



Net-Working for QA

**Lifelong Learning Programme
LLP/LdV/TOI/2012/IRL – 502**

Reflections from a critical friend

Kim Faurschou
FACO
International Sciencepark
Forskerparken 10
DK 5230 Odense M
Denmark

November 2014

Table of contents

1. Summary	3
2. Project position and Context	4
2.1. Context	4
2.2. Quality projects – state of art.....	6
2.3. Project position	7
3. Process and Partners	8
3.1. Partners	8
3.2. Process.....	9
4. Products – output and outcome	14
4.1. Output.....	14
4.2. Outcomes	16
5. Lessons learned	17
5.1. Goals and objectives.....	17
5.2. Partnership and process	18
6. Recommendations.....	18
6.1. At partner level.....	18
6.2. At EU level	19
6.3. Communication	20
7. Kim Faurschou, FACO.....	21
Annex.....	22

1. Summary

The project: Net-Working for QA (LLP/LdV/TOI/2012/IRL – 502) is partly funded by the Lifelong Learning Programme and is unique and innovative in its focus on interagency networking.

Most former and current quality projects have focused, and focus on quality assurance and development within a single actor e.g. VET-provider. Net-Working for QA takes a broader and more learner oriented perspective focusing on quality development and assurance among all actors who engage with learners and whom learners are both in contact with and dependent on.

The other focus areas for the project Net-Working for QA are

- Several countries and organisations
- Bottom-up approach
- Quality culture
- Need for Nurturing and leadership

The involvement of six partners from different countries and different types of organisations make the achieved results both reliable and valid and **an inspiration for further work**. It seems to be universal that quality for the learner can be raised by the use of an interagency and bottom-up approach to quality, and by a clear focus on creating a quality culture covering all stakeholders and involved actors.

The experiences also show how difficult it is to get several stakeholders to cooperate, even if they almost all have the same objectives: to help the learner to develop skills and competences

The main challenge in the project has been engaging with other agencies locally but especially, nationally. The project has highlighted to project partners in all countries, that many organisations have been unaware of their **need for a forum to discuss quality**.

Successful interagency networking requires leadership and a nurturing of the complete process and all the involved stakeholders. This conclusion is valid both for the project as such and for the interagency networks in each country.

2. Project position and Context

Net-Working for QA fits extremely well into the next generation of European quality projects. It builds on the latest overviews of European quality projects, from the QALLL-project, to the most recent analysis of the current context and situation in the EU regarding objectives, tools, challenges, reflections.

The background for NQA is presented in this chapter's first two sections, and the projects unique position is described more in detail in the third section.

2.1. Context

2.1.1. The main EU objectives

The main EU objectives can be summarised to the following

- Develop a single market
- Raise skills levels
- Combat unemployment

And this can be done by

- Recognition of skills and competences
- Transparency
- Quality
- Mobility

So in principle the requirements and the profile of good projects should be specified by these objectives and tools. NQA responds to the Quality priority and aims to meet its broader objectives.

2.1.2. Current EU Tools and challenges

There are at the moment a number of EU tools developed to support and to further develop vocational education and training together with all other types of education. The following list covers the most important and recent of these tools and their main challenges

EU tool	Main challenges
EQF (knowledge, skills, competences)	Communication, use, role, adaptation
ECVET (European credit)	Existing assessment & QA approaches/systems Limited VET-mobility
Validation of non-formal and informal learning	Link to QA-systems Stakeholder involvement
Europass	Lack of learner focus Limited links to QA

The general methodology and thinking behind all these tools are learning outcomes.

Many actors - like EQAVET, HE (ENQA) and adult education in general - have been involved in the development of these tools and in the testing and further development of them.

Quality projects have to be aware of these tools and be confident in how these tools influence quality work and especially how the tools can be used in a broader forum like an inter-agency network. Very often these tools and concepts are new for many of the stakeholders in an interagency network, and it is important to introduce the relevant tools at the right time.

2.1.3. Main EU reflections

The current challenges have been, and continue to be discussed at many levels and fora. The main EU reflections can be formulated in a number of questions:

- How to strengthen the links between the tools?
- How to achieve synergy between the tools?
- How to achieve a better learner focus?
- How to benefit from the existing assessment & QA approaches/systems?
- How to secure better communication?
- How to secure a broader stakeholder involvement?

2.1.4. The internal project contexts

The NQA project has been developed through close cooperation among six partners, and an external evaluator and critical friend. The partners are from different countries and work with very different objectives, tasks, methodologies, clients and in very different contexts.

These different contexts of course influence the possibilities for each of the partners in terms of their contributions and thereby the overall contributions of the project. There has been much work undertaken in the project in order to reduce the potential constraints that these differing contexts may present, but in some cases the projects ambitions may have been higher than the current context of the partners gave room for.

2.2. Quality projects – state of art

Another source for developing innovative quality projects are the existing quality projects finalised over the latest ten years. The QALLL project gives a detailed description of state of the art European projects focused on quality assurance and development in both vocational education and training (VET) and adult learning (AE).

Analysis of all the projects has led to QALLL making ten recommendations related to promoting quality assurance in education provision in VET and AE. These are presented below.

The recommendations are based on:

- 39 good practice projects which have been subjected to a comparative analysis, fleshing out in detail how they contribute to key issues in European quality assurance policy;
- the outcomes of two QALLL conferences and eleven QALLL national expert panels carried out in the partner countries; and
- a survey on sustainability of project results which was conducted among the 39 good practice projects.

The recommendations can be seen as the main quality criteria for new projects.

The ten QALLL recommendations for VET and AE

#	Topic	Recommendation
1	Joint approaches in AE and VET	Enhance exchange and cooperation between AE and VET for mutual benefit.
2	Quality Culture	Develop and nurture a quality culture.
3	The EQAVET Quality Cycle	For constant development make sure to employ the whole quality cycle.

4	Quality Management Models and Indicators	Adopt easy-to-use and flexible QM models and develop/choose meaningful indicators.
5	Methodologies	Make use of the rich repertoire and choose the methodology that suits your requirements.
6	Work-based learning	Develop QA for work-based learning involving enterprises.
7	Guidance	Build upon existing QA models for Guidance and Counseling
8	Professionalisation and staff development	Establish QA as an integral part of professionalisation and staff development
9	Dissemination and Valorisation	Ensure dissemination and valorisation to enhance the impact of your project.
10	Innovation in QA	Support further innovation of quality assurance in AE and VET

Source: http://www.qalll.net/fileadmin/qalll/Downloads/QALLL_Recommendations_web.pdf

2.3. Project position

Net-Working for QA is well positioned due to its contribution to the development of EU and national policy on QA in VET.

- The project first covers several of the QALLL recommendations like joint approaches to QA, creation of a quality culture, the use of the complete quality cycle, staff development and innovation.
- The partnership needs analysis found that member states are at various stages in the implementation of QA systems, including implementation of the CQAF and use of the EQAVET guidelines & indicators for supporting QA.
- The Bruges Communiqué states 'The diversity of European VET systems is an asset for mutual learning. But transparency and a common approach to quality assurance are necessary to build up mutual trust which will facilitate mobility and recognition of skills and competences between those systems.' This project has addressed these issues by focusing on a 'common approach' to QA, which includes strengthening links between VET & labour market needs by the involvement of all relevant stakeholders.

- NQA focuses especially on creating synergy among many stakeholders, by building on existing assessment and QA-approaches, by having a learner perspective and by securing a better communication and a broader stakeholder involvement.
- The project is trying to find answers for almost all the major EU questions, and is unique and at the front of developments within quality assurance and development within VET.
- NQA is primarily unique and innovative in its focus on interagency networking. Most former quality projects have focused on quality assurance and development for a single actor and very often even for a department within a larger organisation.

This project has achieved a position where very few if any projects can be mapped and placed and has thereby **opened a new dimension for the future quality projects**: quality assurance and development with an interagency dimension.

3. Process and Partners

3.1. Partners

The six partners in the project are

- Antares
- Fundacion Tomillo
- Universitatea POLITEHNICA din Bucuresti - Centrul de Tehnologii Avansate, CTANM
- City of TURKU
- GEMS NI
- Ballymun Job Centre

Their roles in the project will be shortly described below – partner by partner. For a more comprehensive description the interested reader shall look in the files from each partner and in the original contracts.

Antares

Antares has covered Italy in relation to building up an interagency network and has been responsible for the research on Quality assurance in VET.

GEMS Northern Ireland

GEMS have first of all contributed by their experiences with their existing interagency network and by making the internal evaluation at each meeting. They have been responsible for the dissemination of three newsletters at National/EU level and opened for a new dimension for most quality projects in VET by their extensive and professional use of the social media like Facebook, Twitter, and BaseCamp.

CTANM

CTANM have been technically responsible for the web-platform and all its different faces. Further have they been very active in the dissemination at national event, EU-networks, at general assemblies in other projects and through newsletters.

City of Turku

The City of Turku has first of all contributed by their experiences with their existing interagency network. They have developed comprehensive training materials and delivered it to all project partners as pamphlets and electronically on the project web-platform.

Fundacion Tomillo

Fundacion Tomillo has contributed mainly by building up completely new interagency networks at both local and national level. Furthermore they have been active in the dissemination of the project products and ideas in Spain.

Ballymun Job Centre

Ballymun Job Centre has been the coordinator, administrator and had responsibility of the management of the project. They have further managed to build up new interagency networks both locally and nationally.

3.2. Process

In an innovative project like this **the process is often more important than the tangible products**, because the development process in each of the project partners understanding are what makes the real progress and development. The process will be described in three sections with focus on the overall process, the process at partner level and the contribution of the external critical friend.

3.2.1. The overall process

The project was from the beginning focused, well described and planned. The partners had already worked together before and many of them had a long experience with EU and national projects, so it was an experienced group to work with.

The project had the following meetings:

Date and place	Meeting
3 rd - 4 th December 2012 - GEMS NI Belfast	1st Transnational meeting of the partners
10 th -12 th April 2013 - ANTARES Rome	2nd Transnational meeting of the partners
30 th September - 2 nd October 2013 -Turku	3rd Transnational meeting of the partners
28 th February-1st March 2014 - Bucharest	4th Transnational meeting of the partners
12 th -13 th June 2014 Madrid	5th Transnational meeting of the partners
25 th - 26 th September 2014	Final EU Partnership meeting in Dublin
26th September 2014	Official launch of NQA findings

The project has benefitted by the detailed planning from the projects start and from the clear milestones and deadlines. Particularly the project manager and co-ordinator have done an outstanding and excellent job by driving the process and leading the meetings with a mixture of focus, leadership and motherly care for the project, its partners and participants. This steering is definitively one of the main reasons for the project's success and for keeping the main deadlines during the project.

The main challenge in the project has been making contact with and agreeing meetings with other agencies, both at local, but particularly at national level. Some of the partners utilised already existing networks and had in that situation no major challenges with getting support from the other agencies and network partners.

In all partner countries, organisations with responsibility for promoting quality in VET exist, so in principle it should be in the interest of these organisations to participate with the project. But in practice the reality was completely different. It was very difficult to motivate these organisations to listen to the project partners and to get a meeting, and even more difficult to motivate them to understand the ideas and to support the project.

It required many resources from the individual partners to continue this pressure on the organisations at national level and to finally succeed in getting the meetings and the possibility to present the ideas behind the project and the results achieved so far.

3.2.2. The processes at partner level

The partners had different contexts and different challenges.

GEMS Northern Ireland, Ballymun Job Centre and Turku Vocational Institute used existing networks or their members as the starting point for the development and implementation of the interagency model. They all had a number of challenges in order to expand their networks to the national level, but ended all up with contacts both locally and nationally.

Fundacion Tomillo took a number of contacts to different actors both locally and nationally, but had to fight hard to achieve what they were aiming for. It took a relatively long time before they got the first success stories to tell, and I think all involved in the project had the feeling that it would be quite difficult for them to achieve their goal. This phase was frustrating and it was difficult to help in any way other than with collegial support, so I am impressed that they continued and finally managed to develop their own interagency network in Spain.

Antares engaged at the regional and national levels and built relationships with the EQAVET national reference point. This enabled them to assess the context in Italy and to consider how the NQA model could be implemented in an Italian context.

The Centre for Advanced Technologies (CTANM) was responsible for the web-page – a topic that was discussed at most meetings. Their main challenge was the difficulty of developing the web-page before the partners had made their final contributions. This resulted in the web-page being first accessible with the products around the final launch of the project, but on the other hand this was good timing, because it was after the launch that external visitors were officially invited to look at the project.

3.2.3. The critical friend

My role in the project has mainly been to function as a critical friend. This role has included a number of different activities based on the contract and the evaluation plan made from the start of the project (annex):

- To develop an internal evaluation plan
- To decide on goals, objectives, resources and methods for my activities
- To participate in the 2nd Transnational meeting and to present the history and state of art for quality assurance in VET in Europe and especially at European level
- To participate in the 3rd Transnational meeting and conduct a focus group interview with the partners on the progress of each partner in implementing the interagency model in their country
- To make an interim report summarising what is done, what we have learned, motivational factors, quality concepts, attitude and the next steps in the project – together and for each partner
- Contact each partner before the 5th Transnational meeting with the questions I want to discuss with them during the 5th Transnational meeting

- To participate in the 5th Transnational meeting of the partners and conduct individual meetings with partners regarding their sense of progress, usefulness of the model, reaction of stakeholders etc.
- To make a detailed follow-up plan for each of the partners covering the task each partner still have to finalise and to give some hints and help on these matters if needed
- Design a questionnaire to be used by each interagency group to understand their experience of QA in VET and how their experiences/attitudes may have changed due to the use of the interagency approach.
- To participate in the final EU partnership meeting and there internally discuss the progress of the individual partner and the overall project according to the follow-up plan from the 5th Transnational meeting and to present my view on the final conclusions to each partner
- To participate in the official launch of the project and to present my reflections and the main conclusions of my internal evaluation

I have during the whole project period

- Provided the co-ordinator with comments after each meeting in relation to perceived progress
- Advised on the presentation of the evaluation so as to have impact at the policy level
- Assisted the partnership to locate the NQA project outcomes at the European policy level
- Assisted the partnership in positioning the NQA project in the policy/practice arena

Parallel to these detailed activities, I have during the whole project period, informed the partners about current developments within quality assurance in VET at European level and done my best to spread the message about the project when I was in situations where there was a potentially interested audience for the project findings.

I have had a number of Skype-meetings with the project management in order to be updated on what happened in meetings where I did not participate and to discuss progress or lack of progress during the project. It is often a lonely job to be project manager so I contributed to the progress of the project by discussions, opinions and action like follow up, directly with the individual partners.

4. Products – output and outcome

Generally projects that are piloting and developing innovative models and tools have limited tangible hardcore products, because their main contribution is focused on developing the tools and models through thinking, discussions, communication, piloting, trial and error in relation to all these activities.

This chapter will cover the main aspects of the products developed and the output and outcome related to these over the past 2 years.

4.1. Output

The direct output of the project is main and very tangible, even if it was expected differently for an innovative piloting and development project, and can be listed as:

- NQA piloted model of interagency working: 65 meetings across five countries
- NQA Resource Pack – tools for developing a quality culture
- NQA One Day Training for Stakeholders
- NQA Framework for Assessing NQA Effectiveness
- NQA Leaflets
- NQA Website (<http://www.n4qa.eu>)

Even if this number of products looks impressive, the main outputs of the project are still hidden behind and amongst these tangible products.

I found the development in quality thinking, in quality culture and in the development of inter-agency networks as/among the main outputs of the project.

4.1.1. Quality thinking

The different partners have long traditions of working with quality – in different ways and in different contexts – but still many experiences in common.

The start of the project showed that despite these experiences there were huge differences in the way the partners worked with and understood quality.

In order to develop **a common quality language** and understanding it was decided that I should give an overview of the quality work within VET at EU-level at the second international partner meeting. This presentation was used to decide on where to position the project and as a reference point for the common understanding of quality that was to be developed over the meetings for the next two years.

It was, as expected, a slow process with many discussions at the first meetings and less and less misunderstandings and discussions on quality concepts at the later meetings. So little by little the common language for quality was developed, accepted and used.

4.1.2. Quality culture

Some partners have a long tradition of working with quality and have already developed their own quality culture. Others have still to get the quality work to go from single persons focus on quality to a quality culture, where the whole organisation is focused on quality.

It is my impression that all partners have shown progress in relation to creating quality cultures and that they both can and will continue that work.

The NQA Resource Pack with tools for developing a quality culture make it possible for other agencies to work in a focused and structured way to create a quality culture. The tools are considered a great help for organisations and agencies that have decided to develop their own quality culture or for a group of agencies that want to develop a quality culture together.

4.1.3. Interagency network

The NQA piloted model of interagency working had 65+ meetings across five countries, which is impressive.

In several partner countries it has been very difficult to engage organisations at local and especially at national level. These challenges, and how other partners had solved these, were discussed at every partner meeting in order to push the process forward – and with success.

All countries managed to get meetings on all levels and have thereby shown that it is possible, even if several of them did not believe in this possibility from the beginning.

4.2. Outcomes

The results from the use of the developed products can be seen as the outcomes of the project, but can normally not be observed in the immediate period after the project has ended.

- However, outcomes that are already visible are the **quality language and understanding** at partner level, where many partners have used the common quality understanding and language developed in the project in their own organisations and contexts.
- Another important outcome of the project is the **belief**, that it is possible to arrange, implement and follow-up on interagency meetings both locally and nationally. This experience and perspective has a number of side effects for the partners including new personal contacts in organisations that normally would be difficult to get in contact with, new potential agencies for cooperation etc.

5. Lessons learned

The main lessons learned can be summarised to the following

- Bottom-up approach needed
- Learner involvement needed
- Awareness of quality, common language and interagency network shall be built/developed
- Possible to motivate other institutions and create interagency networks
- Challenge to get the results to reach the national level

Below the lessons learnt in relation to goals, objectives, partnership and process will be covered in more detail.

5.1. Goals and objectives

The main objectives of the project were met by achieving the following main results:

- Interagency model
- Resource Pack
- Training course
- Web Portal
- Pilot study (13 local/national meetings per partner)
- Recommendations and Guidelines for transfer across Europe
- Seminar

The project has done what it planned to do:

- Placing the learner at the centre of i-VET
- Bottom up and top down approaches to QA in VET
- Development of Interagency & QA culture

- Holistic approach to QA in I-VET
- Increased cooperation between stakeholders

5.2. Partnership and process

The core partnership, with six organisations representing six countries, Ireland, Northern Ireland, Italy, Romania, Finland & Spain, has functioned very effectively and efficiently. The project has benefitted from the fact that the participating countries also are part of well developed networks across Europe (e.g. EQAVET, QALLL, QANRP).

The fact that the partners have worked both with other projects and worked with each other before was a major advantage for the success of the project. It makes it possible to go directly to the core elements of the project and to work on the project from day one.

The project has shown project partners in all countries, that many organisations are unaware of their need for a forum to discuss quality. There seems to be a real demand for this type of interagency networking in all countries and a demand not covered by other actors and activities. It was pleasantly surprising that the interest was so intense and that the participants were so open, when they first decided to come to the meetings.

6. Recommendations

6.1. At partner level

The partners differ in quality traditions and in tasks and contexts, and have in fact been selected due to these differences and the variety it gives. Despite these differences all partners

can benefit from the quality understanding and language they have developed and mastered. This can be done both internally and in their normal networks.

The work on the interagency model and especially the work on further implementation and enhancing the interagency networks will be useful for all partners. Building networks take time and maintaining them takes a lot of resources and requires focus and ongoing cooperation.

Many organisations and actors in the participating countries have not been aware of the need for a forum to discuss quality assurance in VET together. So the project will recommend creating such fora and interagency networks in order to support the individual agencies work on and understanding of quality in VET.

6.2. At EU level

The recommendations for further action at European level are many as presented below:

- Further test and development of interagency networks
- Focus on creating quality cultures
- Learner involvement
- Quality label?
- ECVET and EQAVET cooperation and integration

The project partners have learnt how difficult, resource demanding and rewarding it is to work with interagency networks, so we do not have unrealistic expectation at European level, even if our recommendations can seem very ambitious.

We are convinced that Europe will benefit with further test and development of interagency networks, despite the fact that it will be difficult to convince an even broader audience about the advantages of the interagency model. This can be done by a mix of parallel interagency network projects and by continuing and fine tuning elements of this project: Net-Working for QA (LLP/LdV/TOI/2012/IRL – 502)

Cooperation between employment services, VET-schools and enterprises with especially challenging sectors, can be a concrete example of the next generation of the interagency networking.

Another project idea is to look at the motivational structures and barriers behind the stakeholders' decisions within the existing or new interagency networks. Topics like motivation of individuals, groups and organisations can, together with analysis of the agencies' goals and objectives, be interesting to study and develop further.

6.3. Communication

The project shall be presented in the Adam-database but has a quality that makes it **a potential showcase at both national and EU conferences within quality assurance in general and in VET**. Here can both the project partners and the national authorities who evaluate the project be active in taking the project on board the conference agendas.

Finally I recommend that the partners together write articles to both European and national journals about the project's results. This will be effective in relation to setting the ground for making impact at policy level.

7. Kim Faurschou, FACO

Kim Faurschou (born 1957) is Director of Faco, an independent private consulting company based in the International Sciencepark in Odense, Denmark. He has worked at University of Southern Denmark in many years as associate professor and since the late 1990ties been involved in quality assurance and development within vocational and adult education and training. He was one of the experts supporting the development of the current European quality framework and has contributed to this process for more than ten years. He has worked as a researcher, process consultant, and evaluator and especially as Critical friend for The European Commission, ENQAVET, CEDEFOP, European Training Foundation, Nordic Council of Ministers and a number of projects, ministries and organizations in Denmark, Sweden, Austria, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia, UK, Mexico, Cyprus, Ireland, Norway, and Malta.

Currently and recently he work with the Cedefop-study on Quality assurance & Certification in VET, as quality expert for the QALLL-project, as an ENQAVET Expert, as critical friend for the projects: Quality at provider level (Folkuniversitet, Sweden), Net-Working for Quality (Ballymun Job Centre, Ireland), in the development of a quality assessment system for VET in Norway and in developing a system for Quality measurement in work based learning in Sweden.

Director Kim Faurschou

FACO

International Sciencepark

Forskerparken 10

DK 5230 Odense M

Denmark

faco@spo.dk



Annex

Evaluation plan for Net-Working for QA, Lifelong Learning Programme, LLP/LdV/TOI/2012/IRL – 502

Time and Work Stake	Activity (from the contract)	Evaluation dimension
<p>June – September 2013</p> <p>Work Stage 1:</p> <p>Review of Project to date</p>	<p>Initial Skype meeting with the Co-ordinator (BJC) and GEMS to agree evaluation in line with internal Quality Management as being undertaken by GEMS.</p>	<p>Agreement about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the objectives of the evaluation • the type of evaluation • the overall coordination
<p>26/07/2013</p>	<p>Evaluation plan to be designed and sent to GEMS & BJC</p>	<p>Overall objectives of the evaluation:</p> <p>To actively support the project management and partners in achieving the project goals and objectives.</p> <p>To actively support the project to be a success</p> <p>Type of evaluation:</p> <p>Formative and done during the project period and especially during and in relation to the meetings (before and after)</p> <p>Further objectives:</p> <p>To position the project in relation to other European projects and activities both at policy level and at project level</p>
<p>September 2013 – December 2014</p> <p>Work Stage 2:</p> <p>Interim Report</p>	<p>Attend meeting 3 in Finland and conduct a focus group with partners which will contribute to the interim report (The Co-ordinator will work out with the independent contractor what the key elements of this</p>	<p>Objective of the evaluation:</p> <p>Get an overview of the progress of each partner is in implementing the interagency model in their own country</p>

<p>Meeting 3 in Finland September 30 – October 2 2013</p>	<p>might be re progress of each partner is in implementing the inter-agency model in their own country)</p>	<p>Special focus at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The preconditions in the country • Quality concepts and frameworks, top down /bottom up approaches and interagency models • QA commitment and enthusiasm • What are the motivations for implementing the inter-agency model? Advantages and disadvantages? • The activities done and planned • What supports and prevents the implementation? <p>Evaluation methods</p> <p>Focus group discussion</p> <p>Mail with the questions before the meeting</p> <p>Follow-up mail after the meeting</p> <p>Provide the co-ordinator with comments after the meeting in relation to perceived progress</p>
<p>15/11/2013</p>	<p>Produce an interim report to be submitted as part of the Project Interim report to the National Agency</p>	<p>The interim report will summarize the evaluation results so far in the project and will focus on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is done • What have we learned • Motivational factors • Quality concepts and attitude • The next steps
<p>January – June 2014 Work Stage 3</p>	<p>Attend meeting 4^h in Madrid and conduct individual meetings with partners - regarding their sense of progress, usefulness of the model,</p>	<p>Objective of the evaluation:</p> <p>Get an overview of the further progress of each partner is in</p>

Stakeholder Analysis	reaction of stakeholders etc.	<p>implementing the interagency model in their own country</p> <p>Special focus at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The activities done and planned • Sense of progress • Usefulness of the model • Reactions of stakeholders • QA commitment and enthusiasm <p>Evaluation methods</p> <p>Mail with the questions before the meeting</p> <p>Individual interviews with the partners</p> <p>Follow-up mail after the meeting</p> <p>Provide the co-ordinator with comments after the meeting in relation to perceived progress</p>
30/04/2014	Design a questionnaire that can be used by each local / regional - national / learner interagency groups so as to understand their experience of QA in VET (towards the end of the project) and how their experience/attitudes may have changed due to the use of the interagency approach	<p>Objective of the evaluation:</p> <p>Get an overview how the experience/attitudes of each local / regional - national / learner interagency group may have changed due to the use of the interagency approach</p> <p>Special focus at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attitude to quality from the beginning of the project • The activities done • The different actors motivation for using the interagency approach • Attitude to quality at the end of the project

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential changes in attitude and explanations for the changes • Lessons learned • Recommendations to other countries based on our project <p>Evaluation methods</p> <p>Mail with the questions about the current attitude to quality before the meeting in Finland in 2013</p> <p>Individual interviews with the partners during the meeting in Finland in 2013</p> <p>Questionnaire or interview guide that can be used by each local / regional - national / learner interagency groups so as to understand their experience of QA in VET and how their experience/attitudes may have changed due to the use of the interagency approach (at the end of the project in 2014)</p>
<p>June – September 2014</p> <p>Work Stage 4</p> <p>Final report and Policy Impact</p>	<p>Attend the final meeting in Dublin (September 2014) and present the project from an independent perspective, and position it in terms of its contribution to the development of EU and national policy on QA in VET.</p>	<p>Objective of the evaluation:</p> <p>Present an overview of project</p> <p>Special focus at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activities • Lessons learned • QA commitment and enthusiasm • Recommendations • The projects contribution to the development of EU and national policy on QA in VET • The resource pack and method for use in piloting the EQAVET framework and tools within the partnership countries <p>Evaluation methods</p>

		<p>Short focused presentation</p> <p>Provide the co-ordinator with comments after the meeting in relation to perceived progress</p>
30/09/2014	<p>Explore with the partnership how we can communicate the project in a way which will have impact/ what is the best way to produce the evaluation findings for this project and to develop a 'report' in whatever format we agree that will be submitted with the final report</p>	<p>Objective of the evaluation:</p> <p>Support the development of the communication of the project content, process and results.</p> <p>Contribute to the final report and especially to the executive summary.</p> <p>Advise on the presentation of the evaluation so as to have impact at the policy level</p> <p>Assist the partnership to locate the NQA project outcomes at the European policy level</p> <p>Assist the partnership in positioning the NQA project in the policy/practice arena</p>
During the whole project period	<p>Inform the development of the NQA project from a European policy perspective (to ensure the partnership is not replicating developments in QA/VET) and should guide us on what has already happened/ is being developed.</p>	<p>Evaluation methods</p> <p>Short presentations at each meeting</p> <p>Mail to the partners with news within quality in VET</p>