that attend the training and dissemination activities (conferences, seminars, workshops); and an experienced external evaluator (subcontracted) with a large experience in TEMPUS and Erasmus+ projects In general, the evaluation is done by beneficiaries of the activities (including the students with disabilities), which are asked to evaluate them by answering specific questions using the PQAF-TE (Training Evaluation), PQAF-EE (Event Evaluation), and PQAF-VE (Visits Evaluation) forms, respectively. The responsible for distributing and collecting these forms from the participants and sending them to the PrC is the WP3 leader. To make sure about the evaluation of all the held trainings, events and visits, the host organization is responsible to inform the WP3 leader about all the activities that are going to be held.

#### 4.4.3.2.1.    Elaboration of the questionnaires

The questionnaires consist mostly of questions that can be answered with the aid of:

a) a five points rating scale, where 1 is poor and 5 is very good and
b) choosing and combining questions shown in Template "Edu4ALL_WP3_D3.1.3.docx".

The elaboration of the answers to the questionnaires is made by the WP/subtask leader and circulated to the members of the consortium.

The formula for the evaluation of results rated with the five-point scale is the following

$$[(1*a + 2*b + 3*c + 4*d + 5*e)/(5\,(a+b+c+d+e))] * 100 \quad [\%]$$

Where:

a, b, c, d, and e are the numbers of questionnaires that rated the activity with 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 respectively.

The activity is considered successful if the percentage of satisfaction is more than 75%. In case the percentage of satisfaction is less than 75%, the WPL proposes proper corrective actions (repetition of activity, distribution of more training or informative material, improvements of the database and the website, etc.) in agreement with the PrC.

### 4.4.3.2.2. Elaboration of the procedures

The procedures employed in the Edu4ALL project should be expressed in terms of several steps to complete. The elaboration of the procedures is made by the WP/subtask leader and circulated to the members of the consortium.

Template "Edu4ALL_WP3_D3.1.7.docx" can be used in order to express the purpose of the procedure and the steps to follow for having it completed.

## 4.5. General Quality Issues

### 4.5.1. Document Control

This section describes the control system for preparing, reviewing, approving, distributing, revising and updating documents that are required for the Quality Plan of Edu4ALL project. These documents include but are not limited to the following:

1. Quality Plan (QP)
2. Quality forms (see Annexes section) (also included in the "Templates/Quality Plan Templates/Consolidated/Final versions" folder) (PQAF-WP, PQAF-DE, PQAF-PE, etc.)
3. Minutes of the meetings
4. Reports on deliverables/results of WPs
5. Progress reports
6. External documents like the Erasmus+ programme guide or other instructions by the National Agencies from PS and JO or the European Commission, the partnership agreements (PA) between the PrC and the partners, etc.

The WP3 Leader is responsible for drafting and issuing the QP and the Quality forms (see Annexes section) included in the "Templates/ Quality Plan Templates/Consolidated/Final versions" folder. The partners who are responsible for the review of the above documents are those mentioned in the PQAF-WP.

All the internal documents (except quality forms) are drafted using document templates "Edu4ALL_WP3_D3.1.1.docx",
"Edu4ALL_WP3_D3.1.2.docx",
"Edu4ALL_WP3_D3.1.3.docx",
"Edu4ALL_WP3_D3.1.4.docx",
"Edu4ALL_WP3_D3.1.5.pptx",
"Edu4ALL_WP3_D3.1.6.xlsx", and
"Edu4ALL_WP3_D3.1.7.docx".

Quality forms are drafted using the PQAF-QT (Quality Template).

Draft versions are numbered with 0.1, 0.2, etc. in order to be distinguished from the released versions which are numbered with 1, 2, etc.

**Edu4ALL D3.1. Defining the quality framework for the project**

### 4.5.1.1. Revision of documents

Responsible for the revision of the different documents are the respective WPLs who are also responsible for distributing to all partners the last approved version of each document.

The first version of the documents (0.1) is sent to all partners who have 15 days to submit their comments. The WPL makes the necessary amendments and issues the second version (0.2) which is also distributed to all partners. If no comments are received in 7 days, this second version is considered final and takes the number 1.0.

The last approved version (controlled copy) of Edu4ALL documents is also uploaded to the web-based collaboration platform (Dropbox) by the WPL who is also responsible for its substitution in case of revision (new version). Responsible for the approval of the final version is the PrC.

External documents that are not available on the web-based platform are properly collected, handled and maintained by the PrC correspondingly.

### 4.5.1.2. Abbreviation System for the naming of documents

The abbreviation system for the naming of Quality Plan documentation is as follows:

Edu4ALL_WP#_PQAF-abbreviation_Title_version.extension

where WP# has to reference the number of the WP. Abbreviation has to express the type of evaluation: WP-Work Packages Monitoring; DE-Deliverable Evaluation; PE-Project Meeting and Workshop Evaluation; WQ-Website Questionnaire; TE-Training Evaluation; EE-Event Evaluation; VE-Staff Visits Evaluation; QT-Quality Template; and PQ-Project Quality Assessment. Title gives information to identify the document and version refers to the version. Extension should be .docx for working versions and .pdf for final versions.
e.g The Deliverable D1.1 evaluation should be named Edu4ALL_WP1_PQAF-DE_Deliverable1.1_v0.1.docx

The abbreviation system for the naming of general documentation is as follows:

Edu4ALL_WP#_type_Identifier/title_version.extension

where:

· **WP#:** indicates the WP number (#: 1-5);

· **type:** is a character indicating the type of document:

Table 1. List of type of documents and their suggested templates

| Type of document | Suggested template (see "Templates/General documentation templates/Consolidated/Final versions" folder) |
|---|---|
| D = Deliverable | Edu4ALL_WP3_D3.1.1.docx |

| R = Report | Edu4ALL_WP3_D3.1.2.docx |
|---|---|
| Q = Questionnaire | Edu4ALL_WP3_D3.1.3.docx |
| M = Minutes of Meeting | Edu4ALL_WP3_D3.1.4.docx |
| PP = Presentation (PowerPoint) | Edu4ALL_WP3_D3.1.5.pptx |
| E = Excel file | Edu4ALL_WP3_D3.1.6.xlsx |
| P = Procedure | Edu4ALL_WP3_D3.1.7.docx |
| T = Training/Teaching material (courses) | Edu4ALL_WP3_D3.1.1.docx, Edu4ALL_WP3_D3.1.5.pptx, or Edu4ALL_WP3_D3.1.6.xlsx |
| S = Service/Product | Edu4ALL_WP3_D3.1.1.docx or Edu4ALL_WP3_D3.1.2.docx |
| A = Assignment | Edu4ALL_WP3_D3.1.1.docx or Edu4ALL_WP3_D3.1.2.docx |
| O = Others | It depends |

· **Identifier/title:** If a Deliverable, an alphanumeric code up to six characters to identify each document (e.g. D4.1 for Deliverable 1 in WP4). Otherwise, this code is not needed and a title is used instead.

· **version:** Please see last paragraph of Section 4.5.1.

· **extension:** .docx for MS Word™ format, .pptx for MS Power Point™, .xlsx for MS Excel™, .pdf for final versions.

e.g. The first draft for the first deliverable in WP3 should be named Edu4ALL_WP3_D_D3.1_v0.1.docx.

All the documents of Edu4ALL are elaborated in MS Word™ format (or equivalent) for documents, MS Excel™ format (or equivalent) for spreadsheets and MS Power Point™ (or equivalent) format for presentations. For questionnaires that are circulated to the partners of the project, the google forms tool can be used.

It is important to keep all the versions of the documents in the common collaboration space. If another version of a document that already exists is created, it must be saved as a new version, rather than modifying the one that already exists.

### 4.5.1.3.    Documents for public use

Documents or other material that is addressed to the public (informative material, brochures, leaflets, posters, presentations, DVDs, etc.) must bear:

**Edu4ALL D3.1. Defining the quality framework for the project**

- The logo of Edu4ALL project
- The logo of Erasmus+
- The title and reference number of the project
- The following disclaimer:

> *"The publication reflects only the author's view, and the Agency and the Commission are not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.".*

The same logos and disclaimer are also mentioned on the website of the project as well as on any other social network page (Facebook, Twitter, etc.).

#### 4.5.1.4. Master List of Quality Plan Forms

Table 2. Master list of quality plan forms

| Abbreviation | Full name of the document | Suggested template (see see Annexes section) |
|---|---|---|
| **QP** | **Q**uality **P**lan | - |
| **PQAF-WP** | **W**ork **P**ackages Monitoring | Edu4ALL_WP3_D3.1.8.docx |
| **PQAF-DE** | **D**eliverable **E**valuation Sheet | Edu4ALL_WP3_D3.1.9.docx |
| **PQAF-PE** | **P**roject Meeting and Workshop **E**valuation | Edu4ALL_WP3_D3.1.10.docx |
| **PQAF-WQ** | **W**ebsite **Q**uestionnaire | Edu4ALL_WP3_D3.1.11.docx |
| **PQAF-TE** | **T**raining **E**valuation Sheet | Edu4ALL_WP3_D3.1.12.docx |
| **PQAF-EE** | **E**vent **E**valuation Sheet | Edu4ALL_WP3_D3.1.13.docx |
| **PQAF-VE** | Staff **V**isits **E**valuation | Edu4ALL_WP3_D3.1.14.docx |
| **PQAF-QT** | **Q**uality **T**emplate | Edu4ALL_WP3_D3.1.15.docx |
| **PQAF-PQ** | **P**roject **Q**uality Assessment | Edu4ALL_WP3_D3.1.16.docx |

#### 4.5.2. Communication

Communication between the members of the consortium, between the PrC and the National Agency and between the PrC and the EC is very crucial for the successful implementation of Edu4ALL project.

Day by day communication is conducted by e-mail, telephone conversations and Zoom and/or Google Meet meetings when deemed necessary. For the avoidance of any confusion, special attention is paid to the clear drafting of the subject of the e-mail.

In general, all information relevant to the project is sent to the PrC, who then forwards it to the partners involved in the specific action(s). Each WPL also communicates the WP results to all partners during transnational meetings and via the web platform.

Direct partner/partner communications flows are set up in those cases where an increase in efficiency can be achieved.

Dropbox, a web-based collaboration platform, is implemented by the PrC. This Internet site is secured and enables the consortium to have a very efficient diffusion of the information

connected to the release of minutes, deliverables, reports, results and exchanges between partners.

External communication with the National Agency for Erasmus+ and with the European Commission is the responsibility of the PrC. This communication takes place mainly by e-mail, telephone conversations and face-to-face discussions when it is needed.

## 4.6. Reporting

Each WPL is responsible for reporting the progress of the specific WP every six months and at the end of the WP by sending the report to the PrC. The progress of the WP is also presented during the every-six-month meetings of the consortium. The same stands for the mid-term and final reporting.

Partners are asked every six months by the PrC to do a general project evaluation. This evaluation is done by the Project Quality Assessment form – Project Quality (PQAF-PQ).

The PrC consolidates the progress reports as well as the detailed mid-term and final reports and distributes these to all consortium partners and to the European Commission.

Reports using the progress report template (Template "Edu4ALL_WP3_D3.1.2.docx") are drafted and distributed for review to all partners of the consortium according to Section 4.5.1. (Document control).

The PrC is responsible for the approval of WPs progress reports. The SC is responsible for the approval within six months, mid-term and final reports.

## 4.7. Methodological Approach

In this section, the specific evaluation and QA procedures planned in Edu4ALL are presented. The table below shows the activities, tools/deliverables, responsibilities and schedule related to quality management.

All partners are responsible for implementing the quality procedures expressed in this document as well as supporting the implementation of activities for QA.

Table 3. Edu4ALL activities, schedule and responsibilities for QA

| Edu4ALL activities, schedule and responsibilities for QA | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Activity** | **Description of activity** | **Tools and deliverables** | **Responsible partner/s** | **Timeline/Deadlines** |
| Defining the quality framework for the project | It will define and/or adopt a set of evaluation tools, including questionnaires, virtual meetings, impact assessment. These tools will be used by project partners and involved stakeholders for collecting feedback and reviewing project activities and outputs. It will also define a set of procedures for defining sub- | - A set of procedures for defining sub-objectives within each WP to ensure measurable progress, reported in regular WP leads committee meetings, for more | UPV/EHU | M5 of the project. |

| | objectives within each WP to ensure measurable progress, reported in regular WP leads committee meetings, for more effective project monitoring. These will include a set of specification templates for WP results including courses, assignments, and reports. | effective project monitoring.<br><br>- A set of specification templates for WP results including courses, assignments, and reports (see Table 1). | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Implementing the project quality assurance control process | To ensure quality assurance control process in place, this activity will implement a quality review process within the project, where WP results must undergo an internal review process within the consortium, before submission to the EC. Reviewers will be selected from the participating partners of this work package. The quality review process will ensure WP results are produced to meet a professional standard and use the correct templates defined in the QP in 3.1. | - Quality assurance control process establishment.<br><br>- Quality assurance control process adjustments. | UPV/EHU | M12, M24 and M36 of the project. |
| Generation of project quality reports | Two project quality assurance, intermediate and final, reports will be produced, coinciding with the project management reports. These reports will summarise the followed QA process, faced obstacles or difficulties and recommendations for improvements. | - Intermediate project QA report.<br><br>- Final project QA report. | UPV/EHU | M24 and M36 of the project. |

## 4.8. Quality Assurance Tools and Matrix

The following table lists the tools to be used for supporting the quality management implementation in the project and the purpose or use of each tool.

Table 4. Lists of the tools to be used for quality management implementation

| Tool Name | Tool Purpose/Use |
|---|---|
| Project General Templates | Supports writing the Edu4ALL results. |
| Quality Management Templates | Supports writing the Edu4ALL QP |

| | |
|---|---|
| Edu4ALL project's web site | Informs about activities and outcomes of the Edu4ALL QP |
| Communication tools (Zoom or Google Meet meetings, Dropbox for document sharing) | Facilitates communication between project partners on quality control and QA issues. |

The expected results, their impact and the way they are being achieved are listed below:

Table 5. List of expected results, their impact, and the way they are being achieved

| Project results | Impact (national/regional level) | How? |
|---|---|---|
| A Quality framework for the project that can also be used after the end of the project to evaluate the running Edu4Aall at both PCs | Regional | It will define and/or adopt a set of evaluation tools, (questionnaires, virtual meetings, impact assessment, etc) for project partners and involved stakeholders to collect feedback and review project activities and outputs. It will also define a set of procedures for defining sub-objectives within each WP to ensure measurable progress, reported in regular WP leads committee meetings, for more effective project monitoring. These will include a set of specification templates for WP results including courses, assignments, and reports (see Table 1). |
| Reports about the project quality assurance control process | Regional | To ensure quality assurance control process in place where WP results must undergo an internal review process within the consortium before submission to the EC. Reviewers will be selected from the participating partners of this work package. The quality review process will ensure WP results are produced to meet a professional standard and use the correct templates defined in the QP |

**Edu4ALL D3.1. Defining the quality framework for the project**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| The project quality reports | Regional | Two project quality assurance, intermediate and final, reports will be produced, coinciding with the project management reports. These reports will summarise the followed QA process, faced obstacles or difficulties and recommendations for improvements. |

# 5 Annexes

## 5.1 Annex "Work Packages Monitoring Template (PQAF-WP)"

| Work Package | Subtask | Deliverable | Start date | End date | WP leader | Partner(s) involved | Type of Review (Internal/ External) | Date of review | Indicator(s) | Tools | Reviewer | Status (open/done) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |

## 5.2 Annex "Deliverable Evaluation Sheet (PQAF-DE)"

| Work Package | |
|---|---|
| Deliverable Title | |
| Work Package Leader | |
| Reviewed by | Name of reviewer(s), Organisation(s) |
| Date of Review | dd/mm/yyyy |

# Assessment of Deliverables by the Reviewer

Mark with X the appropriate column (Y: Yes - N: No -    NA: Not applicable)

| A.    Format | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Y | N | NA | Comments |
| Does the document contain: WP number, Deliverable name, Version, Author Name and Date? | | | | |
| Does the document contain all the necessary official logos of the project and the program? | | | | |
| Does the document include a Table of Contents? | | | | |
| Does the document include a list of participants? | | | | |
| Does the document use the fonts and paragraphs defined in the official template? | | | | |
| Are there other remarks about the format of the document (spelling, grammar, etc)? | | | | |

Answer each question with an evaluation from 1-5, where 1 is Poor and 5 is Very Good.

| B.    Contents | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| The clarity of the contents of the document is evaluated as… | | | | | |
| How does the content of the document match the description in the Application Form? | | | | | |
| How is the treatment of the contents of the document regarding the required depth? | | | | | |
| Does the document need the addition of sections to reach completeness (YES/NO)? | | | | | |
| Are there any sections in the document that should be removed (YES/NO)? | | | | | |

1. **Suggested improvements** (add rows as needed)

| Page No. | Section | Suggested Improvement |
|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

2. **Any other observations** (e.g. minor corrections that need attention - add rows as needed)

| Page No. | Section | Observations |
|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

3. **Conclusion** (Mark with X the appropriate line)

| | |
|---|---|
| **Document accepted; no changes required** |  |
| **Document accepted but changes required** |  |
| **Document not accepted; it must be reviewed after changes are implemented** |  |

**Edu4ALL D3.1. Defining the quality framework for the project**

*5.3   Annex "Project Meeting and Workshop Evaluation (PQAF-PE)"*

| | |
|---|---|
| **Work Package** | |
| **Meeting/Workshop** | |
| **Date(s)** | |
| **Hosting Partner: (if applicable)** | DD/MM/YYYY – DD/MM/YYYY |
| **Location: (if applicable)** | |

Answer each question with an evaluation from 1-5, based on your agreement level

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Undecided / Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |

| **1 Meeting Organization** | | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Communication with the host partner (received response on time of any inquiry about travel, accommodation etc.) was effective | | | | | |
| 2. | Information received about the organization of the meeting (location, timing, agenda, etc.) was sufficient | | | | | |
| 3. | General organization during the meeting was appropriate | | | | | |
| 4. | Duration of the meeting was appropriate | | | | | |
| 5. | Timing of the meeting was appropriate (started on time, ended on time) | | | | | |
| 6. | Domestic arrangements (accommodation, meals, meeting location etc.) were convenient | | | | | |
| **Comments, suggestions for improving next meeting** | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| **2 Meeting Contents & Objectives Fulfillment** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| 1. | The subjects discussed were relevant and focused on the objectives of the project | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2. | The activities were relevant and focused on the objectives of the project | | | | | |
| 3. | The meeting followed the planned agenda | | | | | |
| 4. | The meeting facilitated understanding of the objectives and work plan for the next period | | | | | |
| 5. | The meeting fulfilled the established objectives | | | | | |
| Comments, suggestions for improving next meeting | | | | | | |

| 3 Project Partnership and Communication | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | All the partners were committed to the project and contributed to the meeting (were prepared for the meeting, shared responsibility for the meeting) | | | | | |
| 2. | The communication among partners was effective | | | | | |
| 3. | The partners have fulfilled the assigned tasks of the project and appropriately presented the results in the meeting (quality of the presentations, consider other partners contributions) | | | | | |
| Comments, suggestions for improving next meeting | | | | | | |

| 4 Project Management & Coordination | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | The information (on tasks, materials for the meeting etc.) received before the meeting from the coordinator was sufficient | | | | | |
| 2. | The coordinator facilitated understanding the objectives, work plan and tasks for the next period | | | | | |
| 3. | The coordinator facilitates communication and collaboration between partners. Everyone was **encouraged to contribute to discussion.** | | | | | |

| 4. | The tasks and deadlines for the next period are clear for each partner | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Comments, suggestions for improving next meeting** | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| 5 Overall Impression | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | I have a clear understanding of the tasks and deadlines assigned for the next period | | | | | |
| 2. | The meeting fulfilled my personal expectations | | | | | |
| **Please write at least two strengths (positive aspects) and at least two weaknesses (negative aspects) of this project meeting.** | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| **Comments, suggestions for improving next meeting** | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

**Edu4ALL D3.1. Defining the quality framework for the project**

## 5.4   Annex "Website Questionnaire (PQAF-WQ)"

| Work Package | |
|---|---|
| **Date** | |
| **Your name (not compulsory)** | |
| **Your company/organisation (not compulsory)** | |

Answer each question with an evaluation from 1-5, where 1 is Poor and 5 is Very Good.

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **What is your opinion of the general user friendliness of the website?** | | | | | |
| **What is your opinion about the quality and sufficiency of the information provided by the database?** | | | | | |
| **Did you find the use of the website useful?** | | | | | |
| **To which extent did the use of the website live up to your expectations?** | | | | | |
| **How valuable was your visit to the website for your professional growth?** | | | | | |
| **Would you recommend visiting the website to somebody else (YES/NO)?** | | | | | |

| Comments: |
|---|
| |

**Edu4ALL D3.1. Defining the quality framework for the project**

## 5.5   Annex "Training Evaluation Sheet (PQAF-TE)"

| Work Package | |
|---|---|
| Training | |
| Date | |
| Your name (not compulsory) | |
| Your company/organisation (not compulsory) | |

Answer each question with an evaluation from 1-5, where 1 is Poor and 5 is Very Good.

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **What is your opinion of the general organization and facilities of the training session?** | | | | | |
| **To which extent did the training/info session live up to your expectations?** | | | | | |
| **What is your opinion of the Trainers?** | | | | | |
| **How do you evaluate the relevance and clarity of the topics of the training session?** | | | | | |
| **How do you evaluate the technical resources used?** | | | | | |
| **How effective do you think was the methodology used?** | | | | | |
| **How useful was the training material used?** | | | | | |
| **How valuable was the training for your professional growth?** | | | | | |
| **Would you recommend this session to somebody else (YES/NO)?** | | | | | |

| **Which topics were not covered?** |
|---|
| |
| **Which items were not relevant?** |
| |
| **Are you interested in other themes or topics, other events or seminars? Which ones?** |
| |

**Edu4ALL D3.1. Defining the quality framework for the project**

*5.6 Annex "Event Evaluation Sheet (PQAF-EE)"*

| Work Package | |
|---|---|
| Meeting/Event | |
| Date | |

Answer each question with an evaluation from 1-5, where 1 is Poor and 5 is Very Good.

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **What is your opinion of the general organization and facilities of the meeting/event?** | | | | | |
| **To which extent did the meeting/event live up to your expectations?** | | | | | |
| **What is your opinion of the presenters/facilitators?** | | | | | |
| **What is your opinion of the material that was distributed before or during the meeting/event?** | | | | | |
| **How do you evaluate the agenda of the meeting/event?** | | | | | |
| **How do you evaluate the technical resources used?** | | | | | |
| **How effective do you think was the methodologies used?** | | | | | |
| **How useful was the meeting/event?** | | | | | |
| **How valuable was the event for your professional growth? (only applicable for events)** | | | | | |
| **How satisfied are you from the level of participation to the event proceedings? (only applicable for events)** | | | | | |
| **Do you feel that the targets of the meeting/event have been fulfilled?** | | | | | |

**Edu4ALL D3.1. Defining the quality framework for the project**

## 5.7  Annex "Staff Visits Evaluation (PQAF-VE)"

**Instructions: Please give your answers or comments in writing or indicate the extent to which you gained confidence in the topics you learnt in the mobility to the EU/PC host. The scale is 1-5**

**Date …./……./……..**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Units Staff Name ………………….…… Organization Name: …………………..** | **Host Institute Country:** |
| **Organization Place:** | |
| **Type of Organization:** 1. Research    2. Public organization    3. Private    4. Other…………………..….. | |
| **Section one: units staff background** | |
| **1.** | **What are the most useful activities/ visits you had during your stay in the EU/PC hosts? Why?** |
| **2.** | **What are the least useful activities/ visits you had during your stay in the EU/PC hosts? Why?** |
| **3.** | **List the most useful lesson learned** |
| **4.** | **How was the study visit useful to your work? What type of knowledge you will take back home?** |

| |
|---|
| **Section two: To what extent did you gain confidence in the following topics you learnt?** |

**Edu4ALL D3.1. Defining the quality framework for the project**

| Background | | Not at all | Not well | Neutral | Well | Very well |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | (To be defined) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. | (To be defined) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. | (To be defined) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. | (To be defined) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. | Other (please specify) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

| Section three: the host institute environment | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Not at all | Not well | Neutral | Well | Very well |
| 1. | The training was suitable and in good environment | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. | The study visits were relevant and useful | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. | The people we met during the visit were of great value added. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. | What were the biggest obstacles and problems? | | | | | |
| 6. | Your suggestions for improvements: | | | | | |

## 5.8    Annex "Quality Template (PQAF-QT)"

### 5.9 Annex "Project Quality Assessment (PQAF-PQ)"

| Date of Assessment | |
|---|---|
| Assessment made by | |

Answer each question with an evaluation from 1-5, where 1 is Poor and 5 is Very Good.

| Performance Indicators/Issues to be addressed | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **How do you evaluate….** | | | | | | |
| 1. | **The extent to which the consortium commits time and resources as required by the Work Plan?** | | | | | |
| 2. | **The consortium's efficiency to resolve problems?** | | | | | |
| 3. | **The effectiveness and clarity of the communication among the partners and the PC?** | | | | | |
| 4. | **The effectiveness and clarity of communication with other agencies e.g. the National Agency, EEA Grants Managing Authority?** | | | | | |
| 5. | **The commitment and proportionate involvement of all partners?** | | | | | |
| 6. | **The arrangements for the implementation of the work packages and the administration of budgets?** | | | | | |
| 7. | **The effectiveness of the project co-ordination?** | | | | | |
| 8. | **The professional competence and commitment displayed by the PC?** | | | | | |
| 9. | **The quality of the relationship among the partners and team-development?** | | | | | |
| 10. | **The quality of the project monitoring and evaluation processes?** | | | | | |
| 11. | **The quality of the project information/results dissemination arrangements?** | | | | | |
| 12. | **The adherence to the Work Plan by all partners?** | | | | | |
| 13. | **The deviations from the Work Plan? If any, were they based on well-considered reasons and mutual agreement?** | | | | | |

**Edu4ALL D3.1. Defining the quality framework for the project**

| | Performance Indicators/Issues to be addressed | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 14. | The quality of the project in terms of its short, medium- and long-term impact at local/regional/national/European level? | | | | | |
| 15. | The quality of materials/guides/reports/products throughout the life-cycle of the project? | | | | | |
| 16. | The support from within your partner organization, in terms of managerial support, specialized support or peer support? | | | | | |
| 17. | The sufficiency, range and suitability of project resources, including, where appropriate, technology resources? | | | | | |
| 18. | The sharing of resources/expertise amongst transnational partners? | | | | | |
| 19. | The extent to which technology and other resources are used effectively and innovatively? | | | | | |
| 20. | The link between project workplan and cost-effective use of resources? | | | | | |