



COMPETEN-SEA
**Capacity to Organize Massive Public Educational
Opportunities in Universities of Southeast Asia**
(574212-EPP-1-2016-1-NL-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP)

WPD4.3

Quality Control Framework

GIRAF PM Services GmbH
December 2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	3
2. Quality Control Workforce	4
3. Performance monitoring (KPIs).....	5
4. Risk detection and mitigation.....	6
5. Quality control for the deliverables	8
6. Cost effectiveness and efficiency control	9
7. Conclusions	10

1. INTRODUCTION

The deliverable WPD4.3 “Quality Control Framework” is part of WP4 (“Quality Plan: Evaluation Trial and Quality Control Measures”), which has the goal to ensure that all project results meet high quality standards and contribute significantly to the attainment of the project objectives. This WP has 2 distinctive parts: (1) the Evaluation Trial aimed at ensuring that the Preparation activities and based on them Capacity Building efforts result in quality outcomes - namely capacity of the local University staff members to design, develop and deliver effective educational interventions targeting various underprivileged social groups using the MOOC technologies; and (2) Quality Control Framework as a continuous monitoring and quality assessment mechanism implemented through the set of pervasive activities ensuring the effectiveness and efficiency of the project procedures and processes.

The current document represents the final report about the activities within the Quality Control Framework carried out throughout the project. Moreover, it also provides the final values of the project-internal Key Performance Indicators based on the data collected by the management team.

2. Quality Control Workforce

As it was provided in the Detailed Description of the Project (WP4), as well as in the initial version of the deliverable D4.3, the project has set up a special body, Quality Control Workforce, in charge of the QCF implementation and monitoring. This body has been overseeing the QCF design and implementation and reported to the consortium about any identified issues and mitigation activities. Following the initial suggestion, the following representatives of the consortium joined QCWF:

- **GIRAF PM Services GmbH (Andrey Girenko)**
- **OUNL (Marco Kalz, after his departure Maren Scheffel represented the coordinating University)**
- **USM (Wan Tat Chee, the representative of the SEA partners)**

The initial discussion about the procedures and tools for quality control took place at the kick-off meeting (October 2016) and were further developed at the second consortium meeting (May 2017). Both meeting were held in Madrid by UC3M. The outcomes of these discussions have been documented in the initial version of the deliverable D4.3.

Due to the significant delay with the inclusion of GIRAF PM Services GmbH into the COMPETEN-SEA consortium (the amendment procedures were completed in September 2017), Andrey Girenko could join QCWF fully only in the second part of 2017.

3. Performance monitoring (KPIs)

The project partner agreed on the following system of internal project Key Performance Indicators:

Work Package	Key Performance Indicator	Current value	Target value
WP1 Preparation: Massive Open Online Education in Southeast Asia: Feasibility Study	WP1KPI1 Number of experts/stakeholders contacted and interviewed	15	20
	WP1KPI2 Number of University MOOC cases documented	8	8
	WP1KPI3 Number of recommendations produced and agreed	24	20
WP2 Development: Capacity Building Programme	WP2KPI1 Number of University staff members trained	297	60
	WP2KPI2 Number of new items of equipment installed	90	24
	WP2KPI3 Number of inquiries submitted to Helpdesk	0, all inquiries were handled via direct contacts	100
	WP2KPI4 Number of training materials made publically available	24	24
WP3 Development: Pilot MOOCs	WP3KPI1 Number of MOOCs developed	5 MOOCs incl. 31 modules	3
	WP3KPI2 Volume of teaching materials (as equivalent of traditional materials)	Ca. 500 pages	300 pages
	WP3KPI3 Number of stakeholders/multipliers contacted	16	15
WP4 Quality Plan: Evaluation Trial	WP4KPI1 Number of users recruited	715	300
	WP4KPI2 Number of users completed the course	213	150
	WP4KPI3 Percentage of users rated course experience “Positive” and “Very positive”	95%	90%
WP5 Dissemination & Exploitation	WP5KPI1 Number of University staff exposed to the project dissemination	355	300
	WP5KPI2 Number of dissemination materials produced and disbursed	7	6
	WP5KPI3 Number of website visits	n/a	1500
	WP5KPI4 Number of events where the project is promoted	8	15
WP6 Management	WP6KPI1 Number of project meetings	11	10
	WP6KPI2 Number of accepted reports	2	3

The data to be used for KPI assessment was collected from the partner Universities using the Basecamp platform setup by the project coordinator and respective reporting forms.

4. Risk detection and mitigation

Risk detection is an important managerial task directly connected to ensuring the quality; therefore, it was included in to the area of responsibility of QCWF. The following activities have been designed and are being implemented:

Regular internal reporting. In order to facilitate risk detection, the consortium decided to have monthly online meetings using teleconferencing software (Adobe Connect) allowing stable multi-point conferencing and documenting (recording). The agreed date for such meetings is first Tuesday of each month, at 10:00 CET, in order to allow both European and SEA partners to participate. The coordinator moderated all discussions; all partners were asked to report issues and anticipated risks. Potential mitigation strategies were also discussed immediately or, if it requires additional actions/efforts, the plan for mitigation actions elaboration was proposed. The consortium also used this tool to organized special teleconferences dedicated to important issues, such as e.g. final reporting.

Documentation. The project used the online platform (BaseCamp) allowing simple, but effective, way of collaborative work. The platform includes the following functionalities used for quality control:

- Thematic forums facilitating online discussions e.g. on particular issues related to quality. Examples of such discussions were the Final conference organization, collective discussions about joint publications, KPI data gathering, etc.
- Document sharing used for collaborative document development and quality control review
- Scheduling and schedule management tools, to-do lists management, etc. allowed to effectively tackle emerging issues.

The platform was used for sharing various documentation, starting from deliverables, working documents, meeting organization documentation, to meeting recordings (instead of minutes).

Quality control visits. The project plan included several visits for the European partners to visit their SEA counterparts for the quality control purposes. In fact, the consortium decided to use these opportunities for also additional capacity building, consultation and troubleshooting purposes at the later stage of the project during the MOOC development and evaluation. The planning of these visits was done and the visits implemented. Example of this activity was the visit of the UDS team to several SEA partner Universities.

Project surveys and interviews. In the course of the project activities involving external participants, it was decided to use surveys and interviews to collect the feedback and detect



areas for further improvements. The participants of the project activities (e.g. training, collective instructional design workshops, dissemination events, etc.) provided their feedback, which was then discussed in the course of the consortium meetings (telemetings). For instance, the surveys questionnaires used within the evaluation trials in all Partner Countries included also questions related to the quality of the MOOCs, thus indirectly providing evidences on the quality of capacity building measures. Additionally, the survey was designed and is carried out by OUNL to collect data on students' attitudes about culturally inclusive learning analytics, the data collection is ongoing.

5. Quality control for the deliverables

In order to ensure the quality standards for the project deliverables, it was decided to use the internal reviewing procedure for all deliverables. The procedure included the following actions:

- The authors of a deliverable in progress had to inform the coordinator about the tentative date of the document accomplishment at least 15 days prior that date
- The coordinator consulted the partnership to identify the reviewer to be appointed for reviewing the document. The preferences were given (1) to those who were not directly involved in the document development and (2) to volunteers
- The appointed reviewer reviewed the document when it was available and communicated his/her opinions and suggestions for improvements directly to the document authors.
- The iterative process ended when the authors and the reviewers agreed on the readiness for submission. After that, the authors and the reviewer informed the coordinator about the completion.

Examples of such collaborative efforts are the work on the design of the project session and publications for the Final Conference, preparation of the publication for “Learning with MOOCs 2018” conference, etc.

6. Cost effectiveness and efficiency control

The control of project expenditures was in the hands of the coordinator, who appointed a special financial manager (Mrs. Marlies Timmermans) with the responsibilities to:

- Monitor the partner costs and ensure that all expenditures fulfill the eligibility criteria stipulated in the Grant Agreement and respective Erasmus+ regulations;
- Make sure that all project costs are economical, related to the project activities and contribute directly to achieving the project goals;
- Collect the financial reports of partners and check their consistency and correctness;
- Advise and consult the partners on financial issues
- Manage the EU funding (pre-financing and intermediate payments) in accordance with the Grant Agreement and the decision of the consortium.

Quality of the project expenditures was the topic for discussions between the partners during the monthly online meetings and at the occasions of the project coordination meetings. The professional qualification of the financial manager allowed avoiding major problems related to incurring and reporting the project costs.

7. Conclusions

The established quality control regime and procedures are standard and proven to be effective for projects like COMPETEN-SEA. The project consortium successfully monitored how QCF functioned, made necessary adjustments in the project implementation and, though that, ensured the attainment of the project goals with high quality outcomes.