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

Innovative Rehabilitation Education - Introduction of new master degree programs in Ukraine (REHAB)

Deliverable 6.1

Quality Management Plan

(QMP)

1. Introduction

Work Package 6 “Quality Management (QM): monitoring and evaluation” will cover all project stages to allow planned collection of meaningful data about key project activities and outcomes. Specific objectives for monitoring and evaluation are to ascertain achievement of project outputs and outcomes, to control their timelines against project workplan and to assess their effectiveness, relevance, accuracy, accessibility, sustainability (Eurostat (2005d) : Standard Quality Indicators.) in satisfying project goals and needs of stakeholders.

Quality evaluation is primarily focused on project academic and organizational events. Project monitoring is aimed at verification that project deliverables/results/outcomes are achieved in time, according to the workplan, are evaluated against project indicators and are based on the feedback from project team and relevant stakeholders (e.g. students, faculty, trainees).

The aim of the Quality Management Plan is twofold:

On the one hand project evaluation will assist consortium partners in enhancing the processes and activities during its implementation. This **formative evaluation** (deliverable 6.2) concentrates on ways of improving the project while it is still on-going.

Aims of the formative evaluation

-Assess progress towards meeting the aims and objectives
-Identify gaps and issues
-Gather and disseminate best practice
-Ensure project outputs are meeting stakeholder needs
-Ensure the project can respond flexibly to changes in the environment and that it isn’t overtaken by events

Formative questions

-Have milestones been met on schedule?
-What is holding up progress?
-What should we do to correct this?
-Is project management effective?
-Are project activities productive?
-Do partners agree with interim findings?
-Is our dissemination effective?
-What lessons have we learned?
-Do we need to change the plan?

On the other hand it will guide project partners and stakeholders in assessing the extent to which the project was effective and achieved its aims and objectives. This **summative evaluation** (deliverable 6.4) will be undertaken after the project has been completed and judges its overall effectiveness and its impact on the target group.

Aims for the summative evaluation

-Assess whether the project achieved its aims and objectives
-Assess the impacts, benefits, and value of the project in the broader context
-Identify achievements and stimulate discussion with the community
-Synthesise knowledge from the project and lessons learned
-Identify areas for future development work

Summative questions

Have objectives been met?
Have outcomes been achieved?
What are the key findings?
What impact did the project have?
What benefits are there for stakeholders?
Was our approach effective?
What lessons have we learned?
What would we do differently?

The main **evaluation criterion**, regarding the outputs and their impact, is the extent to which these have been achieved in relation to the approved project plan.

What will be evaluated?

There are four major project objectives that have strong relevance to project's evaluation plan:

- creation by 2019 of Comprehensive Physical Therapy Master study programmes.
- formation by 2020 of core academic/professional staff of at least 40 qualified PT faculty members for teaching physical therapy.
- Establishment of Educational Infrastructure for Learning Physiotherapy at a University.
- piloting by 2020 of PT master programmes based on new content and innovative teaching approaches and graduate up to 200 masters in PT.

Beginning Date: 15/01/2019
End Date: 31/10/2021
Coordinating Partner: SSU

2. Quality plan as described in the application for funding

The following deliverables make up the WP 6:

6.1 Quality Management Plan (QMP)

6.2 Development of evaluation instruments and ongoing collection of data

6.3 QMTeam visits to Partner Universities

6.4 Analytical Report on Project Quality and Impact

Related assumptions and risks

Assumptions

- Partners are interested to achieve good quality of project products and thus are ready to take part in quality management processes
- Quality indicators allow to judge about quality of products and events
- Partners will be able to define and implement comparable biorisk/biosafety module that allows universal approaches to assessment of students

Risks

- Difficulties in gathering data for reliable quality analysis from students, faculty members and other stakeholders
- Reluctance of participants to change developed products in case of quality issues

WP description:

All Consortium partners will contribute to the quality evaluation and monitoring activities by administering QMP activities, hosting evaluation team, submitting reports on request of QM team and ensuring smooth communication. Partner Universities will independently use progress testing.

Evaluation results will serve as indicators of progress for all project activities.

Quality Management Plan is to be drafted before Project Start Meeting, discussed and approved at KOM. QMP will articulate the purpose, objectives, evaluation objects, stakeholders, criteria, methodology, quality management structure and team (QTeam), schedule of evaluation. Quality evaluation should base upon standards (e.g. “Quality Standards for Development Evaluation”, OECD, 2010.)

Biannual summaries will reflect the development of evaluation instruments and ongoing collection of data.

Evaluation of project events (workshops, training sessions, teaching activities, work at labs, visits of EU experts and Special Mobility etc.) is aimed to establish relevance, effectiveness, timeliness allowing comparison of different events against the same criteria and event-specific instruments. Evaluation will take place after irregular events like workshop or Biannually in case of regular activity like teaching.

Evaluation of project products (reports, teaching/training/learning materials, services, website, student knowledge) to establish their relevance, clarity, sustainability etc. is based on meeting qualitative and quantitative indicators and will be done by fit-to-product instrument (report, review, self-assessment, publication, interview etc.) and universal tool for survey of stakeholders in biannual and need wise basis.

Monitoring of project will be done via biannual survey of project team about progress and achievement of deliverables/results/outcomes. Monitoring activities are planned to be in synchrony with reporting activities for the purposes of project management.

QMT will develop and validate necessary tools. Other evaluation instruments are developed jointly with leaders of relevant WPs. Individual partners are responsible for running QM activities at their universities according to QMP. QMT will manage gathering and analysis of raw data, preparation of summaries/reports.

QM evaluation and monitoring activities are presented as Biannual Evaluation and Monitoring Summary for formative and summative feedback purposes.

Biannual Evaluation and Monitoring Summaries reflect the status of performance of the project against workplan and quality analysis based on available data collected about project outputs and outcomes together with description of evaluation instruments. Summaries are produced in synchrony with project management activities. Summaries are distributed to universities for feedback. Up to four summaries are planned.

Quality Management Teams visits to each partner university are expected to take place at least once during project life time. QM visits will start from the 2nd project year. 1 visit should cover 2 universities. In addition visiting EU faculty members would provide quality evaluation of partner university during their stay.

During project time each partner university will host at least one QM visit for meeting with students, faculty and other stakeholders to provide live observations. QM visiting panels would include representatives of Project Steering Group lead by LASE, Quality Management team and at least one representative from other partner university. For cost-effectiveness such QM visits whenever possible should be affiliated with other project events.

3. REHAB team of evaluators

Evaluation strategy, resources and database are to be developed by team of evaluators whose functions are:

1. developing strategy, planning and realizing evaluation of project process and results;
2. comparing results and elaborating recommendations for necessary corrections and best practice dissemination;
3. giving feed-back to those whose activity & level were evaluated;
4. informing those who are involved in the process of control.

The core of the QMT is represented by LASE (P1), SSU (P6), SAMK (P10), TB (P3) and LSUPC (P4).

4.REHAB evaluation database

The results of evaluation are planned to be accumulated in REHAB database including:

1. Strategy & mechanisms of quality assurance;
2. REHAB lists of evaluators, project events, stakeholders;
3. Data of project process and results evaluation;
4. Data of training process and materials evaluation;
5. Recommendations for corrections and best practice disseminations based on evaluation results analyses;
6. Records of feed-back meetings;
7. Evaluation reports.

5. Tools for evaluation

The following evaluation tools are proposed to provide for a transparent and productive monitoring. This list isn't exhaustive and may be added by any other tool utilized by consortium and/or individual partner.

- **Meeting evaluation questionnaire** (Appendix 1)

- **Output evaluation report** (Appendix 2)

-**Dissemination and sustainability activities evaluation questionnaire** (Appendix 3)

- **Teacher training evaluation questionnaire** (Appendix 4)

- **Biannual evaluation form** (Appendix 5)

- **Monitoring summary** (Appendix 6)

For Appendixes 1-4 the QMT will draw up an analytical report reflecting level of involvement for feedback among partners as well as the main findings.

6. Main outputs of quality monitoring and responsibilities among partners

All partners are expected to actively participate in providing their productive feedback at least by means of QM tools adopted by consortium. The QMT is authorized to collect feedback, perform analysis of collected data, draw up corresponding reports which are to be presented and discussed by consortium partners at any possible project event.

The QMT will provide the project coordinator with all reports and findings developed under QM activity. These findings will be used by the project steering committee for on-going project management as well as for external reporting to the Agency.

The results of surveys to different groups of stakeholders (students, employers etc.) performed by partners are expected to be reported to the target audiences.

Appendix 1. Meeting evaluation questionnaire

REHAB Project Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union	**Meeting evaluation**

Aim

to identify participants' opinions regarding the quality of meetings

Country	Town	Organization	Occupation

Date	Place	Duration	Who conducted meeting

Instruction:

*evaluate the quality of meeting considering proposed criteria. Mark corresponding cells with: "**A**" - if level is high; "**B**" - if level is adequate; "**C**" - if level is average; "**D**" - if level is low*

	To what extent?	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**
1	The meeting was planned				
2	The date of the meeting was communicated to partners in good time				
3	The programme of the meeting was clear and adequate to the aim				
4	The schedule of the meeting was in line with the plan				
5	Activities were organized				
6	The coordinator conducted the meeting in a professional manner				
7	The technical support was adequate (projector, monitors, computers, printing etc)				
8	The amount of time allocated to each objective was adequate				
9	Participants were allowed the opportunity to express their opinions and views				
10	The response to the questions were satisfactory				
11	The financial aspects of the meeting were handled				
12	The meeting has achieved its aims				
TOTAL					

Comment box: Please write any comment you might have regarding the organizational aspects of the meeting

Appendix 2. Output Evaluation Questionnaire

REHAB Project Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union	**Output evaluation** OUTPUT NAME:

Aim: *to identify participants' opinions regarding the quality of the outputs produced within the project and the processes involved.*

Country	Town	Organisation
Date	Occupation	

Instruction: *evaluate the output considering proposed criteria.*
*Mark corresponding cells with: "**A**" - if level is high; "**B**" - if level is adequate; "**C**" - if level is average; "**D**" - if level is low.*

	To what extent the output:	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**
1	Corresponds to the description produced in the approved work-plan				
2	Contributes to the overall development of the project				
3	Corresponds to a real need				
4	Was achieved in line with the approved work-plan				
5	Involved the majority of the partners				
6					
TOTAL					

Comment box: Please respond in brief to the following questions:
1. What was your contribution to the development of the output?

2. What were the main obstacles you had to overcome in order to achieve/ contribute to the achievement of the output?

3. What lessons you have learned as a result of the work undertaken to achieve this output?

4. How would you characterise the work of the partner who led the production of this output? (Refer to planning, leadership, coordination of effort and commitment)

Appendix 3. Dissemination and sustainability activities evaluation questionnaire

REHAB Project Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union	**Dissemination and sustainability activities evaluation**

Aim *to identify participants' opinions regarding the quality of the dissemination/sustainability event*

Country	Town	Organisation	Occupation

Date	Time	Duration	Who conducted the event

Instruction:

*evaluate the event considering proposed criteria. Mark corresponding cells with: "**A**" - if level is high; "**B**" - if level is adequate; "**C**" - if level is average; "**D**" - if level is low.*

	To what extent the information presented was:	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**
1	Comprehensible				
2	Interesting				
3	The right length				
4	Useful				
5	Relevant to your interests				
6	Has prompted you to act on it				
TOTAL					

Comment box:

Appendix 4. Teacher training evaluation questionnaire

REHAB Project Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union	**Teacher training evaluation questionnaire**

Aim *to identify the extent to which the participants to the training sessions have acquired the knowledge and skills proposed*

Country	*Town*	*Organisation*	Occupation

Place	Duration	Who conducted training

Instruction: *we would be grateful if you could take the time to answer the following questions. The purpose is to keep in touch with your needs and requirements. We want you to know that what you write will be of great value to us, to you and to future students. Please use the comment box to highlight the things you have enjoyed and the things that need improving. Evaluate the quality of the training sessions considering proposed criteria. Mark corresponding cells with: "**A**" - if level is high; "**B**" - if level is adequate; "**C**" - if level is average; "**D**" - if level is low.*

	To what extent? **Information in the cells below is to be completed in line with the aim of the training programme**	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
TOTAL					

Comment box:

Appendix 5. Biannual Evaluation (done by QMT)

REHAB Project Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union	**Biannual evaluation**

Aim: *to identify the status of performance of the project against workplan and quality analysis based on available data collected about project outputs and outcomes*

Place and date of development	Organisations involved

Period covered	Related workpackages

Instruction: *evaluate the achievement of deliverables considering proposed criteria.*
*Mark corresponding cells with: "**A**" – fully achieved; "**B**" – partly achieved; "**C**" – not achieved; "**D**" – due date according to the workplan; "**E**" – new deadline (if necessary) .*

	List of deliverables to be covered within the period:	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
1						
2						
3						

Comment box: Please respond in brief to the following questions:

1.Please list the partners leading corresponding workpackages, estimate the level of contribution (refer to planning, leadership, coordination of effort and commitment)

2. Please identify the contribution of partner institutions to the development of the listed deliverables?

3. Please list the main events organized and the results of their evaluation.

4. What lessons have been learned as a result of the work undertaken within this period?

4. Are any changes foreseen for the workplan in the next period?

Appendix 6. Monitoring summary

REHAB Project Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union	**Monitoring summary**

Aim: *to identify the status of performance of the project against workplan and quality analysis based quality management tools analyses*

Place and date of development	Organisations involved

Period covered	Related workpackages

Instruction: *evaluate the achievement of deliverables considering proposed criteria.*
*Mark corresponding cells with: "**A**" – fully achieved; "**B**" – partly achieved; "**C**" – not achieved; "**D**" – due date according to the workplan; "**E**" – new deadline (if necessary) .*

	List of quality management activities performed within the period:	**Brief summary**
1		
2		
3		

Comment box: Please respond in brief to the following questions:

1. Please comment on the main approaches used to perform quality monitoring of the project activities.

2. What are the main findings reflecting the quality of the partnership cooperation and results?
3. What are the main findings reflecting the project management structures?

4. Are any changes foreseen for the quality monitoring approaches?