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

INTERIM INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE REPORT

Author:

Inspectoratul Școlar Județean Dolj, Romania

Table of Contents

1 Overview

The interim quality report contains information and findings of quality management. It includes mainly findings of the process evaluation as the output and impact are due to a later phase in the project development.

The document focuses on the QA Plan and gives the guide for all quality assurance that have taken place up to now. Quality assurance is a joint effort of all partners who supported the work package by timely action with the help of the given deadlines. Moreover there are numerous risks that have been faced in the project and as a result various challenges related to methodological problems, and especially to the partners Communication as well as deadlines which are not met are foreseen as possible risks of this project.

The Accomplishment of the process was at the commonly accepted quality level.

During the quality insurance process the following indicators were used:

- MST 1. Attainment of the project aims and objectives according to the form description.
- MST 2. Good communication among partners
- MST 3. Effective management and leadership.
- MST 4. Smooth and balanced cooperation in the partnership.
- MST 5. Innovation on sectoral and higher systematic levels.
- MST 6. Deadline meeting.
- MST 9. Active involvement of the target groups during all project stages.
- MST 11. Efficiency of the dissemination and exploitation activities.

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

2 Quality assessment

2.1 Quality control was carried out as it follows:

-permanently by the WP leader, project manager and partners

-internally and externally in accordance with WP 3 evaluation strategy

2.2 Assessment criteria

The assessment criteria were drawn from the Erasmus+ guidelines applied by evaluators of the project. The definition of performance indicators, data collection, analysis of data and reporting dealt with over the duration of the project, the Progress Report mainly mirroring the formative evaluation of the process.

2.3 Assessment indicators

The assessment indicators measured the performance of a project and the level to which the objectives were reached for several aspects:

Project meetings

-the degree of satisfaction with how the meetings progressed;

-expectations and achievements during the meeting;

-clarity of the learning component of the meeting;

-decision making;

-organization, etc

WP progress

-the status of the working progress;

-challenges faced;

Collaboration with partners;

-deliverables achieved;

WP1 Management – lead by P1

1. Created and completed by grant agreement with the EACEA, bilateral agreements between P1 and the rest of the partners, and IPR agreement
2. Created financial reporting and monitoring forms, periodic six-month reporting by all partners at P1

3. Review was made through Skype meetings.

4. P1 was organised by the transnational partners who met in Turkey.

5. A Dropbox folder and Google mail group was created to which all partners have access

6. The project management handbook was created.

WP2 Quality assurance – lead by P8

1. The quality assurance plan and measures was realized.

2. Monthly reviews of progress in contrast with the work programme are elaborated.

3. All partners are involved in quality assurance measures in accordance with pre-defined indicators in terms of project achievements during their production, interactive testing, pilot implementation, dissemination, integration, exploitation and durability

WP3 Evaluation – lead by P3

1. An internal evaluation plan and instruments have been created and the tendering procedure for the external evaluator has been selected.

2. The external evaluator was selected using the tendering procedure.

3. External evaluations are developed and provided permanently.

4. Periodic reviews of progress in relation to the work plan and results and activity in relation to the project goals and objectives and the initial application are carried out.

5. The evaluation of partner meetings and analysing results for feedback to partners was facilitated.

6. The internal evaluation plan and instruments have been achieved

WP5 Database of good practices development & assessment methodology for refugee students' prior knowledge – lead by P2

1. The development and implementation of a logical framework for the collection and classification of resources for Teaching and learning of inclusive refugees, methods, instruments and mechanisms in sectors: early childhood, gymnasium, Adult Education

2. All partners are involved in the creation of a database, with projects, which are examples of good practice in terms of inclusive learning.

3. P6, with the contribution of all partners, works to develop the methodology for evaluating prior knowledge and the online refugee tool for the evaluation methodology for the prior knowledge of refugee students and the recognition and validation of results achieved during the learning process.

4. The collection of other resources for teaching and learning methods, tools and practices for the approved refugees has been overdone.

5. The second meeting of transnational Partners was organised in Plovdiv, Bulgaria

6. The third meeting of transnational Partners was organised in Plovdiv, Bulgaria

7. The framework for the collection and classification of resources for the teaching and learning methods, instruments and mechanisms for the inclusive refugees, was elaborated.

WP6 Peer supported learning intervention method

1. The structure of the guide was finalized.

2. The content of the guide was structured.

3. The English version of the guide was performed

4. Production was optimized based on the feedback gathered

WP7 Online collaborative exchange portal and resource as a repository concept towards inclusive education

1. The development of Alpha/Beta and final versions of the portal is in progress

WP8 Pilot implementation and impact gathering

1. The starting date is April 2019

WP9 Dissemination

1. The working variant of the dissemination strategy is made.

2. The action of identifying stakeholders is in progress

3. Flyers, roll-up banners, logo, PPT templates were made.

4. The development and maintenance of the project site is unfolding.

5. The achievement of key dissemination objectives at European level and their means of realisation

6. The process of producing press releases, organizing informative and workshops thematic sessions is in progress

-delays, if any and their reason,

There are little delays due to the change of the Italian partner and the team's search for other the partners.

The partners work to accomplish the activities in due time.

Project coordination

-**the overall management of the project;**

Project management was achieved in optimum conditions by the project leader.

It has continuously sought to ensure the necessary framework for the project

-**internal communication and cooperation;**

The communication was made by electronic mail, in meetings on Skype and at the 3 international meetings in Turkey (1) and Bulgaria (2)

-**level of understanding the project documentation;**

When there were cases of slight hesitations of understanding the documentation, the coordinator of each activity came to help.

Dissemination

-identification of the target groups reached;

-the main dissemination activities carried out;

-the main stakeholders reached out;

The working variant of the dissemination strategy is made.

The action of identifying stakeholders is in progress

Flyers, roll-up banners, logo, PPT templates were made.

The development and maintenance of the project site is unfolding.

The achievement of key dissemination objectives at European level and their means of realisation

The process of producing press releases, organizing informative and workshops thematic sessions is in progress

2.4   Instruments for quality assessment

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

- Evaluation forms (feedback forms, direct observation, etc.)
- Document analysis: online partner communication and document-sharing (i.e. strategies, work programmes, schedules, reports, minutes of meetings, templates, working documents,)
- A feedback questionnaire will be designed, implemented, and sent (via E-mail) to all partners who have benefited from the project.
- Reports on the progress of the project.

3 Process quality

The main activities of the quality strategy according to the proposal of the "TIEREF" project were:

- Project management efficiency
- Project data
- Project pilot implementation
- Project dissemination

The following Performance Indicators were used:

	Quality Indicators	
	Appropriate Logistics	√
	Agenda	√
	Content of meeting	√
	Activities	√
Project transnational meetings	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%)	√
	Appropriate Logistics	√
Project management	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	√
Semi-open question on timing of reporting from partners to the Coordinator	√
Open question on deviations of project implementation	√

The following instruments were used:

3.1 Management

Target	Shared vision and sense of work goals
Conclusions	The Project Coordinator devised a detailed action plan and a clear communication plan.
Evidence	The meeting minutes recorded Detailed action and communication plans periodically reviewed
Risks faced and solutions	-

Target	Strong and knowledgeable teams
Conclusions	Project teams selected

	The roles and responsibilities were clearly defined, explained and understood.
Evidence	Distribution of roles and a task assignment among the team members in each team.
Risks faced and solutions	A partner withdrew and was replaced. The tasks were redistributed

Target	**The quality of the leading organisation resulting in the good quality of outputs and outcomes**
Conclusions	Constructive guidance was offered to other consortium members.
Evidence	Detailed plans
Risks faced and solutions	Some delays were registered Communication was strengthened Task deadlines were reviewed .

Target	**A well-balanced contribution and decision making to the project**
Conclusions	A strategic plan with clear actions, milestones, reporting and deadlines was shared Good collaboration among partner organizations, deep trust, mutual respect, and regular and effective interaction took place

![TIEREF logo]

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

Evidence	Clear task distribution
	Signed meeting minutes as a proof of acceptance
Risks faced and solutions	-

Target	**Active participation in the local an transnational activities which increases partner satisfaction**
Conclusions	Equal participation in all, the project activities was registered
	Initial preparation for intercultural encounters with other people with different backgrounds and cultures.
	The issue of protection and safety of participants was properly addressed.
Evidence	The existence of legal documents specific to procedures filled in before and after each transnational mobility.
Risks faced and solutions	-

Target	**On time task completion**
Conclusions	The agreed deadlines were generally met but some delays arose.
Evidence	Gant chart provided to all partners

	Action plans reviewed at each meeting and circulated/uploaded on Dropbox. A reporting schedule was set
Risks faced and solutions	Immediately reported, the delays were analysed and a new estimated date of completion was suggested.

3.2. Communication

Target	**High quality of the communication among project partners**
Conclusions	Each partner appointed a communication representative A clear communication plan was provided
Evidence	The review of the Communication plan
Risks faced and solutions	An agreement upon the schedule of meeting dates, times, and locations was established and continuously reviewed

3.3. Project data flow

Target	Effective information flow
Conclusions	Partners shared data among themselves and with Stakeholders, regularly reporting partnership progress
Evidence	Dissemination plan Dropbox Meeting minutes
Risks faced and solutions	-

3.4. Dissemination

Target	Visibility of the project
Conclusions	All actions were undertaken in order to ensure visibility and appropriate promotion of project activities. All actions of visibility were in accordance with EU and Erasmus + guides of visibility.
Evidence	The existence of logos, project number, disclaimer and mention of the project being funded by the Erasmus + on all the project documents .
Risks faced and solutions	-

Target	Effective dissemination of the project outcomes
Conclusions	All the partners were provided with a dissemination plan including the purpose of dissemination, what to disseminate, the target group and the means and channels.
Evidence	The dissemination plan
Risks faced and solutions	-

4   Risk management

Compliance of the quality assurance to the project risk management

Several risks have been faced and solutions found.

Risks faced	Solution
Delays in gathering data	Rescheduled deadlines
Lithuanian partner withdrawal	Partner replacement and tasks redistributed Reallocation of the tasks/responsibilities of the LT partner to P1 and P3 implemented– Annex to the bilateral agreement of P3 provided Logo and Project Website changes regarding the replacement of the previous partner
Lack of financial reporting by majority of the partners	All financial reports rescheduled

Whenever necessary the risk plan was reviewed and updated.

.