# MENVIPRO

*Modernization of Environment Protection Studies
Programmes for Armenia and Georgia*

(598232-EPP-1-2018-1-IT-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP)



# WPD5.1
# Quality Control Framework

GIRAF PM
December 2019

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

# 1. Introduction

The deliverable WPD5.1 "Quality Control Framework" is a part of Work Package 5 ("Quality Control Measures"), which has the goal to ensure that all project results meet high quality standards and contribute significantly to the attainment of the project objectives. This WP has 2 distinctive parts: (1) Quality Control Framework as a continuous monitoring and quality assessment mechanism implemented through the set of pervasive activities ensuring the effectiveness and efficiency of the project procedures and processes, and (2) the set of quality control visits allowing the European partners to get the first-hand insight into the project activities (above all – curricula development and evaluation trial) to ensure their relevance and quality. The latter activity is scheduled for the second half of the project.

The current document represents the report about the activities within the Quality Control Framework carried out during the first project year. Moreover, it also outlines the consensus of the consortium members over the set of project internal Key Performance Indicators, as well as the procedures for their measurement, developed by Quality Control Workforce.

# 2. Quality Control Workforce

As it was outlined in the Detailed Description of the Project (WP5) the project set up a special body, Quality Control Workforce, in charge of QCF implementation and monitoring. This body has to oversee the QCF design and implementation and report to the consortium about any identified issues and mitigation activities. Following the initial suggestion, the following representatives of the consortium joined QCWF:

- **GIRAF PM (Andrey Girenko)**
- **UNITUS (Angela Fattoretti)**
- **ISEC (Gevorg Tepanosyan)**

The initial discussion about the procedures and tools for quality control took place at the kick-off meeting (January 2019, Yerevan) and were further developed at the second consortium meeting (March-April2019, Viterbo).

The further discussions have been organized via email exchange and/or teleconferencing.

# 3. Performance Monitoring (KPIs)

The project partner agreed on the following system of internal project Key Performance Indicators:

| Work Package | Key Performance Indicator | Current value | Target value |
|---|---|---|---|
| WP1 Preparation: Best Practice Study and SWOT Analysis | WP1KPI1 Number of experts/stakeholders contacted and interviewed | 19 | 20 |
| | WP1KPI2 Number of Partner University experts participated in study visits | 8 | 10 |
| | WP1KPI3 Number of University EP-related curricula cases documented | 11 | 8 |
| | WP1KPI4 Number of recommendations produced and agreed | 16 | 20 |
| WP2 Development: Curricula Development | WP2KPI1 Number of University EP courses developed/improved | 11 | 5 |
| | WP2KPI2 Volume of teaching materials developed | | 300 pages |
| | WP2KPI3 Number of stakeholders/multipliers contacted for curricula evaluation/accreditation | 1 | 10 |
| WP3 Development: Innovative learning/ teaching/ research environments | WP3KPI1 Number of University staff members participated in joint workshop | | 20 |
| | WP3KPI2 Number of new items of equipment installed | | 20 |
| | WP3KPI3 Number of courses selected for the Summer Schools | | 15 |
| | WP3KPI4 Number of University technical staff trained | | 5 |
| WP4 Development: Evaluation Trial | WP4KPI1 Number of pilot students recruited | | 150 |
| | WP4KPI2 Number of students successfully completed the new/improved courses | | 150 |
| | WP4KPI3 Percentage of students rated course experience as "Positive" and "Very positive" | | 90% |
| | WP4KPI4 Number of participants in the Summer Schools | | 40 |
| | WP4KPI5 Number of participants in the project webinars | | 60 |
| WP5 Quality Plan: Quality Control Measures | WP5KPI1 Number of interviews with project participants performed | | 10 |
| | WP5KPI2 Number of quality control visits organized | | 6 |

| WP6 Dissemination & Exploitation | WP6KPI1 Number of University staff exposed to the project dissemination | 80 | 300 |
|---|---|---|---|
| | WP6KPI2 Number of dissemination materials produced and disbursed | 34 | 3 |
| | WP6KPI3 Number of website visits | | 1500 |
| | WP6KPI4 Number of events where the project is promoted | 7 | 15 |
| WP7 Management | WP6KPI1 Number of project coordination meetings | 5 | 4 |
| | WP6KPI2 Number of accepted reports | | 3 |

The data to be used for KPI assessment will be collected from the partner Universities using the file exchange platform setup by the project coordinator with the support of GRENA. The corresponding form will be online and available for partners to report in their KPIs within the regular reporting activities.

# 4. Risk Detection and Mitigation

Risk detection is an important managerial task directly connected to ensuring the quality; therefore, it was included in to the area of responsibility of QCWF. The following activities have been designed and are being implemented:

**Regular internal reporting.**
The leading role in reporting plays email exchange. The mailing list includes all contact persons and additional personnel depending on the nature of the discussion issue.
In addition, in order to facilitate risk detection, the consortium decided to have online meetings using teleconferencing software (Skype) allowing stable multi-point conferencing and documenting (minutes taking). The consortium agreed to use flexible schedule for the meetings depending on the number of issues to be discussed and respective timing. Typically, the coordinator moderates the discussions; all partners are asked to report issues and anticipated risks. Potential mitigation strategies can be also discussed immediately or, if it requires additional actions/efforts, the plan for mitigation actions elaboration is proposed.

**Documentation:** the project uses the online platform (shared Google Drive repository) allowing simple, but effective way of collaborative work. The platform includes the following functionalities used for quality control:
- Thematic forums facilitating online discussions e.g. on particular issues related to quality
- Document sharing used for collaborative document development and quality control review
- Scheduling and schedule management tools, to-do lists management, etc. allowing effectively tackle emerging issues.

The platform is used for sharing various documentation, starting from deliverables, working documents, meeting organization documentation, to meeting minutes.

**Quality control visits:** the project plan includes several visits for the European partners to visit their Armenian and Georgian counterparts for the quality control

purposes. In fact, the consortium decided to use these opportunities for also consultation and troubleshooting purposes at the later stage of the project during the curricula development and evaluation. The planning of these visits will be done during the second project year.

Project surveys: in the course of the project activities involving external participants, it was decided to use surveys to collect the feedback and detect areas for further improvements. This will be used mainly for the project dissemination events (2 workshops and the final conference).

# 5. Quality Control for Deliverables

In order to ensure the quality standards for the project deliverables, it was decided to use the internal reviewing procedure for all deliverables. The procedure includes the following actions:

- The authors of a deliverable in progress have to inform the coordinator about the tentative date of the document accomplishment at least 15 days prior that date.
- The coordinator consults the partnership to identify the reviewer to be appointed for reviewing the document. The preferences are given (1) to those who were not directly involved in the document development and (2) to volunteers.
- The appointed reviewer reviews the document when it is available and communicates his/her opinion and suggestions for improvements directly to the document authors.
- The iterative process ends when the authors and the reviewers agree on the readiness for submission. After that, the authors and the reviewer inform the coordinator about the completion.

# 6. Cost Effectiveness and Efficiency Control

The control of project expenditures is in the hands of the coordinator, who appointed a special financial manager with the responsibilities to:

- Monitor the partner costs and ensure that all expenditures fulfill the eligibility criteria stipulated in the Grant Agreement, Partnership Agreement and respective Erasmus+ regulations;
- Make sure that all project costs are economical, related to the project activities and contribute directly to achieving the project goals;
- Collect the financial reports of partners and check their consistency and correctness;
- Advise and consult the partners on financial issues;
- Manage the EU funding (pre-financing and intermediate payments) in accordance with the Grant Agreement and the decision of the consortium.

Quality of the project expenditures is the topic for discussions between the partners during the monthly online meetings and at the occasions of the project coordination meetings.

# 7. Conclusions

The established quality control regime and procedures are standard and proven to be effective for projects like MENVIPRO. The project consortium will monitor how QCF functions and, if needed, will make adjustments in order to ensure the attainment of the project goals with high quality outcomes. The next review of the quality control issues is planned for the next face-to-face coordination meeting scheduled for the first half of 2020 in Italy.