

Project number: 527662-LLP-1-2012-1-UK-LEONARDO-LMP

Grant agreement number: 2012-5522/ 001 - 001

Funding Programme: Lifelong Learning Programme 2007 - 2013 - Multilateral project for Development of Innovation – Leonardo da Vinci

D.14.1: Periodic Quality Assessment

Deliverable Co-ordinator: Daniele Fantechi

Deliverable Co-ordinating Organisation: MMRTC

Contributors:

Martin Ziarati (C4FF), Stephen Cauchi, Maria Galea (MMRTC), Nikolai Velikov (NVNA), Clive Cole (WMU), Sari Nyroos (CMS), Tomas Gregoric (SPINAKER D.o.o.), Janusz Uriasz (OPR), Reza Ziarati (PRU), Alison Noble (AMA), Vangehuchten Lieve (UOA)

 <p>C4FF Developing the Future</p> <p>C4FF (Centre for Factories of the Future)</p>	 <p>MMRTC (Training Branch of the Malta Maritime Pilots)</p>	 <p>NVNA (Nicola Vaptsarov Naval Academy)</p>	 <p>WMU (World Maritime University)</p>	 <p>University of Turku - Centre of Maritime Sciences (UoT) (CMS)</p>
 <p>SPIN (Spinaker d.o.o)</p>	 <p>OPR (Centre of Development Works)</p>	 <p>AMA (Antwerp Maritime Academy)</p>	 <p>UoA (University of Antwerp)</p>	 <p>PRU (Piri Reis University)</p>

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. 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.

SeaTALK Consortium

This document is part of the SeaTALK project, financed with the EC funds in the domain of "Lifelong Learning Programme" managed by EACEA, number 527662-LLP-1-2012-1-UK-LEONARDO-LMP. The following partners are involved in the SeaTALK project:

- C4FF (Centre for Factories of the Future, Coventry, UK (www.c4ff.co.uk)).

Warwick University Science Park, Barclays Venture Center, Sir William Lyons Road Coventry
West Midlands CV4 7EZ UK, Tel: +44 02476236734

- MMRTC (Training Branch of the Malta Maritime Pilots), Malta (www.maritimepilots.com.mt)

Transport Malta Centre Blk 3, Level 0 Triq l-Ghassara tal-Gheneb , Marsa MRS 1917, Malta, Tel:
00356 21 239170

- Nicola Vaptsarov Naval Academy, Varna, Bulgaria (www.naval-acad.bg)

73 V. DRUMEV St. VARNA Severoiztochen 9026 Bulgaria, Tel: +359/52/552374

- World Maritime University, Malmo, Sweden (www.wmu.se)

Citadellsv. 29 Malmo Extra-Regio 21118 Sweden, Tel: +46-40-35 63 47

- University Of Turku, Turku, Finland (<http://www.utu.fi>)

Yliopistonmäki Turku Länsi-Suomi 20014 Finland, Tel: +358 (0)2 333 8184

- SPINAKEER D.o.o, Portoroz, Slovenia (www.spinaker.si).

Soncna pot 8, 6320 Portoroz, Tel: +38 41412067

- OPR (Center of Development Works), Szczecin, Poland (www.opr.org.pl).

Goscislawa 22B/12, Szczecin 71-706 Poland, Phone: +48 502112991, Fax: +48 914280056

- Antwerp Maritime Academy, Antwerpen, Belgium (www.hzs.be/)

Noordkasteel Oost 6, 2030 Antwerpen, Tel. +32 (0)3 205 64 30 - Fax +32 (0)3 225 06 39

- University of Antwerp, Antwerpen, Belgium (www.ua.ac.be)

Prince Street 13 , 2000 Antwerpen, +32 (0) 3 265 41 11, +32 (0) 3 265 44 20 (fax)

- Piri Reis University, Turkey (www.tudev.com.tr).

Hacioglou Sok, Istasyon Mah, 34940 Tuzla Istanbul, Turkey, Phone: +90 2164470079

Work package participants

The following partners have taken an active part in the work leading to the elaboration of this document, even if they might not have directly contributed writing parts of this document:

- C4FF (Centre for Factories of the Future, Coventry, UK (www.c4ff.co.uk)).
- MMRTC (Training Branch of the Malta Maritime Pilots), Malta (www.maritimepilots.com.mt)
- Nicola Vaptsarov Naval Academy, Varna, Bulgaria (www.naval-acad.bg)
- World Maritime University, Malmo, Sweden (www.wmu.se)
- University Of Turku, Turku, Finland (<http://www.utu.fi>)
- SPINAKEr D.o.o, Portoroz, Slovenia (www.spinaker.si).
- OPR (Center of Development Works), Szczecin, Poland (www.opr.org.pl).
- Antwerp Maritime Academy, Antwerpen, Belgium (www.hzs.be)
- University of Antwerp, Antwerpen, Belgium (www.ua.ac.be)
- Piri Reis University, Turkey (www.tudev.com.tr).

Reviews History

Version	Date	Modifier	Remarks
0.1	06.11.13	MMRTC	
0.2	30.03.13	MMRTC	Updated assessment of deliverables produced to date
0.3	30.01.15	MMRTC	Updated assessment of deliverables produced to date
0.4	30.04.15	MMRTC	Updated assessment of deliverables produced to date
0.5	30.09.15	MMRTC	Updated assessment of deliverables produced to date

Executive Summary

The Quality Plan establishes a number of criteria for the tasks and deliverables envisaged in the SeaTALK project. This document is a periodic assessment of the criteria identified in the Quality Plan aimed at providing recommendations to the partners.

Table of Contents

ASSESSMENT _____	8
ITEMISED ASSESSMENT _____	10
QA CRITERIA FOR WP1 - PROJECT MANAGEMENT _____	10
QA CRITERIA FOR WP2 – IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS FOR A MARITIME ECVET MODEL _____	12
QA CRITERIA FOR WP3 – MARITIME ENGLISH TRAINING MODULES DEVELOPMENT _____	13
QA CRITERIA FOR WP4 – ECVET MODEL _____	14
QA CRITERIA FOR WP5 – MARITIME ENGLISH LEARNING MATERIAL CONSOLIDATION _____	15
QA CRITERIA FOR WP6 – E-LEARNING PLATFORM _____	16
QA CRITERIA FOR WP7 – QUALITY ASSURANCE _____	17
QA CRITERIA FOR WP8 - DISSEMINATION _____	18
QA CRITERIA FOR WP9 - EXPLOITATION AND SUSTAINABILITY _____	19

QUALITY ASSURANCE ASSESSMENT ON DELIVERABLES

Assessment

The quality plan of the SeaTALK project clearly indicated the acceptance criteria for the different key tasks envisaged. The following analysis takes into consideration the level of achievement of the deliverables; the quality of the deliverables is assessed on the basis of acceptance criteria agreed by the partners in the Quality Plan.

The SeaTALK project is being implemented in line with the expected timeframe and some of the key deliverables are close to completion. The production of the learning outcomes grid for the 4 profiles identified in the project constituted the main challenge due to the complexity of the subject and the lack of baseline. The same applies for the training modules.

In terms of Project Management (WP1), the critical tasks identified in the Quality Plan were successfully completed and the acceptance criteria fully respected.

In relation to the WP2, the previous report suggested the introduction of the following measures:

- Include a reference to the scope of the grids in each grid produced

This suggestion was taken and the grids have now a reference to the scope at the beginning

WP7 tasks were successfully completed and were in line with the Quality Plan acceptance criteria. Further analysis on the deliverables produced at end of March 2014 has been carried out. During Partners' meeting in Holland a session on quality will be held to further discuss quality aspects of the project, as suggested in the last report on quality. Following communication between the Project Coordinator and the partner in charge of WP7 (MMRTC), terms of reference for the external expert have been shared and discussed.

WP 8 was mostly completed and tasks were carried out in line with the quality assessment criteria. In terms of website, the recommendation of introducing a clearer statement of what SeaTALK is expected to achieve was taken on board as now the home page of the website features the following statement *"The SeaTALK project will develop a harmonised ECVET framework for Maritime English Education and Training, where a standard approach to teaching, learning and assessment of qualifications throughout Europe is established for each type and rank of seafarers"*. This statement could still be further highlighted in the home page or other parts of the website by using different colours or fonts.

Still the relevant power point presentations shall be made available on the website.

The power point presentation of the SeaTALK project should be available in the website and distributed to the partners.

The dissemination strategy will be shared amongst partners during the 5th partners' meeting.

WP3 ongoing

WP4 ongoing

WP5 ongoing

WP6 ongoing some of the material available on the website but it will be assessed once deliverables are complete

WP9 have not started yet or at inception stage and deliverables would be checked in terms of envisaged quality once produced.

Recommendations:

The following recommendations are made following the periodic assessment hereby reported:

- In the home page of the website highlight further the statement related to the aim of SeaTALK
- Make presentations available on the website

Itemised assessment

QA criteria for WP1 - Project Management

During SeaTALK, WP1 will produce nine (9) critical tasks, to be assessed against their specific acceptance criteria.

WP1 Acceptance Criteria

#	Critical Tasks	Acceptance criteria	Month	Assessment
1	Consortium management structure established	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Steering Committee has been formed Shared electronic work space operational and all members provided with access 	M2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> complete on time complete on time
2	Communication infrastructure established	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Mailing lists of the project have been set up Contact details of all partners available to all members of the consortium 	M2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> complete on time complete on time
3	Contractor-Partner Contract	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Describe terms and procedures for cooperation between partners Describe IPR issues and licences Approved, distributed, signed by all partners 	M4	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> complete on time complete on time complete on time
4	Quality Manual	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Operational procedures described Detailed risk analysis and contingency planning. Approved and distributed by all partners 	M6	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> complete on time complete on time complete on time
5	Internal and External Evaluators	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Define external and external evaluators Receive assistance on quality assurance procedure 	M 30	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Terms for external evaluators contracts agreed and reflected in the contract. External evaluator project management completed 2 questionnaires and 1 report.. External evaluator on ECVET completed
6	Internal-project Progress & Cost Monitoring	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Bimonthly reports All partners report progress in tasks per WP All partners report costs and personnel resources per time period 	Bimonthly	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> partners regularly provide information and data as required by the project coordinator partners regularly provide information and data as required by the project coordinator partners regularly provide information and data as required by the project coordinator
7	Interim and Final Reports	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Gather information and documents from partners Submit the reports to the EC 	Yearly	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> complete on time complete – interim report submitted on time

8	Regular Bi-Annual Meetings	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Schedule and arrange bi-annual meetings of project partners and management bodies 2. Schedule and arrange other focused or bilateral meetings 3. Partners actively undertake this task 4. Outcomes discussed during meetings 5. Identifies areas where to improve the project 6. Partners act according to what discussed and agreed 	Per 6 months (at least)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. to date n.5 meetings held 2. When required by partners' representatives or in relation to key implementation stages, online meetings held as well as bilateral ones 3. Partners collaboratively agree on the actions and minutes 4. Matching of the agenda items and items discussed during meeting correct, no deviations 5 Partners collaboratively agree and participate actively to meetings 6 Partners undertake the tasks assigned.
---	-----------------------------------	--	-------------------------	---

QA criteria for WP2 – Identification of needs for a Maritime ECVET Model - COMPLETE

During SeaTALK, WP2 will produce two (2) critical tasks, to be assessed against their specific acceptance criteria.

WP2 Acceptance Criteria

#	Critical Tasks	Acceptance criteria	Month	Assessment
1	Establishment of Competence Grids	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Definition of scope of the grids 2. Agreement on grids structure 3. Include input from all partners 4. Update of the grids according to the discussions held 5. Consolidation of the grids and approval of final version 6. Reference to CEFR 	M6	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. complete 2. complete 3. complete 4. complete 5. complete 6. complete
2	Preparation of the survey	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify critical questions and information to be obtained 2. Ensure comparability of results 3. Dissemination of questionnaires 	M6	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. questions and info to be obtained explained in section 1 and 2 – complete 2. results comparable through common questionnaires and assessment - complete 3. list of countries and contacts - complete

QA criteria for WP3 – Maritime English Training Modules Development - COMPLETE

During SeaTALK, WP3 will produce one (1) critical tasks, to be assessed against their specific acceptance criteria.

WP3 Acceptance Criteria

#	Critical Tasks	Acceptance criteria	Month	Assessment
1	Creation of Modules	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clarity of title 2. Description of the module comprehensive 3. Consistency with LOs 4. Consistency of Assessment Criteria and LOs 5. Identification of duration for the modules and overall duration of the training path 	M26	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. complete 2. complete 3. consistent 4. consistent 5. complete

QA criteria for WP4 – ECVET Model

During SeaTALK, WP4 will produce three (3) critical tasks, to be assessed against their specific acceptance criteria.

WP4 Acceptance Criteria

#	Critical Tasks	Acceptance criteria	Month	Assessment
1	Competence and link with ECVET points	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Clear identification and definition of Learning Outcomes2. Link with the professional standard and performance criteria3. Clear link with training modules	M26	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. complete2. complete3. complete
2	Handbook	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Develop comprehensive information2. Provide tools to facilitate application in other Countries	M26	2. MoU model, ILA model and Transcript of Records Model provided - complete
3	ILO and MoU	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Provide effective models to facilitate transferability and application in different Countries	M19	1. complete

QA criteria for WP5 – Maritime English Learning Material Consolidation - COMPLETE

During SeaTALK, WP5 will produce 6 critical tasks, to be assessed against their specific acceptance criteria. Tasks will focus on consolidation of online platform and the educational method (the teaching method and the content material) through a sample module.

WP5 Acceptance Criteria

<i>#</i>	<i>Critical Tasks</i>	<i>Acceptance criteria</i>	<i>Month</i>	<i>Assessment</i>
1	Learning Material	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Easily accessible and manageable 2. Coherently linked to the module 3. Training material has relevant copyright or authorisation if applicable 	30	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. complete 2. complete 3. complete

QA criteria for WP6 – E-Learning Platform

During SeaTALK, WP6 will produce two (2) critical tasks, to be assessed against their specific acceptance criteria.

WP6 Acceptance Criteria

#	Critical Tasks	Acceptance criteria	Month	Assessment
1	Platform (Final Version)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Setup learning communities and online courses 2. Configure evaluation/assessment of learning methods finalize integrated e-learning and scenario-based interactive simulations software 3. Finalize integrated e-learning and scenario-based interactive simulations software 4. Easily accessible and manageable for user 	M28	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. complete 2. complete 3. complete 4. complete
2	Compatibility	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ability to host resources in different formats 	M28	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. complete

QA criteria for WP7 – Quality Assurance – COMPLETE

During SeaTALK, WP7 will produce three (3) critical tasks, to be assessed against their specific acceptance criteria.

WP7 Acceptance Criteria

#	Critical Tasks	Acceptance criteria	Month	Assessment
1	Develop Quality Manual	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Describes the main elements of the project 2. Defines requirements for project deliverables 3. Identifies possible risks and measures to be undertaken 4. Common sharing and approval 	M6	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. complete 2. complete 3. complete 4. complete
2	Evaluation Questionnaire	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clarity of questions 2. Questions coherent with criteria to be assessed 3. Distribution of the questionnaire effective to have significant results 4. Common sharing and approval 	M30	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. questions clearly address the main aspects of the project and are tailor-made on the target groups. 2. questions coherent with criteria of assessment as explained in the methodology section of the Evaluator report 3. distributed to all partners with several reminders 4. partners provided feedback on questionnaire draft and approved the consolidated version, which was used for the evaluation
3	Periodic Quality assessment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Partners actively undertake this task 2. Outcomes discussed during meetings 3. Identifies areas where to improve the project 4. Partners act according to what discussed and agreed 	Biannual	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Partner in charge carries out the task and informs other partners accordingly for feedback. Periodic assessment available on online shared area 2. Quality assurance discussed in partners' meeting 3. Partners collaboratively agree and participate actively to meetings 4. Partners undertake the tasks assigned.

QA criteria for WP8 – Dissemination - COMPLETE

During SeaTALK, WP8 will produce three (3) critical tasks, to be assessed against their specific acceptance criteria.

WP8 Acceptance Criteria

#	Critical Tasks	Acceptance criteria	Month	Assessment
1	Project web site	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Describes project and objectives 2. Provides information on partners and expected results 3. Lists news and events related to the project 4. Includes Powerpoint presentation of the project 5. Reviewed and approved by all partners 	M3	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. complete 2. complete 3. complete 4. presentation available on homepage http://seatalk.pro 5. complete
2	Specification of dissemination plan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Describes tools and channels to be used for dissemination 2. Outlines strategy as a project and on individual level 3. Identifies Schedule of initial dissemination activities 4. Includes reporting templates for dissemination actions 5. Reviewed and approved by all partners 	M4	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. complete 2. complete 3. complete 4. complete 5. complete
3	Dissemination Package (final version)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Preparation of the full package including Project web site 2. Logo, promotional flyer and final powerpoint presentation 3. Recommendations on how to disseminate project 	M4	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. complete 2. complete 3. complete

QA criteria for WP9 - Exploitation and Sustainability

During SeaTALK, WP9 will produce three (3) critical tasks, to be assessed against their specific acceptance criteria.

WP7 Acceptance Criteria

#	Critical Tasks	Acceptance criteria	Month	Assessment
1	Articles and papers for publication	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly explain applicability of the model to other Countries Published on resources that are relevant and coherent with the target group 	M30	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> complete complete
2	Conference	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Actively involves stakeholders contacted during project implementation Clearly describes and communicates advantages deriving from project Provides effective tools for application of the model in other Countries 	M30	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> complete complete complete
3	Policy Paper	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Outline terms, benefits, processes for the set up and operation of project's networking program Identify potential stakeholders/ exploiters Create channels to communicate the project results 	M30	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> complete complete complete

Naming Deliverables

All the **results/ deliverables** have to be based on the **template for documents** developed by the Project Coordinator and approved by all partners. A **standardized document name** should to be used for every first draft of a deliverable (as well as for every new document, see below) consisting of:

1. the **calendar date** in the order year/month/day and this format: "yyyymmdd"
2. the **deliverable number** in this format: "DN.N"
3. the **final deliverable name** (only the names from the Grand Agreement)
4. the **version number** in this format: "vN.N"

the **file format** in this format: ".pdf"