



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union



TIEREF

“Towards Inclusive Education For Refugee Children” (TIEREF)

Erasmus+ programme

Key Action 3: Support for policy reform - Social inclusion through education, training
and youth

Project number: 592142-EPP-1-2017-1-TR-EPPKA3-IPI-SOC-IN

WP 2: Quality assurance

Del.2.1

QUALITY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

Author:

Inspectoratul Școlar Județean Dolj, Romania



Table of Contents

1	Introduction.....	3
1.1	WP3 Quality.....	3
1.2	General project quality assurance	3
1.3	Responsibility	5
2	Quality Strategy – Qualitative and Quantitative Criteria.....	6
3	Process quality.....	10
3.1	Management.....	10
3.2	Communication.....	16
3.3	Project data flow	17
3.4	The testing phase.....	18
3.5	Pilot implementation.....	20
3.6	Mainstreaming	22
3.7	Exploitation and dissemination.....	23
3.8	Impact and sustainability	26
4	Product quality.....	30
5	How the quality assessment will be carried out	34
5.1	Quality control will be carried out as it follows:	34
5.2	Assessment criteria	34
5.3	Assessment indicators	34
5.4	Instruments for quality assessment.....	35
5.5	Compliance of the quality assurance to the project risk management.....	35



1 Introduction

1.1 WP3 Quality

The work package is aimed at establishing criteria, tools and procedures for ensuring the Quality Management System, which will be deployed by all the partners. It is also aimed at the actual implementation of the stated quality control in line with the underlined strategies, the scheduled deliverables, and the budget.

All the project activities and outputs are subject to evaluation in work package 3, while the quality assurance is aimed at establishing quality control in terms of both process and outcomes. It includes quality policies, responsibilities, processes and activities to meet the needs of the project and achieve its objectives.

All project activities and outputs will be subject to. Qualitative and quantitative data will be taken into account.

A Quality Report will be delivered by the WP leader at the end of the project, summing up all formal and informal evaluation exercises carried out by the partners, as well as by users and stakeholders, and containing a summative evaluation of the quality of the project.

Quality in context of TIREF project involves planning, implementing, monitoring, reviewing and evaluating to ensure the project quality standards.

1.2 General project quality assurance

The quality strategy requires the application of a rigorous quality control of the entire project process and outcomes, using a variety of approaches.

For most project coordinators the process of evaluating a European Erasmus + Key Action 3: Support for policy reform - Social inclusion through education, training and youth project begins as they construct their application for funding and make their bid to the EACEA and the European Commission. However, for many projects the real implementation of a quality strategy began at the kick-off meeting. This was also the case



for TIEREF, the quality strategy plan has been initiated during the kick-off which was held in Istanbul, Turkey.

The QUALITY ASSURANCE activity is meant to be an ongoing process, aimed at facilitating a common understanding and agreement of key project issues such as the formulation of user requirements, the definition of project objectives, roles and responsibilities, critical success factors, risks, constraints and organisational impact.

The WP leader and partners will assess the project quality plans and monitoring their execution, for measuring user satisfaction, determining the acceptance criteria for project deliverables by assessing deliverables against these criteria. The direct impact of the QUALITY ASSURANCE will be the improvement of the quality of project deliverables, in terms of compliance with project specifications and user satisfaction.

The WP2 Quality assurance comprises 2 main *Outputs*:

2.1 Quality plan

2.2 Internal quality assurance reports.

THE QUALITY PLAN

This plan describes the unique requirements of this project and its application throughout the project lifecycle. This plan will also be the prescribed mechanism for the quality compliance throughout the project.

The Project Quality Plan documents the necessary information required to effectively manage the project quality from project planning to delivery. It defines a project's quality policies, procedures, criteria for and areas of application, together with roles, responsibilities and authorities.

The Project Quality Plan's intended audience is the project manager, project team and any stakeholder whose support is needed to carry out the plan.

The regular monitoring of the application of the Quality Plan is carried out through actions, comprising such as: verification of documents, participation in reviews, follow-up of corrective actions and analysis of quality indicators. These roles will be performed throughout the project lifecycle.



The internal QUALITY ASSURANCE REPORTS will be issued every 6 month or more frequently, should it be necessary, and are in direct relation with the main aspects the project concerns.

In the context of TIREF European project work, quality assurance is a process that:

- guarantees the targets have been met;
- enables results improvement, based upon the conclusions/judgements made about the value and quality of the project;
- facilitates decision-making and assistance with fundamental changes in the project, should these be necessary.

1.3 Responsibility

WP2-1 Production and implementation of quality assurance will be led by Inspectoratul Școlar Județean Dolj, Romania and implemented together with all the partners.

The quality of the project's activities and results will permanently and continuously be monitored and evaluated by the coordinator, the local project managers or the quality assurance responsible team members.

Partners will be continuously updated on the status of the project. All the staff will be involved in the creation and implementation of changes. The progress and the plan of action will be discussed during meetings.

During the process, all data related to the quality of the project (collected) will be collected by distributing surveys, questionnaires, etc. and the planning, monitoring and evaluating quality will be reviewed, should it be necessary. Corrective measures will be envisaged upon the conclusions of the reports to ensure the quality measures foreseen are met.



2 Quality Strategy – Qualitative and Quantitative Criteria

The quality strategy of the “TIEREF” project will be conducted in three main phases:

- **Quality plan**

A quality plan will be created by the WP leader to guarantee the equal attainment of the quality standards by all partners throughout the project implementation.

- **Quality assurance**

The quality assurance plan assures that the quality assurance, measures the predefined indicators with regards to: project outputs, iterative testing, pilot implementation, dissemination, mainstreaming, exploitation and sustainability. It will be changed according to the requirement of the partners, and will be complementary to WP3.

- **Quality control**

A quality control system will be implemented for all the main aspects of the project to assess the process and the products, to identify possible risks and make readjustments, if necessary.

Aims of the quality strategy:

- To support the project and acts as a thorough internal and external check/review on whether the targets, indicators, results, impact have been met;
- To facilitate result–improvement, based upon the data analysis and the conclusions regarding the value and quality of the project;
- To underline the project progress and achievements of the envisaged deliverables
- To measure the impact
- To measure the compliance with the initial project specifications, to identify the possible deviations from the expected results and to suggest necessary solutions
- To implement an assessment approach, which includes the evaluation of the development of project outputs, evaluation of the dissemination/impact of the project outputs, observation of partners’ meetings and identification of possible risk factors and recommendations for improvements.



-
- To measure the effectiveness of the seven transnational partners meetings: Kick off meeting - Istanbul, TR M1 (P1); Second TSN meeting - Plovdiv, BG, M6 (P3); Third TSN meeting - Craiova, RO, M13 (P8); Fourth TSN meeting - Trikala, GR, M19 (P7); Fifth TSN meeting - Bari, IT, M25 (P6); Sixth TSN meeting - Dangavpils, LV, M31 (P5); Final TSN meeting - Istanbul, TR, M36 (P2)
 - To build on and draw together quality management procedures embodied in all intellectual outputs.

Envisaged results:

- Production of the quality assurance plan
- Ongoing implementation of the quality plan
- Measurement of the degree of user satisfaction and impact achieved in terms of project target groups at partners' countries and on EU level
- Accomplishment of the process, deliverables and outputs at the commonly accepted quality level.

During the quality insurance process the following indicators will be used:

- MST 1. Attainment of the project aims and objectives according to the submitted form.
- MST 2. Level of communication among partners
- MST 3. Effectiveness of management and leadership.
- MST 4. Level of cooperation in the partnership.
- MST 5. Innovation on sectoral and higher systematic levels.
- MST 6. Deadline meeting.
- MST 7. Accomplishment of the foreseen impact.
- MST 8. Measures taken and achieved sustainability
- MST 9. Level of the target groups involvement during all project stages.
- MST 10. Achieved European policy added-value and contribution
- MST 11. Efficiency of the dissemination and exploitation activities.



WP2 Quality assurance

Activities

WP2/A1 Production and implementation of quality assurance plan and measures – lead by P8 + contribution by all partners.

WP2/A2 Monthly reviews of progress against the work programme – lead by P1 + contribution by all partners. Peer review on regular base by all partners

WP2/A3 Ongoing participation in the quality assurance measures according to predefined indicators with regards to the project outputs during their production, iterative testing, pilot implementation, dissemination, mainstreaming, exploitation and sustainability – by all partners

WP2/A4 Regular reviews of progress and gathering structured and concise feedback by the members of the NEAC – by all partners

WP2/A5 Impact assessment based on logical framework indicators – lead by P1 + contribution by all partners.

The “TIEREF” quality assurance strategy will be based on different steps whose aims are to answer the following questions:

- “Why” is quality assurance necessary?
- “Who” will be benefit from implementing quality measures?
- “What has to be evaluated and on the basis of what criteria?
- “Who” will provide the required information and data?
- “How” will the quality activities be conducted?
- “When” will the quality activities be conducted?
- “How” will the outcomes of the quality process be used?



These are the necessary questions to be made before starting the assessment process and choosing the tools, items and methods for the “TIEREF” project. Three main areas of quality implementation have already been identified:

- At Process Level,
- At Output Level and
- At Impact Level.



3 Process quality

The quality of the project requires, first, the identification of the processes to keep under control during the project lifetime. The main activities, subject of the quality strategy according to the proposal of the “TIREF” project are:

- Project management efficiency
- Project data
- Project testing effectiveness
- Project pilot implementation
- Project mainstreaming
- Project dissemination
- Project sustainability

3.1 Management			
Target	Recommendation	Evidence – Examples – not exhaustive	Risks and mitigation strategy
Shared vision and sense of work goals	Understanding of project deliverables and intellectual outputs aims, objectives and tasks is vital to the success and sustainability of the project. The Partnership goals are assessed using performance -based indicators. The Project Coordinator should devise a detailed	Analysis of stated roles and responsibilities in partner contracts. Record keeping of the meeting minutes. Review of sharing the detailed action and communication plans.	Potential risks: - diverging views on the vision & goals -possible lack of interest of particular pedagogical staff members who are not eager to change their existing practices due to prejudice or other not inclusive factors -frequent political changes

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission (Erasmus+ Programme). This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.



3.1 Management			
Target	Recommendation	Evidence – Examples – not exhaustive	Risks and mitigation strategy
	action plan and a clear communication plan.		<p>Mitigation strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - agreement on vision and maximise involvement -any deviation be identified, the situation and the contingency measures will be clarified with the coordinator according to the project LFM.
Strong and knowledgeable teams	Human resources will be selected in each team to be relevant to the project roles and able to use their knowledge and resources to make a positive contribution to the project.	Monitoring the existence of a diagram at the level of each partner with distribution of roles and a task assignment among the team members in each team.	<p>Potential risk identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Loss of a key member of the consortium due to change of position

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission (Erasmus+ Programme). This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.



3.1 Management			
Target	Recommendation	Evidence – Examples – not exhaustive	Risks and mitigation strategy
	<p>Management and Accountability structures should be devised during the first transnational meeting. This should include clarity between the roles of Contractor and between internal quality roles.</p> <p>The roles and responsibilities should be clearly defined, explained and understood.</p>	<p>The management structure diagram, clearly outlining the roles and responsibilities should be uploaded to internal file repository.</p> <p>Checklist-organisational charts</p>	<p>Mitigation strategy:</p> <p>-close interaction with the related working groups</p>
<p>The quality of the leading organisation resulting in the good quality of outputs and outcomes</p>	<p>Unity of the management at the level of the project</p> <p>Each leading organisation, responsible for each WP is relevant for the assigned WP and has experience in managing international projects ensuring thus the</p>	<p>Checking the realisation of the Project management manual by the coordinator</p> <p>Analysis of the coordinators' CV in application.</p>	<p>Possible risk identified:</p> <p>-delays in the realisation of the project management manual</p> <p>Mitigation strategy:</p>

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission (Erasmus+ Programme). This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.



3.1 Management			
Target	Recommendation	Evidence – Examples – not exhaustive	Risks and mitigation strategy
	<p>quality of the outputs and outcomes.</p> <p>Partners should know the objectives of the intellectual outputs they are leading and offer constructive guidance to other consortium members.</p>		<p>-strengthen communication</p> <p>-immediate reporting of any issue that might impede the on time delivery</p>
A well-balanced contribution and decision making to the project	<p>Shared strategic plan with clear actions, milestones, reporting and deadlines should be adopted.</p> <p>Collaboration among partner organizations is characterized by deep trust, mutual respect, and regular and effective interaction.</p> <p>The process for partnership decision-making is</p>	<p>Clear task distribution</p> <p>Checklist- bilateral agreements with each partner, which will detail the expected contributions to each activity in each WP</p> <p>Document analysis- Signed meeting minutes as a proof of acceptance</p> <p>Reports</p>	<p>Possible risk identified:</p> <p>-difficulties in the decision-making process</p> <p>-not all the partners involved in decision making</p> <p>Mitigation strategy:</p> <p>-less emotional and more data based decisions</p>

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission (Erasmus+ Programme). This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.



3.1 Management			
Target	Recommendation	Evidence – Examples – not exhaustive	Risks and mitigation strategy
	clearly articulated and involves all partners		-involvement of all partners in the decision making process
Active participation in the local and transnational activities which increases partner satisfaction	<p>Equal participation in all, the project activities: meetings, output creation, dissemination, etc.</p> <p>The partners share responsibility for actively advocating on behalf of the partnership to gain visibility, support, and resources to support partnership goals.</p> <p>The participants will be prepared for intercultural encounters with other people with different backgrounds and cultures.</p>	<p>Checking the existence of legal documents specific to procedures filled in before and after each transnational mobility.</p>	<p>Possible risks:</p> <p>-availability of all staff members in partners organizations to support the project activities</p> <p>-unidentified milestones</p> <p>-delays in reporting</p> <p>Mitigation strategy:</p>



3.1 Management			
Target	Recommendation	Evidence – Examples – not exhaustive	Risks and mitigation strategy
	The issue of protection and safety of participants is properly addressed.		-peer review of the Gantt chart -monitoring
On time task completion	Agreed deadlines should set and task completion by the requested time should be monitored. Should any risk of delay arise, it has to be immediately reported, analysed and a new estimated date of completion suggested.	Gant chart provided to all partners Critical paths method Action plans reviewed at each meeting and circulated/uploaded on Dropbox. Reporting schedule	meeting the deadline reporting - realisation of the project activities in accordance with the call guidelines and requirements stated in the project management manual
Quality assessment and emphasizing strengths and future improvements.	Outstanding quality issues should be addressed during all partner liaisons.	Direct observation Surveys/questionnaires Reports	- strict follow-up on the project process and activities' time table



3.2 Communication			
Target	Recommendation	Evidence – Examples – not exhaustive	Risks and mitigation strategy
High quality of the communication among project partners	<p>Each partner should have a communication representative present at all transnational and virtual meetings</p> <p>A clear communication plan should be provided containing at least the purpose, the frequency and the channel of communication in order to assure good communication and avoidance of possible misunderstandings.</p> <p>.</p>	<p>The review of the Communication and Dissemination plans</p> <p>Regular check of the Synchronous communication</p>	<p>Possible risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - weak flow of communication <p>Mitigation strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -additional efforts will be made to ensure optimal communication - an agreement upon the schedule of meeting dates, times, and locations is established at the beginning of each year to support regular attendance

3.3 Project data flow			
Target	Recommendation	Evidence – Examples – not exhaustive	Risks and mitigation strategy
Accomplishment of the expected Outcomes	Agreement on performance measures that will be used to assess progress should be reached by all the partners All the partners are held responsible for accomplishing the partnership goals	Quality plan Meeting minutes	Possible risks: -delays regarding the data flow - miscommunication or cultural misunderstandings
Quality assurance though data use	Data will be collected and analysed through both formal and informal means to assess partnership effectiveness and to guide decision making leading to continuous improvement.	Surveys Questionnaires Feedback forms Reports Collection, systematisation and categorisation of the good practices results	Mitigation strategy: - structured and concise feedback by all partners -setting clear reporting deadlines



<p>Effective information flow</p>	<p>Partners share data among themselves and with Stakeholders, regularly reporting partnership progress And achievements towards the partnership goals</p>	<p>Dissemination plan Reports</p>	<p>-effective communication process set</p>
--	--	---------------------------------------	---

3.4 The testing phase

Target	Recommendation	Evidence – Examples – not exhaustive	Risks and mitigation strategy
<p>Content validation</p>	<p>It ensures the correctness against content plan, providing information regarding quality</p>	<p>proofreading</p>	<p>Possible risks: -material provided may not be of good or objective quality. - inclusive learning</p>
<p>Correction of the translation</p>	<p>The materials used should be compare with original text to make sure what is tested corresponds to the original commonly designed material</p>	<p>Translations in the partners’ languages</p>	<p>may not be regarded as a priority Mitigation strategy: -to ensure the quality of contributions</p>

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission (Erasmus+ Programme). This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.



Unique testing method and common analysis standards	Commonly used procedures and sample test plans	Common repository	received, a set of objective parameters will be defined by the consortium and will be applied to all submitted material. This will be embedded in the portal framework and will be managed by partners in each respective partner country, thus ensuring quality is maintained.
Improved learning outcomes and relevance of the materials	Analysis should be conducted to check if the materials created and the activities used are relevant for the target groups, joint reflexion.	Satisfaction surveys Peer review	
Competencies improvement	The piloting should measure the competences of the beneficiaries at the beginning and the end of the project.	Pre- and post-test	
Broad applicability of the results	The results should be made available at a larger scale to a wide range of stakeholders	Open source publications White papers	

3.5 Pilot implementation			
Target	Recommendation	Evidence – Examples – not exhaustive	Risks and mitigation strategy
Capacity building	All the project partners should empower the associated partners and the network of stakeholders to test and use the methodology	Presentations	Possible risks: -inability to complete the pilot phase in the allotted time - lack of availability of all staff members in partners organisations to support the project activities -giving up inclusive learning practices once the project ends Mitigation strategy: -continuous monitoring
On time completion of the pilot phase	All the partners should complete the piloting phase in the allotted time	Progress reports	
Size of the beneficiaries group	All the partners should deliver the pilot teaching according to the specification in the form	Report The number of participant The attendance lists	
Recognition and validation of the learning outcomes	The project ensures recognisable certification of formally and non-formally acquired competences	Certificates Europass, etc	
Ensuring quality	As part of the process, all the stakeholders should	Surveys Questionnaires	

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission (Erasmus+ Programme). This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.



<p>standards and positive recognition</p>	<p>be involved in the assessment process and act as advisors for reviewing aspects of the implementation process.</p>	<p>Open discussions/forums Peer review</p>	<p>-monthly reviews of progress against the work programme</p> <p>-immediate replacement of human resource, should any staff member be unavailable</p> <p>-on-going implementation of inclusive learning practices by the pedagogical staff beyond the project lifetime and readiness to mainstream experience to other colleagues</p>
--	---	--	--



3.6 Mainstreaming			
Target	Recommendation	Evidence – Examples – not exhaustive	Risks and mitigation strategy
Relevance of the project to the target group	The proposal involves as participants young people with fewer opportunities	Partners and associated partners list List of relevant and suitable organisations which pilot and use the project results	Possible risks: -selection of irrelevant organisations
Elimination of any kind of bias (gender, religion, etc)	All the partners should ensure equal participation of the target groups, irrespective of gender, race, religion, etc. and exploration of different topics on an equal basis, regardless of their language abilities or other skills.	Transparent selection process	Mitigation strategy: -clear implementation guidelines - correct and on time reporting by the project partners -peer review
A clear strategic mainstreaming framework	A commonly agreed mainstreaming strategy throughout the project implementation will ensure consistency and a balanced vision in implementing the	Formal and non-formal dialogue Clear implementation guidelines Body of evidence in evaluation reports	

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission (Erasmus+ Programme). This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.



	project as well as a sense of ownership of the project goals, avoiding any cultural bias and misinterpretation.		
--	---	--	--

3.7 Exploitation and dissemination			
Target	Recommendation	Evidence – Examples – not exhaustive	Risks and mitigation strategy
Visibility of the project	All actions will be undertaken in order to ensure visibility and appropriate promotion of project activities. All actions of visibility must be in accordance with EU and Erasmus + guides of visibility.	Presence of logos, project number, disclaimer and mention of the project being funded by the Erasmus + on all the project documents	Possible risks - unwillingness/impossibility of stakeholders to participate Mitigation strategy: - active participation (including time availability) of the policy
Effective dissemination of the project and its results	The strategy for regularly disseminating partnership news and progress updates in a	The dissemination plan	makers during project events, focus groups and negotiations for mainstreaming and exploitation.

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission (Erasmus+ Programme). This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.



	timely manner are in place. The project management should provide all the partners with a dissemination plan including at least the purpose of dissemination, what to disseminate, the target group and the means and channels.		<p>-active participation (including time availability) of project stakeholders and gatekeepers during all project stages.</p> <p>- engagement as much as possible of national educative authorities to ensure interest in the project activities.</p>
Multiplication of the outputs	Multiplier events should be organised to ensure the long-term perspectives of adopting the project outputs and implementing them into the current activity of various organisations after the project completion	<p>Final conference</p> <p>Exploitation seminars</p> <p>List of young people, youth workers, media, political leaders, representatives of local or regional public bodies, opinion leaders, EU decision makers involved in each partner country</p>	<p>- on-going implementation of inclusive refugee learning practices by the pedagogical staff beyond the project lifetime and readiness to mainstream experience to other colleagues.</p>



<p>Transferability of results to the target groups</p>	<p>An appropriate and effective set of measures and tools are be used to reach the target groups for dissemination</p>	<p>Dissemination plan</p>		
<p>The impact of the results use</p>	<p>Optimal use of the results at local, regional, national and/or European level. In each of the participating organisations specific and adequate resources are allocated to the dissemination activities.</p>	<p>Questionnaire</p>		
<p>Use of European Commission tools to disseminate the project</p>	<p>The project results should be made available on the European Commission platforms</p>	<p>Publication of the results on eTwinning and/or School Education Gateway</p>		



3.8 Impact and sustainability			
Target	Recommendation	Evidence – Examples – not exhaustive	Risks and mitigation strategy
Integration of the project activities in the regular activity of the partners	To ensure good quality the project work should be integrated in the regular work of the partners, if possible	Reports	Possible risks: -policy makers are in general hard to reach and convince Mitigation strategy: -white papers will be drafted by experienced writers from P1, P7 and P8, while national versions will be created, validated by local (educational) authority representatives. -gathering of impact based on
Sustainability	Succession planning and protocols should be envisaged to maintain, use, adapt and further develop the outputs of the project. The partners continually explore new opportunities to expand the partnership.	Protocols of collaboration Exploitation seminars Translations in partners languages	
Official recognition	The validation/accreditation of the project results should be sought timely	Open sources Policy recommendations	
Policy making	The partnership understands the role of influencing the policy makers. Steps should be	Protocols of collaboration Statistics: Number of Training organisations, universities/colleges, Ministry of Education,	

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission (Erasmus+ Programme). This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.



	taken to enlarge its impact upon authorities	Educational inspectorates, National Education Authorities, Regional Education Authorities reached	logical framework indicators
--	--	---	------------------------------

The project management is the most delicate process in a project insofar, as it deals with objectives, hurdles and limits, which are material and immaterial resources as well as contingencies that could not be foreseen, thus making the project deviate from the initial work plan. The following Performance Indicators have been identified:

	Quality Indicators
Project transnational meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate Logistics Agenda Content of meeting Activities Clearness of presented tasks and next steps Working atmosphere Management of meeting by the Coordinator Social programme Fulfilling the items of the Agenda (at least 80%)
Project management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transparency of Management Information flow Partners' Communication Time crisis Clearness of tasks Financial and administrative issues Development of project phases Contractual management within the partnership

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission (Erasmus+ Programme). This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.



	<p>Semi-open question on timing of reporting from partners to the Coordinator</p> <p>Open question on deviations of project implementation</p>
--	--

The following instruments were identified:

Products	Instruments	Responsible	Results
Project transnational meetings	<p>Evaluation questionnaires/feedback form</p> <p>Observation sheet</p> <p>Reports</p>	<p>ISJ Dolj</p> <p>Hosting organisation</p> <p>ZGURA-M</p> <p>External evaluator</p>	<p>Feedback form filled in</p> <p>Meeting minutes taken</p> <p>Completed report after each meeting.</p>
Project management quality assessment	<p>Progress and final reports.</p> <p>Observation Reports</p>	<p>ISJ Dolj</p> <p>Project manager</p> <p>ZGURA-M</p> <p>External evaluator</p>	<p>Dedicated section created in Progress and Final reports to achieve the documents.</p>

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission (Erasmus+ Programme). This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.



Products	Instruments	Responsible	Results
Work progress for each WP	Observation sheet Checklists	ISJ Dolj Project manager	Registered documentation



4 Product quality

Ensuring the quality of the outcomes is essential. The final products to consider as the intellectual outputs of the “TIEREF” project are:

- 1.1 Project management handbook
- 1.2 Reporting forms
- 1.3 Report on factual findings - Type
- 2.1 Quality plan
- 2.2 Internal quality assurance reports
- 3.1 Internal evaluation plan and tools
- 3.2 External evaluation reports – progress and final stage
- 4.1 Exploitation strategy
- 4.2 Exploitation agreements
- 4.3 Exploitation multiplier event – Istanbul, Turkey
- 5.1 Framework for collection and categorisation of inclusive refugee’s teaching and learning resources, methods, tools and mechanisms
- 5.2 Online tool for assessment methodology for refugee students’ prior knowledge & recognition and validation of the learning outcomes gained during the learning process
- 6.1 Peer supported learning intervention method
- 7.1 Online collaborative exchange portal and resource repository concept towards inclusive education
- 8.1 Pilot plan and impact gathering tool
- 8.2 White papers towards inclusive education for refugee/migrant children, based on the project’s outcomes and results
- 8.3 Case studies from implementers – pedagogical staff who used the inclusive learning resources
- 9.1 Dissemination strategy and awareness-raising campaign
- 9.2 Dissemination promotional materials
- 9.3 Project website www.teachref.eu



The quality of the products in TIEREF will try to answer the following questions:

- Do the envisaged products contribute to the general objective of the project?
- Are the products proportional to the objectives of the project?
- Are there any tangible products?
- Are the products substantial in quality and quantity?
- Do the outputs contain the element of innovation?
- Do the products show potential impact within the organizations and if relevant within other sectors and levels (local, regional, national) in order to exploit and to disseminate it to a wider public?
- Are the outputs made freely available and promoted through open licences?

The quality of the project outputs design will be assessed to meet the needs of the target group/sector:

Target	Recommendation	Evidence – not exhaustive
The impact of project outputs reaches all target users in all partner countries (Turkey, Bulgaria, Greece, Romania, Latvia, Italy) from the beginning of the project	Stakeholder identification should be conducted by all partners to identify targets for dissemination and exploitation of the project. This exercise should identify not only target users but policy influencers to maximise impact.	Records of evidence
The needs of the target group are clearly relevant and in	Partners should regularly and closely liaise with relevant stakeholders and members of the target group to identify prevalent	Project preparation documentation

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission (Erasmus+ Programme). This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.



Target	Recommendation	Evidence – not exhaustive
accordance with the further project sustainability.	product requirements e.g. during steering group meetings.	
Innovation is embedded in the outputs produced	The outputs need to be innovative, the project has to create, at least, something completely new for the partners of the project, not just dissemination of existing knowledge	The existence of aspects according to the form specifications
The quality of design and creation process of the intellectual outputs	Piloting and testing stages should implement tools to measure both hard and soft outcomes. A standard form should be completed by all partners to provide end users' feedback.	User testing and piloting framework(formal feedback systems that will provide measurable evidence and inform project development and practise)
Quality analysis to maximise the attainment of the quality standards	Partners to undertake a 'plan, do, review' framework at each transnational meeting. Partners to complete questionnaires as and when required to inform internal quality assurance manager Project Coordinator (IMEM) to produce reports (every six months) and regularly updated action plan (before each TSN meeting); to record progress against	Partner meeting agendas and minutes. reports

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission (Erasmus+ Programme). This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.



Target	Recommendation	Evidence Examples – not exhaustive
	<p>targets, to highlight delays or problems in a timely fashion to ensure prompt remedial action.</p> <p>Skype meetings to be used between transnational meetings where key decision points or problem solving actions are required between planned meetings.</p>	<p>Partner satisfaction questionnaires.</p> <p>Action plans and management reports.</p> <p>Regular virtual meetings</p>

The Indicators of Performance are the following:

- MST 1. Attainment of the project aims and objectives according to the submitted form.
- MST 2. Level of communication among partners
- MST 3. Effectiveness of management and leadership.
- MST 4. Level of cooperation in the partnership.
- MST 5. Innovation on sectoral and higher systematic levels.
- MST 6. Deadline meeting.
- MST 7. Accomplishment of the foreseen impact.
- MST 8. Measures taken and achieved sustainability
- MST 9. Level of the target groups involvement during all project stages.
- MST 10. Achieved European policy added-value and contribution
- MST 11. Efficiency of the dissemination and exploitation activities.



5 How the quality assessment will be carried out

5.1 Quality control will be carried out as it follows:

- Permanently by the WP leader, project manager and partners
- Internally and externally in accordance with WP 3 evaluation strategy

5.2 Assessment criteria

The assessment criteria are drawn from the Erasmus+ guidelines applied by evaluators of the project proposals. The assessment criteria can be classified into process, product and impact criteria and attributed to the formative quality assessment or the summative assessment category. The definition of performance indicators, data collection, analysis of data and reporting will be dealt with over the duration of the project, the Progress Report mainly mirroring the formative evaluation of both process and impact issues and the Final Report concentrating more on the final/summative evaluation of both process and impact issues.

5.3 Assessment indicators

The assessment indicators measure the performance of a project and the level to which the objectives are reached according to the set milestones. By quantifying the evaluation questions, they provide a possibility to measure and monitor the progress of the project and assess the extent to which the objectives are attained.

Indicators measuring the project outputs are performance indicators, and relate to the achievement of the aims. The stated indicators include effectiveness of results (outputs), usability and accessibility, validity, reliability, mainstreaming and exploitation of results. Outcomes are defined as medium term effects of project outputs. They are logically linked to the intended impact and to the objectives.

The external evaluation of the outputs will follow some key criteria against which the project will be assessed and accepted for final funding:

- Innovation – whether the intellectual outputs are new and applicable;



-
- Validity and relevance– whether the needs described in the justification are met;
 - The impact of Dissemination & Exploitation – level of multiplier effects through mainstreaming activity.

5.4 Instruments for quality assessment

A series of instruments will be used to assess quality, yet, the list is not exhaustive:

- Evaluation forms (questionnaire, feedback forms, observation, observation, etc.)
- Document analysis: online partner communication and document-sharing (e.g. strategies, work programmes, schedules, monitoring forms, reports, minutes of meetings, templates, working documents, research questionnaire, outcomes, dissemination deliverables)
- Interviews with target groups and stakeholders during the multiplier event in Turkey.
- Questionnaire/Surveys - a usability/feedback questionnaires will be designed, implemented, and sent (via E-mail) to all partners who have benefited from the project. The questionnaires will be designed to assess information about the views for outputs developments, stakeholders' survey and impact of the results, this method is in support of formative assessment process.
- Reports on the progress of the project
- Reports of summative evaluation

5.5 Compliance of the quality assurance to the project risk management

The quality strategy is in direct connection with the risk management strategy. Successful risk management includes assurance and enhanced decision-making, providing benefits by way of improvements in the efficiency of operations, effectiveness of tactics and the efficacy of the quality assurance strategy. It enables the project to respond to change effectively, should it be necessary.



By considering risk throughout the project, the likelihood of achieving the stated objectives is improved, the outputs are more consistent and the beneficiaries can be confident that they will receive the expected results.

The risk management strategy is based on identifying any undesirable situation or circumstance that might have potential impact on the project success.

Further, for each project phase and aspect, several risks have been identified and possible solutions foreseen for each of them. The risk action plan will be delivered to all the partners so that better and clear understanding of the risks and the possible actions to be taken.

During the initial phase, TIREF project established the flowing risk plan including possible challenges, risks and mitigating strategies:

Challenges	Risks	Mitigation strategies
To reach all stakeholders and gatekeepers nationally	Unwillingness by stakeholders to participate	In all dissemination and exploitation activities, we will engage as much as possible national educative authorities, to ensure interest in our project activities.
To ensure we gather enough good/best practices to make the database relevant	Unwillingness by stakeholders to participate	As an initial step, it will be the consortium partners who will populate the portal, while in a second step it will be the task from all partners to identify and attract more content.
To ensure white papers do have an impact	Policy makers are in general hard to reach and convince	White papers will be drafted by experienced writers from P1, P7 and P8, while national versions will be created, validated by local (educational) authority representatives.
How to ensure quality database content	Material provided may not be of good or objective quality.	To ensure the quality of contributions received, a set of objective parameters will be defined

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission (Erasmus+ Programme). This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.



Challenges	Risks	Mitigation strategies
		by the consortium and will be applied to all submitted material. This will be embedded in the portal framework and will be managed by partners in each respective partner country, thus ensuring quality is maintained.

Whenever necessary, the risk plan will be reviewed and updated. Periodically, in the progress project report partners have to document and explain the potential risks identified and their impact, if any.

One key component in dealing with risks is communication. Immediate and clear communication of any potential risk is essential. The risk identification, quantification and response is vital for the quality assurance of the whole projects to avoid delays and flaws in the quality of the deliverables.