

# Quality Report

---



<b>Quality Report</b>	
Deliverable number: Volume (if necessary):	Del. 16
Work package title:	Quality Report
Work package number:	WP 3
Dissemination level:	Confidential
Submission date:	30th December 2015
Work package Leader:	SEERC

# Quality Report

---

## Executive Summary

This is a report that analyzes the main issues that the QA (Quality Assurance) team confronted with, during the second term of the project (after month 18). In this respect, all deliverables that were under quality assurance are briefly described, and QA team's main comments and suggestions are mentioned. Recommendations based on the lessons learned from the quality assurance exercise are also provided.

The main conclusion of the report is that the deliverables so far were comprehensive, detailed and accompanied by rich supportive evidence. Although the project is quite complex because of the high number of materials developed, objectives and deliverables, deliverable outcomes were quite satisfactory.

However, there is still room for improvement as there were some cases where, although an extremely extensive and outstanding work had been done (and this is evident from the supporting evidence provided in most of the deliverables) this was not very clear to the reader, since the main conclusions and recommendations of the deliverable were not emphasized.

# Quality Report

---

## 1. Introduction

After the Interim Report (month 18) of the project, SEERC developed a Quality Assurance (QA) plan with the guidelines for the write-up of the deliverables. More analytically, the QA-plan defined the roles and responsibilities of the partners involved, described the methodology to be followed and made reference to the relevant templates that need to be used for all report type deliverables.

The current deliverable is an overall assessment of the finalized deliverables from month 18 until the end of the project based on the quality assurance criteria set. In the first part of the report after a **brief description on the quality assurance process**, an **overall assessment of all the deliverables** is presented providing **the conclusions** made from the QA exercise so far.

A general comment is that on average the deliverables were not of report format as most of them were tools and materials developed and used, training, events and services so the quality assurance was based mostly in brief descriptive reports, questionnaires, photos and other supportive evidence which give an overall view of the deliverables but in some cases further e-mail communication was necessary so that some procedures and outcomes to become clear. All the deliverables were successfully complied with the criteria set in the QA exercise and were **comprehensive and accompanied with the relevant supportive evidence**.

Eliemental was a complex project regarding the high number of deliverables which in some cases as the project evolved, the deliverables and WPs needed to change to accommodate the needs of the research. Also, sometimes confusions are created when a **deliverable's description is not so clear** in the DoW; in some cases, some WPs could have been merged to avoid complexity as some deliverables in different WPs were very relevant. The fact that almost all the deliverables included materials and tools that needed to be translated in three languages from English (the partners languages were Romania, Polish and Greek), made the project more complex in terms of documentation that needed to be organized, filed and used.

However, although the complexity regarding the project delivery and objectives the deliverable outcomes were of a **very good standard** and **after month 18, no communication problems were observed** what has been noticed thorough the QA process is that although all deliverables were implemented successfully, in some cases **not enough emphasis is placed on the conclusions and impact part**.

The final part of the report refers to QA team's recommendations for future use.

Mainly, it is recommended that the deliverables' format must be clear and always accompanied by a report. That way it will be more clear what exactly was delivered, how and why. Regarding the documents (tools, reports) the **deliverable template should be followed more closely**. In that way deliverables will have a more concise structure where further actions that need to be taken will be highlighted and responsibilities will be more clearly defined.

Also, the responsibilities of the WP Leader must be made more clear in the DoW. The WP Leader is responsible not only for the delivery of the relevant deliverables, the objectives of the deliverable and the WP but also for documentation corresponding to the deliverables and organizing the material of the specific WP in the shared platform with the rest of the partners.

# Quality Report

---

## 2. The Quality Assurance Process – Overall Assessment

As described in Deliverable 15 Quality Plan, the QA team developed certain criteria to assess the quality of the project deliverables, and incorporated them in an easy to use checklist. Once the deliverable was ready, the relevant WP Leader was sending the relevant deliverable to SEERC and this checklist was completed by SEERC. It was then sent to the project coordinator for comments and approval, while the WP Leader was also informed. There were cases where the relevant WP Leader sent some of the evidence supporting the deliverable and it was not easy to follow with the delivery.

Based on the checklist and the incorporated comments in the document, the WP leader might needed to make the appropriate changes in the deliverable and send it again for approval or in any other case it was considered complete.

The criteria set involved the deliverables' consistency with the project's workpackages', and deliverables' objectives, the quality of the content and the adequacy of complementary information. On average, all deliverables managed to meet these criteria in terms of content, procedures, supplementary information and formatting. It is evident that all partners had worked following the description of work and put effort in the project having impact. In terms of their content, the deliverables complied with the objectives of the project, the specific objectives of the work package, and the description of work of the relevant deliverable. In terms of presentation, as most of the deliverables were not in report format, they couldn't comply with the report template and in some cases a brief report as e-mail was asked so to make clearer whether the deliverable meet the quality criteria. All supplementary information were provided as templates, completed after the relevant deliverables and translated in all partners' languages (English, Polish, Romanian, Greek). However, in many cases because of the many deliverables and large amount of information provided (e.g. photos from 4 countries for most of the deliverables, training materials, translations of all the materials, questionnaires for mentors, for mentees, questionnaires before training, after training, interviews e.t.c.) it was not clear that everything was followed according to the WP and Deliverables' description as well as Dropbox which was originally used as the online platform for sharing all the information was proved insufficient for such a large amount of information. Many of the partners couldn't follow the updated information uploaded on Dropbox because of storage limitation having as a result to lack in organisation of the saved information on specific deliverables.

Communication of the partners responsible for deliverable production with the WP leaders, the Coordinator and the QA team was also efficient and prompt. There were some small delays from most of the partners, which however did not affect the outcome. Overall, QA's suggestions were followed up consistently.

In many cases, it was deemed necessary to modify the content, the focus or the timing of some of the deliverables according to the needs of the research. In some cases the delivery took longer than initially planned and also the fact that there were staff changes during the project's duration, affected timing as well.

The following tables summarize the (table 1) Deliverables together with the submission date and potential delays and the (table 2) QA checklist for all finalized deliverables after month 18 when the quality assurance exercise started.

# Quality Report

Table 1.

Deliv.	Title	WP	WP leader	Exp. delivery date (updated)	Submission Date
2.2	Recruit and manage stakeholder advisory panels	1	ULANC	M27	M24 & M26
2.3	Recruit and manage stakeholder advisory panels	1	ULANC	M34	Romanian panel not held
3.4	Partner Meetings (UK)	1	ULANC	M25	M23
3.5	Partner Meetings (PL)	1	ULANC	M31	M30
3.6	Partner Meetings (B)	1	ULANC	M36	M36
5	Final Report	1	ULANC	M36	M36
8.3	Biennial Newsletter No. 3	2	SEERC	M24	M24
8.4	Biennial Newsletter No. 4	2	SEERC	M30	M34
8.5	Biennial Newsletter No. 5	2	SEERC	M36	M36
10	Policy Roundtable Discussion Day	2	SEERC	M28	M28-M36 Different submission dates between partner countries
11	Policy Briefing Document	2	SEERC	M30	M36
13	Knowledge Exchange Launch Event	2	SEERC	M36	M36
14	Conference Presentations and Academic Articles	2	SEERC	M8-36	M8-M36
15	Quality Plan	3	SEERC	M25	M28
16	Quality Report	3	SEERC	M36	M36
17.2	Report from Independent Evaluation	3	SEERC	M27	M27
17.3	Report from Independent Evaluation	3	SEERC	M36	M36
26	Community Noticeboards (CAPS)	5	BTEG	M14	
28	Individual Modules and Learning Materials and Enterprise Skills Qualification	6	TAMESIDE	M25	M25-M36 Updated
29	Validated ELEMENTAL ENTERPRISE SKILLS QUALIFICATION	7	TAMESIDE	M23	M14-M35
30	Mentor Match System	8	LODZ	M23	M23-M36 Updates
31	Enterprise Mentor training Materials	8	LODZ	M23	M23-M36 Updates
32	Data Collection Tools	9	ERGANI	M31	M31-M36 Completed
33	Evaluation report of Pilot	10	LODZ	M34	M34

# Quality Report

---

Table 2.

Deliv.	Title	WP	WP compliance	Deliverable compliance	Overall project compliance	Complementary Information
2.2	Recruit and manage stakeholder advisory panels	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2.3	Recruit and manage stakeholder advisory panels	1	Partially - One Meeting in Romania not delivered.	Partially	Partially	Yes
3.4	Partner Meetings (UK)	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
3.5	Partner Meetings (PL)	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
3.6	Partner Meetings (B)	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
5	Final Report	1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
8.3	Biennial Newsletter No. 3	2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
8.4	Biennial Newsletter No. 4	2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
8.5	Biennial Newsletter No. 5	2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
8.6	Biennial Newsletter No. 6	2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
10	Policy Roundtable Discussion Day	2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
11	Policy Briefing Document	2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
13	Knowledge Exchange Launch Event	2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
14	Conference Presentations and Academic Articles	2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
15	Quality Plan	3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
16	Quality Report	3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
17.2	Report from Independent Evaluation	3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
17.3	Report from Independent Evaluation	3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
26	Community Noticeboards (CAPS)	5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
28	Individual Modules and Learning Materials and Enterprise Skills Qualification	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
29	Validated ELEMENTAL ENTERPRISE SKILLS QUALIFICATION	7	Yes	Yes	Partially	Yes
30	Mentor Match System	8	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
31	Enterprise Mentor training Materials	8	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
32	Training	9	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
33	Evaluation of the Mentoring	10	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

### **3. Analysis of WPs**

This section summarizes the QA for all WPs completed after month 18. In the analysis that follows a general assessment of the WPs is presented based on the Quality assurance exercise of all the relevant deliverables.

#### **WP1: Project Management**

##### **Advisory Panel meetings**

All the Advisory panel meetings took place in three of the four countries (UK, Poland, Greece). Elemental advisory panels (one per country) were formed from HEI representatives, businesses, academics, policy makers, community groups and participants. All the supporting evidence was provided including meeting minutes, photos and participation sheets.

##### **Partners' meetings**

Partners' meeting took place according to the description of work in all partners' countries. Several Skype and Google hangout meetings took place also in order for the partners to coordinate and make sure all the deliverables are performed efficiently. Meeting minutes, travel evidence, participation lists and photos were provided for all meetings. Project meetings provided opportunities for face to face exchange of information, discussions on planning and monitoring deliverables, analysis of findings and developing new theoretical and practical approaches for the project.

The final report produced at the end of the project summarizes successfully the entire project; from its inception, methodology, findings, pilot and results.

#### **WP2: Dissemination and Exploitation**

##### **Newsletters**

Six Newsletters according to the description of work were prepared during the Elemental project (to be precise, five newsletters and one brochure). All the newsletters provided up to date information on the project in electronic format and through dissemination, a route for engaging with the project for a wide range of stakeholders was offered. All the newsletters were published on the website and sent electronically to identified stakeholders including enterprise educators, 3<sup>rd</sup> sector organisations, policymakers, FE and VET providers and HEI enterprise offices in all four countries.

Policy roundtable discussion day, policy briefing document & Final event

# Quality Report

---

All the dissemination events of WP2 were held successfully. The target of the Policy roundtable discussion day in each country, was to bring participants and policymakers from the relevant countries together with other stakeholders to discuss the policy implications of the ELEIMENTAL projects. Using the briefing notes from the event a policy briefing document on approaches to breaking down the social and cultural barriers to entrepreneurship was developed. At the last month of the project, the final event also targeted in dissemination, invited policy makers, 3<sup>rd</sup> sector representatives and FE/HE providers to inform them on the findings of ELIEMENTAL, exchange knowledge through workshops with attendees to demonstrate the ELIEMENTAL approaches to breaking down the social and cultural barriers to entrepreneurship as well as to provide all participants with an information pack.

## **WP3: Quality Assurance**

In our effort to ensure that the project runs according to the proposed description of work, ensure that the project timescales and deliverables were met, ensure that the scope of research of all the deliverables and WPs after month 18 were successfully completed, we run the Quality assurance exercise and the external evaluation. A two-pronged approach was used: a) SEERC internally evaluated providing advice/support to project managers/staff through a 'critical friend' approach and b) An external evaluator provided an evaluation plan by capturing outcomes and results through a set of indicators and used these to monitor progress. A final evaluation report capturing overall results and outputs was produced.

## **WP5: Mapping Community Access Points**

### **Community Noticeboards**

The community Noticeboards, D26 was the only deliverable completed after month 18 from WP5. Notiboards were used in several cases as dissemination tools in different settings in the four countries. The noticeboards provided a space for information about the project to be displayed, and also provided takeaway information in the form of leaflets. Accompanying material was successfully provided for the deliverable.

## **WP6: Design of ELEIMENTAL Enterprise Learning Toolkit and Enterprise Skills Qualification**

Using information from WP4, Learning Materials successfully developed with input from VET & FE providers. All learning materials are easy accessible from anyone interested.

# Quality Report

---

## **WP7: Validation of Enterprise Skills Qualification**

The deliverable reports on the validation of the eliemental in all partner countries. All the necessary information on each country were asked from the partners so that during the quality assurance to become clear what is the case in each country. In two of the four countries the eliemental has been accredited while in Greece and Poland this was not possible due to specific to country restrictions. Some information regarding the impact of accreditation of the programme in each country could have been provided.

## **WP8: Recruitment and training of SME mentors and facilitating access to support for participants wanting to start up businesses**

Deliverables 30 and 31 were successfully developed and implemented. Materials have been evaluated and revised by partners to meet the needs and targets of the Eliemental project. Materials are all translated in all partners' languages and this makes it very easy for potential participants in the future to use them. Access to the material is easy via the Eliemental project website.

## **WP9: Data Collection Tools**

This deliverable describes the pilot training of trainee entrepreneurs the development of a portfolio of data collection tools during the pilot training of Eliemental participants. Objectives of the WP and D32 were met successfully.

## **WP10: Evaluation of our learning tools & mentoring system**

Four questionnaires were developed in the frame of evaluating the learning tools used. Appendix A Questionnaire on the mentees' needs, a Mentoring system post-evaluation questionnaire for Mentee, a Mentoring system post-evaluation questionnaire for Mentor and a questionnaire with final questions addressed to partners on mentoring issues. The evaluation materials were translated in Polish, Romanian and Greek for easy use by the mentors and mentees. Also interesting recommendations for the future are proposed in the deliverable. The evaluation showed that overall both mentors and mentees were satisfied with the mentoring process although changes are suggested targeting in mentoring improvement and what this can follow.

## **Conclusions & Recommendations**

Based on the deliverables checked, the following suggestions can be made.

# Quality Report

---

- Deliverables in report format (even in brief report format) are necessary in order to make clear whether the deliverable was delivered successfully and whether it meets the criteria and scope of the WP and the description of work. More specifically, it is necessary that a brief report or an executive summary of a report to provide a brief description of the deliverable and its main outcomes and the conclusion part recommendations for further actions where appropriate. In that way further actions that need to be taken will be highlighted and responsibilities will be more clearly defined.
- Carefully following the template will also improve the overall presentation of the produced tools and documents as well as the deliverable (report form).
- When technical information must be included for the deliverable, it would be good if all supporting evidence for all Deliverables would be kept on the shared online platform and updated by the relevant WP Leader, in order to avoid confusion because of the large number of the deliverables, materials created and evidence.
- Regarding communication issues, when a deliverable's description is not so clear in the DoW, an effort to reach a common understanding between the the WP leader and the project coordinator is essential. The WP Leader is responsible for the successful completion of the WP and the relevant deliverables.
- Finally, when decisions are made that modify the original directions of the DoW, the reasons behind it should be more clearly outlined and explained. In other words, any amendment vis-a-vis the DoW should be highlighted and justified and should be included in the executive summary of the deliverable.