

**Project Prepare mobility
2012-1-It1 - Leo05 - 02800**

WP2: Quality Plan

Work Package:	2	Quality assurance
Description	Quality plan	
Author	Antonio Mocci (subcontractor of Trento Province)	

Index

1. Background of the quality monitoring and evaluation procedure
2. Scope and purpose of evaluation
 - 2.1 Terms of reference of the project
 - 2.2 Evaluation strategy
3. Methodologies and techniques
4. Timetable
5. Modalities for information collection
6. Annexes included in the quality package (Appreciation questionnaires and work program assessment format in En and It).

December 2012

1. Background of the quality monitoring and evaluation procedure

The present plan for evaluation and quality assurance has been developed specifically for Prepare mobility - PREMO, a Leonardo da Vinci project in the framework of the Lifelong Learning Programme (reference no. 2012-1-It1 - Leo05 - 02800).

According to the Guide for Applicants to the Lifelong Learning Programme, every network that receives financing under the Programme is asked to establish mechanisms for monitoring and evaluation, besides mechanisms for updating the work program, work methodology and organisational arrangements. From the point of view of the EU Commission, this has three primary objectives:

- Providing the data and the necessary information for the evaluation at the national and community wide level. The specifications regarding the type of data to be monitored, recorded and submitted to the experts are normally provided by the managing authority;
- Documenting experiences and collecting information for the thematic networks and activities that may be established at the national and community wide level in order to identify, verify and publish interesting practices;
- Controlling the activities and developments of the network and of the work done at the transnational level so as to evaluate them in a continuously way in order to improve one's own performance and the results obtained.

The Partner responsible for Work Package 2: Quality assurance is the Province of Trento.

PREMO considers the evaluation and monitoring activities as part of the quality assessment policy of the project, which is meant as a systematic activity aiming to describe and reconstruct the project implementation, through the methodical retrieval of data and information.

This quality plan describes inputs/outputs that will be expected from each Partner and presents feedback questionnaires that will be used for implementing the monitoring and evaluation.

2. Scope and purpose of the evaluation

2.1 Terms of reference from the project.

According to the approved project, the quality securing activity of PREMO has the following aims:

- to analyse to what extent project activities and results satisfy the expectations of all involved actors;
- to investigate the results' production process and project's outputs to check their conformity to plans and to the LLP priorities;
- to analyse the impact of the transfer process on partners and end users;
- to support the project staff with information on project progress;
- to verify the efficacy of the valorisation activity.

Therefore, monitoring and evaluation aim at individuating possible differences between what was planned and what is realised, identifying eventual risk areas, adopting promptly correcting or preventive measures, repositioning the intervention according to the stated finalities. Within this context, quality assurance implies management aspects and operative solutions to secure:

- transparency of working processes,
- clear understanding in participants of general objectives and of their role,
- measurability of results,
- use of indicators related to project tasks and goals,
- achievement of the LLL Program priorities and aims,
- prevention of risks.

In order to meet its objectives and to accomplish its tasks, evaluation is structured in the following activities:

Redaction of the quality plan. Basing on the terms of reference, the evaluator will design a quality plan to be proposed during the kick off meeting. The quality plan will contain the evaluation strategy, the envisaged methodology, evaluation tools, the indicators, modalities for reporting and schedule.

Elaboration of tools. In order to collect information from partners and end users, several types of tools will be developed:

- a format to collect periodically information on project progress and appreciation from partners (see annex).
- questionnaires and interview grids to measure the impact on project partners and end users. Questionnaires will be delivered at the end of each steering committee meeting and after the workshops. The tools will be also used at the end of dissemination events.

Reporting. The information on quality securing and on evaluation will be inserted in two reports: the first, the interim report, will be produced one month before the deadline fixed by the Italian National Agency for Leonardo da Vinci for the official Interim Report. The second one, the final report, will be ready one month before the end of the project. The final report will formulate the conclusive evaluation judgement and will contain proposals for enhancing the sustainability of produced benefits beyond the end of the project. The information used for monitoring and evaluation will be used as well to report to the National Agency.

2.2 Evaluation strategy

Generally speaking, all complex projects need to be carefully monitored and evaluated. Nevertheless, approaches for doing so may vary significantly as for objectives and methodologies. As for **approaches**, VET – related (and, in a broader perspective, human capital development) interventions realised within funded projects may be assessed from different points of view:

- first of all, evaluation can have a **control** purpose: in this case, the focus is on the rigid verification of the correspondence between planned results and produced results;
- evaluation meant as **verification of outcomes**: in this case, funded interventions are considered as a path articulated in: objectives → input → process → output and the focus is on participants reactions, learning (knowledge and experience), changes produced in the relevant context;
- finally, evaluation as **research**: this approach considers VET actions as a process open to different results, in which involved actors are reaching out for objectives which not necessarily are homogeneous. Here the focus is on checking outcomes through considering the whole process of outcomes production, the organisational conditions, and the actors involved.

From this short conceptual clarification derive the methodological choices that the evaluator proposes for the evaluation of PREMO. Referring to the three paths for evaluation approach mentioned above, first of all it must be said that this assessment will have no control intention, since in the Lifelong Learning Programme this function is up to the EU Commission and to the National Agencies. The chosen approach is in between the other two paths: it is verification of outcomes as it considers PREMO outputs and actions as processes aiming at creating an impact on problems and challenges identified by the project. And it is evaluation as research since it reconstructs the process of results production, considering the modalities of working, the organisational conditions, and involved actors, trying to link this to the conceptual framework, which generated the project idea.

The proposed approach to monitoring and evaluation is an integrated methodology which combines evaluation criteria based on objectives with other criteria which reflect the different types of actions carried out by the partners.

In fact, monitoring is meant here as a systematic collection of information aiming to analyse the project completion process.

Monitoring focuses on project processes and pertains the development of project activities through the implementation of an effective cooperation within the partnership. Cooperation is made explicit by:

- defined goals and tasks;
- transnational project meetings;
- event organisation;
- cooperation and communication between Partners;
- project management;
- progresses made towards the project's goals.

The above mentioned topics will be investigated through the periodical delivery of formats and questionnaires: the project progress analysis will provide indications on possible measures for improvement to be implemented by the partnership.

The information will be collected through a monitoring form (in annex): partners will be asked to fill it every six months, as this is the period of time the National Agency has fixed for their monitoring activity.

Information collected from partners and with questionnaires will be processed to give feedback to the steering committee and interested stakeholders (National Agency, EU Commission).

PREMO monitoring objectives

- first, to analyse transnational actions to produce information on the way objectives are reached;
- second, to consider project activities so as to identify success factors and outputs, with the aim to identify good practices that may boost innovation transfer potential;
- third, to consider project implementation process so as to check if tasks are performed regularly by partners and actors involved.

As for **evaluation**, it has to be remembered that its main characteristic is the formulation of a judgement, based on the information provided for by monitoring and which aims to answer the fundamental questions of those interested in evaluation: have project objectives been met ? have expected results been produced ? did participants gain benefits ? have human and financial resources been properly used ?

Besides these “basic” requests, there are other evaluation questions related to the several actions of the project: was the organisational pattern correct ? were communication mechanisms effective ? were tasks correctly balanced among partners ? are results according to expectations ? are they transferable and sustainable ?

The evaluation will cover both the quality of the envisaged project process as well of as planned products. Project processes will be assessed by the Partners with the help of specific questionnaires included in the quality package and prepared by the person in charge of evaluation. The quantitative and qualitative outcomes of evaluation will be summarized in two quality reports (mid-term and final) prepared by the evaluator. This person will also assess the overall management of the project and will provide inputs on the degree of innovation, transferability and sustainability reached by the results achieved by the project.

More in detail, the dimensions for quality securing, have already been listed in the application form and are the following:

Relevance. Quality securing activity will investigate to what extent project objectives are justified against needs that generated them. Relevance will also refer to local, national and European priorities and will also consider strategies aiming to improve the accessibility to mobility interventions.

Efficacy. Evaluation will check to what extent project objectives will be met and if non expected effects were generated.

Utility. Quality securing will consider the added value for participants.

Innovation. Evaluation will cope with the effects of the transfer of innovation on recipient contexts.

Transferability. The potential for further transfer of the PREMO model will be investigated, with specific reference to the competitors in offering mobility interventions.

Sustainability. Evaluation will consider to what extent results and benefits may last in time.

Quality descriptors and indicators.

As far as indicators are regarded, the application form already listed some of them: in particular, **impact indicators referring to targets** are:

- number of youngsters in training or in placement involved in the project tests (threshold: at least 20 youngsters per territory);
- level of satisfaction of participants to training;
- number of information requests received by the territorial structure for mobility;
- number of participants to final conference;
- number of copies of the service charter circulated;
- number of operators of the territorial structure trained;
- number of companies informed about the structure services;
- number of visits to the web site;
- number of links available on the project vortal;
- number of protocols signed.

On the other hand, the **impact on territories** will consider the following indicators.

- number of youngsters in training or in placement involved in the project tests (threshold: at least 20 youngsters per territory);
- level of satisfaction of participants to training;
- number of information requests received by the territorial structure for mobility;
- number of participants to the launch event;
- number of participants to the focus groups;
- number of participants to the final conference;
- level of variety of mobility services;
- number of requests for support services to mobility;
- number of counters created within the territorial structure;
- number of companies accredited as sites for placements.

In addition to those indicators, the importance (and again, the heterogeneity) of meetings and events suggests to develop meeting quality indicators/descriptors, such as the following.

Meeting achievements and efficiency

- Achievement of meeting objectives
- Establishment of a common working basis
- Clarification of roles and tasks

Structure, contents and delivery of the meeting

- Selection of themes addressed

- Appropriateness of agenda, clear relation to project aims
- Clarity of information given, quality of presentations
- Quality and efficiency of work methods
- Quality of documents, working materials

Quality of transnational cooperation during the meeting

- Extent to which a reasonable representation of participants from various countries has been achieved
- Extent to which each Partner contributed to the meeting
- Extent and quality of the intercultural dimension
- Mutual understanding amongst Partners about the project
- Level of satisfaction with working language
- Level of satisfaction with strategies for overcoming language difficulties

Quality of arrangements

- Accommodation (hotel)
- Meeting location
- Meals
- Balance between work and social programme
- Duration, date and timing of the meeting

Overall opinion about the meeting

- Overall satisfaction with the meeting

Finally, with the purpose to collect information and assess the work package flow, the following WP quality indicators can be applied.

Contents of the WP

- Aims of the WP
- Roles and responsibilities of Partners
- Quality of the described working methods
- Products of the WP
- Realistic planning of time and material/financial resources

WP implementation

- The WP was sufficiently introduced by the WP-coordinator
- Quality of working materials
- Quality of common working basis and of working methods
- Effective distribution of roles and responsibilities among Partners
- Quality of the coordination (deadline monitor, assistance...)

Own work in the WP

- Good understanding of roles and responsibilities
- Satisfaction of activities appointed in the WP
- Evaluation of time and material/financial resources to perform the activities
- Evaluation of information and working materials to perform the activities
- Personal involvement (ability to use expertise in the WP, possibility to gain new expertise, valuable contribution to the partnership)

Cooperation during the WP

- Contribution and responsibility of each Partner to the WP
- Evaluation of general working climate
- Evaluation of communication between Partners
- Evaluation of data and in-between results
- Evaluation of the cooperation during the development of end-product(s)

Overall opinion about the WP

- Satisfaction with the process of the WP

3. Methodologies and techniques.

Since the PREMO project is an articulated mix of different actions, the methodology adopted will be a mix of different techniques and tools as well. The overall approach will be participative, as this seems the best way to involve actively the different actors who will implement the project. Feedback and reactions will be collected during and after the events in presence (workshops, focus groups and final event) to appreciate opinions and relevance attributed to the events' outcomes.

The overall methodology implies a cyclical structure: planning evaluation (in the quality plan), checking periodically information (with questionnaires and formats), informing the steering committee about project implementation (during SC meetings) and supporting project staff in managing activities.

The interim report and the final evaluation document will describe the results of the project, analysing and processing the information coming from the monitoring activity. The story and acquis of PREMO will then be available.

4. Timetable.

The quality securing activity will start from the project inception and will last for all project lifespan. **Milestones** for monitoring and evaluation are as follows:

- Redaction of the draft for the quality plan: December 2012;
- Discussion on and validation of the quality plan: kick off meeting, 3 – 4 December 2012;
- Analysis of the activity realised by the partners: on going;
- First workshop: observation of activities and feedback collection: 4 December 2012;
- Interim report: approximately September 2013;
- Second and third steering committee meeting: observation of activities and feedback collection: in 2013;
- Final event: observation of activities and feedback collection: in 2014;
- Final report: September 2014.

5. Modalities for information collection.

About every six months, all participants will send the quality manager an updated version of the format attached to this document (see annex 1): the format will be filled with information on all recent activities. SC's meetings, workshops and focus groups will be checked for appreciation of participants.

6. Annexes to the quality plan:

Q1 Questionnaire for partners. Participants to the meeting - En

Q1 Questionario per i partner. Partecipanti ai meeting - It

Q2 Questionnaire for workshop participants - En

Q2 Questionario per i partecipanti ai workshop - It

Format for collecting information on project implementation.

Q1. Satisfaction questionnaire: Participants to meetings - En	
Organisation:	
Name of participant:	
Meeting:	
Date of the meeting	
Venue of the meeting	

Please give your opinion about the meeting using the following criteria:
 😊😊😊 = excellent 😊😊 = very positive; 😊 = positive; 😐 = neither/nor; 😞 = poor;
 😞😞 = very poor; 😞😞😞 = terrible. NA = not applicable

1. How do you rate the achievements made in the meeting and its efficiency ?

Aspect of evaluation	😊😊😊	😊😊	😊	😐	😞	😞😞	😞😞😞	NA
Achievement of meeting objectives								
Establishment of a common working basis								
Clarification of roles and tasks								

If any of your answers were “poor” (😞) or below, please write why and how this could be improved.

2. How do you rate the structure, contents and the delivery of the meeting ?

Aspect of evaluation	😊😊😊	😊😊	😊	😐	😞	😞😞	😞😞😞	NA
Selection of themes addressed								
Appropriateness of agenda, clear relation to project aims								
Clarity of information given, quality of presentations								
Quality and efficiency of work methods								
Quality of documents, working materials								

If any of your answers were “poor” (😞) or below, please write why and how this could be improved.

3. How do you rate the quality of the transnational cooperation during the meeting ?

Aspect of evaluation	😊😊😊	😊😊	😊	😐	😞	😞😞	😞😞😞	NA
Representation of participants from various countries								
Partners' contribution to the								

meeting								
Extent and quality of the intercultural dimension								
Mutual understanding among partners about project implementation								
Level of satisfaction with working language (EN)								
Level of satisfaction with strategies for overcoming language difficulties								

If any of your answers were “poor” (☹) or below, please write why and how this could be improved.

4. What do you think of the practical arrangements for the meeting ?

Aspect of evaluation	☺☺☺	☺☺	☺	☹	☹☹	☹☹☹	☹☹☹☹	NA
Accommodation								
Meeting location								
Meals								
Balance between work and social programme								
Duration, date and timing of the meeting								

If any of your answers were “poor” (☹) or below, please write why and how this could be improved.

5. What is your overall opinion about the meeting ?

Aspect of evaluation	☺☺☺	☺☺	☺	☹	☹☹	☹☹☹	☹☹☹☹	NA
Overall opinion on the meeting								

6. Comments on the aspects mentioned.

Q1. Questionario di gradimento: Partecipanti ai meeting	
Organizzazione:	
Nome del partecipante:	
Meeting:	
Data del meeting	
Sede del meeting	

Fornite la vostra opinione sul meeting usando i seguenti giudizi:
 😊😊😊= eccellente 😊😊 = molto positivo; 😊 = positivo; 😐 = neutrale; ☹ = scarso;
 ☹☹= molto scarso; ☹☹☹ = inqualificabile. NA= non applicabile

1. Come valutate i risultati del meeting e la sua efficienza ?

Aspetto della valutazione	😊😊😊	😊😊	😊	😊	☹	☹☹	☹☹☹	NA
Raggiungimento degli obiettivi del meeting								
Raggiungimento di una base lavorativa comune								
Chiarezza su ruoli e compiti								

Se la tua valutazione è stata in qualche caso “scarso” (☹) o inferiore, scrivi perché e come potrebbe essere migliorato.

2. Come valuti la struttura, i contenuti e la realizzazione del meeting ?

Aspetto della valutazione	😊😊😊	😊😊	😊	😊	☹	☹☹	☹☹☹	NA
Scelta degli argomenti da trattare								
Correttezza della costruzione dell’agenda e chiaro collegamento con gli obiettivi del progetto								
Chiarezza dell’informazione disponibile, qualità delle presentazioni.								
Qualità ed efficienza dei metodi di lavoro								
Qualità dei documenti e dei materiali di lavoro.								

Se la tua valutazione è stata in qualche caso “scarso” (☹) o inferiore, scrivi perché e come potrebbe essere migliorato.

3. Come valuti la qualità della cooperazione transnazionale durante il meeting ?

Aspetto della valutazione	☺☺☺	☺☺	☺	☹	☹☹	☹☹☹	☹☹☹☹	NA
Presenza di partecipanti da vari paesi								
Contributo dei partner al meeting								
Ampiezza e qualità della dimensione interculturale								
Reciproca comprensione fra i partner circa l'implementazione del progetto.								
Livello di soddisfazione relativamente alla lingua di lavoro								
Livello di soddisfazione relativamente alle strategie per superare le difficoltà linguistiche								

Se la tua valutazione è stata in qualche caso “scarso” (☹) o inferiore, scrivi perché e come potrebbe essere migliorato.

4. Cosa pensi dei preparativi pratici per il meeting ?

Aspetto della valutazione	☺☺☺	☺☺	☺	☹	☹☹	☹☹☹	☹☹☹☹	NA
Alloggio								
Sede del meeting								
Pasti								
Bilanciamento fra programma lavorativo e programma sociale								
Durata, data e tempistica del meeting								

Se la tua valutazione è stata in qualche caso “scarso” (☹) o inferiore, scrivi perché e come potrebbe essere migliorato.

5. Qual è la tua opinione complessiva sul meeting ?

Aspetto della valutazione	☺☺☺	☺☺	☺	☹	☹☹	☹☹☹	☹☹☹☹	NA
Opinione generale sul meeting								

6. Commenti e suggerimenti.

Q2. Satisfaction questionnaire: Participants to workshops (EN)	
Organisation:	
Name of participant:	
Workshop:	

Please give your opinion about the workshop using the following criteria:								
☺☺ = very positive; ☺ = positive; ☹ = neither/nor; ☹ = negative; ☹☹ = very negative; NA = not applicable								
Criteria	☺☺	☺	☹	☹	☹☹	NA	What did you like best?	What would you change?
1.1. Relevance of the content to your daily work								
1.2. Personal interest in the content								
1.3. Scope / duration of the workshop								
1.4. Organisation and preparation of the workshop								
1.5. Relevant mixture of activities: e.g. icebreaking activities, didactic sessions, free time, group activities,...								
1.6. Quality of the working materials								
1.7. Competence and engagement of the experts / facilitators								
1.8. Overall how did you like this workshop ?								

1.9. Would you recommend the participation to this workshop to others?	definitely	probably yes	probably not	definitely not
1.10. Do you feel your knowledge in the field covered by the workshop improved thanks to the participation ?	definitely	probably yes	probably not	definitely not

1.11. If any of your answers to 1.9 and 1.10 were “probably or definitely not”, please state your reasons and how you feel this would be improved.	
---	--

Q2. Questionario di gradimento: Partecipanti ai workshop (It)	
Organizzazione:	
Nome del partecipante:	
Workshop:	

Fornite la vostra opinione sul workshop usando i seguenti giudizi: 😄😄 = molto positivo; 😊 = positivo; 😐 = neutrale; 😞 = scarso; 😞😞 = molto scarso; NA= non applicabile								
Giudizio	😊😊	😊	😐	😞	😞😞	NA	Cosa ti è piaciuto di più ?	Cosa cambieresti ?
1.1. Rilevanza del contenuto per il tuo lavoro quotidiano								
1.2. Interesse personale nel contenuto								
1.3. Obiettivo e durata del workshop								
1.4. Organizzazione e preparazione del workshop								
1.5. Varietà e combinazione delle attività: presentazioni, discussione, approfondimento,...								
1.6. Qualità dei materiali di lavoro								
1.7. Competenza e impegno dei conduttori il workshop								
1.8. In generale, quanto ti è piaciuto il workshop ?								

1.9. Sugeriresti ad altri della tua organizzazione di partecipare al workshop ?	Assolutamente si	Forse si	Forse no	Assolutamente no
1.10. Ritieni che la tua conoscenza nel campo affrontato dal workshop sia migliorata dopo la partecipazione al workshop ?	Assolutamente si	Forse si	Forse no	Assolutamente no

1.11. Se le risposte alle domande 1.9 e 1.10 sono state forse no o assolutamente no, spiega perché e come si potrebbe migliorare.	
---	--

Format for the periodical collection of information.

Period considered :

Partners involved:

PARTNER	
ORGANIZATION	
Referent for the survey	
TEL. and FAX	
e-mail	

1. How do you think the execution of activities is managed ? Rates 1 = lowest, 4 highest. N.A. = Not applicable.

	Aspect of evaluation	1	2	3	4	N.A.
a.	The work programme was sufficiently introduced by the Work Package / Project coordinator.					
b.	Working materials, such as documents, instructions, formats, etc. were clear.					
c.	The working method(s) implemented were effective.					
d.	The WP/Project coordinator made sure that agreements were clear and were kept.					
e.	The WP/ Project coordinator made sure that deadlines of activities were observed.					
f.	The WP/Project coordinator made sure that the quality of the product(s) was observed.					
Comments, learning points & suggestions for improvement:						

2. How do you rate your own work activities in this period ? Rates 1 = lowest, 4 highest. N.A. = Not applicable.

No	Aspect of evaluation	1	2	3	4	N.A.
a.	We had enough time and material/financial resources to perform the work activities.					
b.	We had enough information and working materials to perform the activities.					
c.	We had the right expertise to perform the work activities.					
d.	We have gained new knowledge/expertise in this period.					
e.	We feel our contribution to the results of this period is valued by the partnership.					
f.	We have executed our role/responsibility's as agreed.					
Comments, learning points & suggestions for improvement:						

3. How do you rate the cooperation during the period ? Rates 1 = lowest, 4 highest. N.A. = Not applicable.

No	Aspect of evaluation	1	2	3	4	N.A.
a.	Each partner contributed to the work as agreed.					
b.	Each partner felt responsible for the end-result(s) of the period.					
c.	There's been a good general working climate.					
d.	The communication between partners was effective and satisfactory.					
e.	Data and in-between results were sufficiently available.					
f.	The product(s) of this period can be considered as a real co-production of the partnership.					
Comments, learning points & suggestions for improvement:						

4. What did you appreciate most during the execution of activities in this period ?

5. Further comments and suggestions for improvement

--

6. How do you rate the quality of the product(s) realised in this period ? Rates 1 = lowest, 4 highest. N.A. = Not applicable.

No	Aspect of evaluation	1	2	3	4	N.A.
a.	The product(s) realised in this period are in line with the aims of the project.					
b.	The product(s) are (likely to be) used by the target group(s).					
c.	The product(s) are (going to be) used by our organization.					
Comments, learning points & suggestions for improvement:						