



WP 3. QUALITY ASSURANCE AND EVALUATION PLAN (QA&EP)

WP Leader:

- Brusov State University

Co-leaders:

- Roshydromet Advanced Training Institute
- (ATI)
- Perm State University (PSU)

V: final



Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| WP 3. QUALITY ASSURANCE AND EVALUATION PLAN (QA&EP) | 1 |
| Abbreviations of the Project Partners in QA&EP | 3 |
| Abbreviations..... | 3 |
| 1. INTRODUCTION | 4 |
| 2. QUALITY ASSURANCE APPROACH | 4 |
| 3. QUALITY ASSURANCE TOOLS..... | 5 |
| 4. QUALITY MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE | 5 |
| 5. QUALITY ASSURANCE TIMESCALE | 6 |
| 6. QUALITY ASSURANCE STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES | 6 |
| A. Event..... | 6 |
| B. Service/Product | 7 |
| C. Teaching/learning/training material | 7 |
| D. Report..... | 8 |
| Relevance: | 8 |
| E. MANAGEMENT | 8 |
| 7. QUALITY TOOLS BY WP..... | 10 |
| WP1. Project Methodology | 11 |
| WP2. WBL FRAMEWORK DEVELOPMENT | 16 |
| WP3. QUALITY ASSURANCE AND EVALUATION | 40 |
| WP4. DISSEMINATION AND EXPLOITATION | 46 |
| WP5. MANAGEMENT..... | 55 |
| Annex 1. WP Success survey..... | 62 |
| Annex 2. Meetings' Evaluation Form..... | 63 |



Abbreviations of the Project Partners in QA&EP

| | |
|-----|---|
| P1 | Liepaja University (LIEPU) |
| P2 | Klaipeda University (KU) |
| P3 | Private University of Education of the Diocese of Linz (PHDL) |
| P4 | Tver State University (TvSU) |
| P5 | Don State Technical University (DSTU) |
| P6 | Perm State University (PSU) |
| P7 | Roshydromet Advanced Training Institute (ATI) |
| P8 | Brusov State University (BSU) |
| P9 | Gavar State University (GSU) |
| P10 | National University of Architecture and Construction of Armenia (NUACA) |

Abbreviations

| | |
|-------|---------------------------------------|
| CBHE | Capacity Building in Higher Education |
| HE | Higher Education |
| LO | Learning Outcomes |
| PMS | Project Management System |
| SC | Steering Committee |
| TG | Target Group |
| QA&EP | Quality Assurance and Evaluation Plan |
| WBL | Work-based Learning |
| WP | Work Package |
| TOR | Terms of Reference |

1. INTRODUCTION

In the frame of the Erasmus+ CBHE Project “Development of a flexible, innovative and practical framework for WBL in HE of Armenia and Russia” it is planned to develop a Quality Assurance and Evaluation Plan (QA&EP). The leader of the WP 3 is the Brusov State University in co-leadership with Roshydromet Advanced Training Institute and Perm State University. The aim of the QA&EP is to ensure that the project processes and outcomes will match the expected quality standards and indicators.

The (QA&EP) will provide a framework for evaluation and feedback collection from beneficiaries on project’s (a) events, (b) services/products, (c) teaching/learning/training materials, (d) reports, (e) management.

The Evaluation would aim at:

- Improving the quality of the activities to meet the Project objectives and pre-set deadlines
- Commitment and participation from all the Partners
- Consistency
- Openness and transparency
- Participative decision-making

2. QUALITY ASSURANCE APPROACH

The Quality Assurance approach ensures that quality is planned for both the processes and outcomes. For that purpose, the Project adopts a strategy to meet its quality objectives by introducing an integrated quality approach to define quality standards, evaluate quality and continuously improve it. However, the focus is on the Project outcomes and the criteria set forth will ensure that the deliverables meet present quality standards and aspirations of the Partner University leadership.

A continuous Project evaluation strategy is adopted to evaluate, process and analyse data, and continuously improve the processes to meet the Project objectives.

Metrics are developed to evaluate quality throughout the project lifetime. The WP3 Leader and Co-Leaders are responsible for the development of the QA&EP, evaluation and analysis of the results. The evaluation outcomes serve to determine the success of the Project and whether the preliminary set objectives have been met.

The evaluation results are shared among Project Partners with the call to mitigate the drawback and make improvement plans if there are any issues revealed. The results are presented to the Project SC for their further consideration and decision-making.

3. QUALITY ASSURANCE TOOLS

The original quality evaluation tools used in the context of the FLEXWBL project are listed below:

WPs' quality standards and tools: For each WP and each of the WP's deliverables a verification table will be produced where the quality standards for each deliverable will be checked in terms if they have been met or not. Its completion will take place once in a six-month period by WP Leader and will be checked by the QA&EP Leader and Co-leaders.

WPs' Success Survey: a peer review questionnaire will be sent to each partner every 6 months, and in any case before any official reporting.

Questionnaire: Questionnaires will follow events, seminars, conferences to provide short overview and evaluation for further consideration in the organization of similar events. Additionally, whereas it is required, questionnaires will be developed to evaluate the progress and success of each WP deliverables as per standards specified in the table below.

4. QUALITY MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE

The QA team is formed with participation of representatives of partner institutions responsible for quality (BSU – lead partner; ATI & PSU – co-leaders), up to 13 people, led by the BSU representative with co-leadership of ATI and PSU. This team develops and operates QA tools, procedures and timescale for all project deliverables, such as training materials, events, reports, services/products, each having a set of identified quality indicators developed in cooperation with the WP leaders. It also undertakes continuous quality assurance of project processes based on quality standards developed in cooperation with the project coordinator. Every consortium

institution appoints the QA point of contact responsible for timely collecting necessary project quality information, as stipulated by the QA team. The schedule of QA activities is developed and followed by the QA team, which reports its findings to the SC one week before SCMs or to project coordinator directly if urgent corrective actions are needed.

5. QUALITY ASSURANCE TIMESCALE

The Quality Assurance should be conducted during the Project lifetime as per initially defined deadlines. For major deliverables the QA processes should be repeated every 6 months, while for the events they should take place within 1 month from the event.

6. QUALITY ASSURANCE STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

A. Event

- 14 days before the meeting/event draft meeting agenda is circulated for amendments/additions;
- 14 days before the meeting/event info on the venue, recommendations on travel/accommodation are circulated;
- 7 days before the meeting/event agenda is agreed with partners and disseminated;
- Registration of participants is organized before the meeting via online registration form or e-mail;
- Registration list is available for each day of the event;
- Photos of the meeting are taken (for online meetings screenshots are available; video recordings are made whenever possible for internal circulation);
- Secretary to the event is assigned before the event and minutes are taken during the event;
- Targeted post-event evaluation is organized depending on the types of the participants during 7 days after the event
- Post-evaluation survey is analysed during 21 days after the event
- Minutes, presentations and recordings are disseminated among partners during 7 days after the event



- List of immediate actions required from each partner is compiled and sent to Partners during 7 days after the event
- Dissemination measures by each Partner are taken during 1 month after the event

B. Service/Product

- All the stakeholders are involved in the development of the service/product;
- The responsibilities of all Partners are clearly defined and agreed upon;
- Service/Product development Leader actively leads and communicates the process;
- Service/Product development follows the preliminary defined objectives and deadlines;
- Mechanisms to mitigate the risks of underperformance are available and implemented;
- Service/Product outcome is discussed with stakeholders and reviewed accordingly;
- Feedback on service/product from Partners is provided within 10 days after the receipt of the email/assignment;
- Service/Product results are accepted by all Partners and positive feedback is provided;
- Service/Product result has been piloted and implemented by the Partners.
- Samples of WBL individual study contracts and portfolios are made available.

C. Teaching/learning/training material

- WBL framework, curriculum, manuals etc. are based on practice and workplace needs and takes into account the current competencies of the learners;
- The curriculum includes a set of courses / modules created for the purpose of WBL;
- Developed WBL curricula/courses with flexible LOs are approved at Partner universities;
- WBL curricula /courses are presented as online modules;
- Guidelines are available to enable learners to validate prior non-formal and informal learning;
- Academic materials vary according to the current competencies of the learners;
- WBL curricula/ courses are interdisciplinary;
- Study materials are adjusted for the WBL;
- There is a description of academic projects implemented at the workplace;

- Tools have been developed to regularly evaluate LOs;
- Tools have been developed to assess the satisfaction of participants (students, employers, and teachers)

D. Report

Relevance:

- TOR & specifications are adhered;
- Only relevant up-to-date information is gathered, evaluated and analysed;
- Informative – answers its purpose: adequate information to stakeholders concerned to take appropriate decisions.

Good writing style:

- Readable;
- Scientific or technical jargon is avoided;
- Material is structured in logical and coherent manner;
- Proof-read grammar and punctuation.

Good form & content:

- Graphs and tables carefully labelled;
- Project visibility measures are respected;
- References are always quoted and checked for accuracy;
- All authors are acknowledged;
- Summary is provided;
- Report is dated and signed.

E. MANAGEMENT

- WP's objectives, development stages and anticipated results are clear to all Partners;
- Contact information of people responsible for WP implementation is up-to-date and available for all Partners on Own Cloud platform;



- Combination of various communication tools (email, messengers, conference calls, etc.) is used to ensure the efficiency and promptness of interaction;
- Consortium online meetings are organized regularly (at least once per month). Date and time is agreed by doodle voting or at previous meeting;
- WP leaders notify of the receipt of the inquiry regarding their WP within 3 days, the response to the inquiry is provided within 14 days;
- Project templates with the respective project logo, number etc. are available for all Partners (report templates, presentation templates, timesheet templates, etc.);
- Equipment purchase process is organized in line with the project timeline;
- Financing is issued in line with the project plan;
- Deliverables' drafts are available on Own Cloud platform 14 days before the discussion.



7. QUALITY STANDARDS AND TOOLS

WP1. Project Methodology

| WP 1: Project Methodology- Preparation | | | | | | |
|--|--------|--|-------------------|-------------|--|---|
| Leader: P 1: Liepaja University | | | | | | |
| Review Date: | | | | | | |
| Deliverable | Type | Quality Standards | Delivery deadline | Met/Not met | Tools | Comments on the processes |
| 1.1 Research methodological guideline on WBL in HE | Report | <p>The methodological guideline is adhered</p> <p>Only relevant up-to-date information is gathered, evaluated and analysed</p> <p>Fits the purpose: corresponding information to stakeholders concerned to take appropriate decisions</p> <p>The guideline is user-friendly and readable</p> <p>Scientific or technical jargon is avoided</p> <p>Guideline is structured in logical and coherent manner</p> <p>Grammar and punctuation are</p> | M10 | | <p>Review of the documents by QA Team</p> <p>Feedback from the Academic department or Scientific Council of the University</p> | <p>Used to describe the current national WBL context in HE (WBL practice, NQF, learning contracts, qualification recognition and accreditation, legal framework etc.)</p> |

| WP 1: Project Methodology- Preparation | | | | | | |
|--|-------|--|-------------------|-------------|--|---------------------------|
| Leader: P 1: Liepaja University | | | | | | |
| Review Date: | | | | | | |
| Deliverable | Type | Quality Standards | Delivery deadline | Met/Not met | Tools | Comments on the processes |
| | | proof-read Project visibility measures are respected References are always quoted and checked for accuracy | | | | |
| 1.2 3-day WBL Transfer Workshop | Event | 14 days before the meeting/event draft meeting agenda is circulated for amendments/additions 14 days before the meeting/event info on the venue, recommendations on travel/ accommodation 7 days before the meeting/event agenda is agreed with partners and disseminated Registration of participants is | M1-M36 | | Review of the Minutes, pre-training correspondence, post-training evaluation report Questionnaire | |

| WP 1: Project Methodology- Preparation | | | | | | |
|--|------|---|-------------------|-------------|-------|---------------------------|
| Leader: P 1: Liepaja University | | | | | | |
| Review Date: | | | | | | |
| Deliverable | Type | Quality Standards | Delivery deadline | Met/Not met | Tools | Comments on the processes |
| | | <p>organized before the meeting via online registration form or mail</p> <p>Registration list is available for every day</p> <p>Photos of the meeting are taken (for online meetings screenshots and video recordings are available)</p> <p>Secretary to the event is assigned before the event and minutes are taken during the event</p> <p>Targeted post-event evaluation is organized depending on the types of the participants during 7 days after the event</p> <p>Post-evaluation survey is analysed during 21 days after</p> | | | | |

| WP 1: Project Methodology- Preparation | | | | | | |
|---|--------|---|-------------------|-------------|--|---------------------------|
| Leader: P 1: Liepaja University | | | | | | |
| Review Date: | | | | | | |
| Deliverable | Type | Quality Standards | Delivery deadline | Met/Not met | Tools | Comments on the processes |
| | | <p>event</p> <p>Minutes, presentations and recordings are disseminated among partners during 7 days after the event</p> <p>List of immediate actions required on behalf of each partner is combined and sent to Partners during 7 days after the event</p> <p>Dissemination measures by each Partner are taken during 1 month after the event</p> | | | | |
| 1.3 Development of the methodological base of the project | Report | <p>The methodological base is adhered</p> <p>Only relevant up-to-date information is gathered, evaluated and analysed</p> | M8 | | <p>Review of the documents by QA Team</p> <p>Feedback from the</p> | |

| WP 1: Project Methodology- Preparation | | | | | | |
|--|------|--|-------------------|-------------|---|---------------------------|
| Leader: P 1: Liepaja University | | | | | | |
| Review Date: | | | | | | |
| Deliverable | Type | Quality Standards | Delivery deadline | Met/Not met | Tools | Comments on the processes |
| | | <p>Fits the purpose: corresponding information to stakeholders concerned to take appropriate decisions</p> <p>The guideline is user-friendly and readable</p> <p>Scientific or technical jargon is avoided</p> <p>Guideline is structured in logical and coherent manner</p> <p>Grammar and punctuation are proof-read</p> <p>Project visibility measures are respected</p> <p>References are always quoted and checked for accuracy</p> | | | Academic department or Scientific Council of the University | |

WP2. WBL FRAMEWORK DEVELOPMENT

| WP 2.1: WBL FRAMEWORK DEVELOPMENT- Development | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|---|-------------------|---------------|---|--|
| Leader: P 3: Private University of Education of the Diocese of Linz | | | | | | |
| Review Date: | | | | | | |
| Deliverable | Type | Quality Standards | Delivery deadline | Met / Not met | Tools | Comments on the processes |
| 2.1.1 Initial WBL framework and implementation plan | Teaching material/Report | <p>The WBL framework provides a definition and a concept based on the relevant literature and practice</p> <p>The WBL framework is based on practice and workplace needs and takes into account the current competencies of the learners</p> <p>The WBL framework allows validation of prior non-formal and informal learning</p> <p>The WBL framework promotes</p> | M10 | | <p>Review of the documents by members of the Leader-Team</p> <p>Review of the documents by Co-leaders (P4, P9)</p> <p>Review of the documents by QA Team</p> <p>Feedback from partner</p> | <p>Languages of the report: English, Armenian, Russian</p> |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>interdisciplinarity</p> <p>Tools have been developed to assess the satisfaction of participants with the WBL framework (university representatives, employers)</p> <p>The WBL framework is adhered</p> <p>Only relevant up-to-date information is gathered, evaluated and analysed</p> <p>Fits the purpose: corresponding information to stakeholders concerned to take appropriate decisions</p> <p>The guideline is user-friendly and readable</p> <p>Scientific or technical jargon is avoided</p> <p>WBL framework is structured in logical and coherent manner</p> | | | <p>universities in cooperation with their employer partners</p> <p>Feedback from the Academic department or Scientific Council of the University, employers</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|

| | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|--|----------|--|---|--|
| | | <p>Grammar and punctuation are proof-read</p> <p>Project visibility measures are respected</p> <p>References are always quoted and checked for accuracy</p> | | | | |
| 2.1.2 A manual for WBL Framework development and implementation | Teaching material | <p>The WBL manual is based on practice and workplace needs and takes into account the current competencies of the learners</p> <p>The WBL manual allows validation of prior non-formal and informal learning</p> <p>The WBL manual promotes transdisciplinarity.</p> <p>Tools have been developed to assess the satisfaction of participants with the WBL framework (university representatives,</p> | M12, M28 | | <p>Review of the documents by members of the Leader-Team</p> <p>Review of the documents by Co-leaders (P4, P9)</p> <p>Review of the documents by QA Team</p> <p>Feedback from partner</p> | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>employers)</p> <p>The WBL manual is adhered</p> <p>Only relevant up-to-date information is gathered, evaluated and analysed</p> <p>Fits the purpose: corresponding information to stakeholders concerned to take appropriate decisions</p> <p>The manual is user-friendly and readable</p> <p>Scientific or technical jargon is avoided</p> <p>Manual is structured in logical and coherent manner</p> <p>Grammar and punctuation are proof-read</p> <p>Project visibility measures are respected</p> <p>References are always quoted and checked for</p> | | | <p>universities in cooperation with their employer partners</p> <p>Feedback from the Academic department or Scientific Council of the University</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | |
|--|-------|---|----|--|--|--|
| | | accuracy | | | | |
| 2.1.3 3-day WBL framework development Workshop | Event | <p>14 days before the Workshop draft meeting agenda and info on the venue, recommendations on travel/accommodation are circulated for amendments/additions</p> <p>7 days before the Workshop the agenda is agreed with partners and disseminated</p> <p>Registration of participants is organized before the Workshop via online registration form or mail</p> <p>Registration list is available for every day</p> <p>Photos of the Workshop are taken (for online meetings screenshots and video recordings are available)</p> <p>Secretary to the workshop is assigned before the event and</p> | M8 | | | |



| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>minutes are taken during the event</p> <p>Targeted post-event evaluation is organized depending on the types of the participants during 7 days after the event</p> <p>Post-evaluation survey is analysed during 21 days after the Workshop</p> <p>Minutes, presentations and recordings are disseminated among partners during 7 days after the event</p> <p>List of immediate actions required on behalf of each partner is combined and sent to Partners during 7 days after the Workshop</p> <p>Dissemination measures by each Partner are taken during 1 month after the Workshop</p> | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| WP 2.2: Implementation of the WBL Framework: Knowledge and Competence | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------|-------------|---|---------------------------|
| Leader: P2 Klaipeda University | | | | | | |
| Review Date: | | | | | | |
| Deliverable | Type | Quality Standards | Delivery deadline | Met/Not met | Tools | Comments on the processes |
| 2.2.1 Approved WBL Curricula at partner universities | Teaching/Learning /Training material | The WBL curricula is based on practice and workplace needs and takes into account the current competencies of the learners; The WBL curricula curriculum includes a set of courses/modules created for the purpose of WBL; Developed WBL curricula with flexible LOs are approved at Partner universities; WBL curricula are presented as online modules; Guidelines are available to enable learners to validate prior non-formal and informal learning; | M14 | | Review of the document by members of the Leader-Team and Co-leaders, as well as QA Team Feedback from stakeholders | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|------------------------|--|-----------------|--|--|--|
| | | <p>Academic materials vary according to the current competencies of the learners;</p> <p>Study materials are adjusted for the WBL</p> | | | | |
| <p>2.2.2 Sample portfolios/ learning documentation material for and of students</p> | <p>Service/Product</p> | <p>All the stakeholders are involved in the development of the sample portfolios/ learning documentation material;</p> <p>The responsibilities of all Partners are clearly defined and agreed upon;</p> <p>The document development follows the preliminary defined objectives and deadlines;</p> <p>The document outcome is discussed with stakeholders and reviewed accordingly and the feedback on the document from Partners is provided within 10 days after the receipt of</p> | <p>M16, M26</p> | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|----------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>the email/assignment;</p> <p>The Document is accepted by all Partners and positive feedback is provided and implemented</p> | | | | |
| 2.2.3 Analysis of the survey results and interviews | Report | <p>Only relevant up-to-date information is gathered, evaluated and analysed;</p> <p>Informative – answers its purpose: adequate information to stakeholders concerned to take appropriate decisions.</p> <p>All authors are acknowledged;</p> <p>Analysis of the survey results and interviews are dated and signed.</p> | M18, M26 | | | <p>Criteria of efficiency of WBL program & feedback from engaged stakeholders</p> <p>TG: Teaching staff, students, administrative, technical, Employers, Employers Association, Policy-Makers</p> <p>EN, AR, RU - Languages of the report: English, Armenian, Russian</p> |
| 2.2.4 Updated WBL framework | Teaching/learning/training material | The updated WBL framework is based on practice and workplace needs and takes into account the current competencies of the | M26 | | | |



| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>learners</p> <p>The WBL manual allows validation of prior non-formal and informal learning</p> <p>Tools have been developed to regularly evaluate LOs (university representatives, employers)</p> <p>The WBL framework is adhered, only relevant up-to-date information is gathered, evaluated and analysed</p> <p>Fits the purpose: corresponding information to stakeholders concerned to take appropriate decisions</p> <p>The WBL framework is user-friendly and readable</p> <p>Scientific or technical jargon is avoided, it is structured in logical and coherent manner</p> | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | |
|---|--------------|--|-------------|--|---|--|
| <p>2.2.5 Workshop on WBL Framework implementation</p> | <p>Event</p> | <p>14 days before the Workshop draft meeting agenda is circulated for amendments/additions</p> <p>14 days before the Workshop info on the venue, recommendations on travel/accommodation</p> <p>7 days before the Workshop agenda is agreed with partners and disseminated</p> <p>Registration of participants is organized before the meeting via online registration form or mail;</p> <p>Registration list is available for every day</p> <p>Photos of the Workshop are taken (for online meetings screenshots and video recordings are available)</p> <p>Secretary to the event is assigned before the event and minutes are</p> | <p>M 11</p> | | <p>Presentations are prepared and disseminated among participants</p> | |
|---|--------------|--|-------------|--|---|--|

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>taken during the event</p> <p>Targeted post-event evaluation is organized depending on the types of the participants during 7 days after the event</p> <p>Post-evaluation survey is analysed during 21 days after the event</p> <p>Minutes, presentations and recordings are disseminated among partners during 7 days after the event</p> <p>List of immediate actions required on behalf of each partner is combined and sent to Partners during 7 days after the event</p> <p>Dissemination measures by each Partner are taken during 1 month after the event</p> | | | | |
| <p>WP2.3 Implementation Support</p> <p>Leader: P5 Don State Technical University</p> | | | | | | |

| Review date: | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------|---|-------------------|--------------|--|---------------------------|
| Deliverable | Type | Quality Standards | Delivery deadline | Met /Not Met | Tools | Comments on the processes |
| 2.3.1 Stakeholder interaction plan | Report | Present project information and deliverables to groups of stakeholders;) Allow the groups of stakeholders to provide their views and opinions and reviewing of deliverables; Gather, analyse the opinions and views from stakeholders and make improvements; | M8 | | 1)Stakeholders 'meetings schedule (including on-line) is composed; 2) Stakeholders' Questionnaires and surveys prepared and analyzed; 3) stakeholders are classified and contact list is available; 4) Deliverables' review procedure for Stakeholders is developed; 5) Consultation methods and | |

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-----------------|---|-----|--|--|--|
| | | | | | Interaction technique per stakeholder group are outlined. | |
| 2.3.2 WBL Website | Service/Product | <p>Relevant content & deliverables are shared and updated;</p> <p>Website is informative, attractive, follows visual identity rules;</p> <p>There is an area for WBL learning: curricula, references, samples of WBL documentation etc.;</p> <p>WBL labs and partner network are present at website</p> | M16 | | <p>1)Content is updated weekly;</p> <p>2)relevant content and deliverables are uploaded;</p> <p>3) events agendas, presentations and photos are available</p> <p>3) project branding and visual identity logos and disclaimer are in place</p> <p>4) WBL curricula, references, samples of</p> | |

| | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------|--|-----|--|---|--|
| | | | | | <p>WBL documentation etc. are uploaded and accessible;</p> <p>5) information about WBL network and labs is present</p> <p>6) number of website visitors/downloads etc. is recorded and statistics available</p> <p>7) contact form is available</p> | |
| 2.3.3 WBL Educators' Network | Service/Product | Relationships with business community for the purpose of WBL is confirmed (enterprises' profiles; overview of cooperation in the frame of WBL implementation; WBL projects examples; | M36 | | -Agreement/Memorandums of university enterprise cooperation for WBL implementation | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| | | university-enterprise agreements, etc.) | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> n signed and put into effect; - Partner enterprises profiles are provided; - Overview of cooperation is provided; -examples of WBL projects are given | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------|---|------------|--|---|--|
| <p>2.3.4 WBL Regional Workshop</p> | <p>Event</p> | <p>14 days before the meeting/event draft meeting agenda is circulated for amendments/additions</p> <p>14 days before the meeting/event info on the venue, recommendations on travel/ accommodation</p> <p>7 days before the meeting/event agenda is agreed with partners and disseminated</p> <p>Registration of participants is organized before the meeting via online registration form or mail;</p> <p>Registration list is available for every day</p> <p>Photos of the meeting are taken (for online meetings screenshots and video recordings are available)</p> <p>Secretary to the event is assigned before the</p> | <p>M17</p> | | <p>-Visa Invitations are prepared;</p> <p>-Presentations are prepared and demonstrated;</p> <p>- participatory exercises are used to facilitate group discussions, brainstorm issues, analyse information, and develop recommendations and strategies</p> | |
|------------------------------------|--------------|---|------------|--|---|--|

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>event and minutes are taken during the event</p> <p>Targeted post-event evaluation is organized depending on the types of the participants during 7 days after the event</p> <p>Post-evaluation survey is analysed during 21 days after the event</p> <p>Minutes, presentations and recordings are disseminated among partners during 7 days after the event</p> <p>List of immediate actions required on behalf of each partner is combined and sent to Partners during 7 days after the event</p> <p>Dissemination measures by each Partner are taken during 1 month after the event</p> | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|---|--------------------------|--------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| 2.3.5 WBL Lab | Service/Product | The Work-Based Learning Labs are established to facilitate work-based learning opportunities for students and implement WBL framework which is developed in the frame of FlexWBL project. | M16 | | -WBL labs equipment is purchased and installed; -Lab functions developed; -Lab establishment and regulating documentation developed | |
| WP2.4 Evaluation | | | | | | |
| Leader: P6 Perm State University (PSU) | | | | | | |
| Review date: | | | | | | |
| Deliverable | Type | Quality Standards | Delivery deadline | Met/Not Met | Tools | Comments on the processes |
| 2.4.1 Pilot evaluation/ Plan for a second iteration | Service/Product | All the stakeholders are involved in the development of the pilot evaluation/Plan for a second iteration. Fits the purpose: corresponding | M24 | | Review of the document by members of the Leaders and Co-leaders | |

| | | | | | | |
|------------------------|--------|--|-----|--|---|--|
| | | <p>information to stakeholders concerned to take appropriate decisions.</p> <p>Outcomes are discussed with stakeholders and reviewed accordingly;</p> <p>Feedback on the Plan from Partners is provided within 10 days after the receipt of the email/assignment;</p> <p>It has been piloted and implemented by the Partners</p> | | | Feedback from partners and stakeholders | |
| 2.4.2 Final evaluation | Report | <p>The evaluation provides adequate information to stakeholders to take appropriate decisions.</p> <p>The evaluation outcomes serve to determine the success of the Project and whether the preliminary set objectives</p> | M32 | | <p>Questionnaires and surveys prepared and analyzed;</p> <p>Review of the document by members of the Leaders and Co-leaders</p> | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|---|-----|--|---|--|
| | | <p>have been met.</p> <p>The evaluation results are shared among Project Partners.</p> <p>Feedback on the evaluation from Partners is provided within 10 days after the receipt of the email/assignment;</p> <p>The results are accepted by all Partners and positive feedback is provided;</p> <p>The results are presented to the Project SC for their further consideration and decision-making.</p> <p>The evaluation is structured in logical and coherent manner; is readable, Scientific or technical jargon is avoided.</p> | | | Feedback from partners and stakeholders | |
| 2.4.3 A manual providing recommendations to | Teaching material/Report | The manual is based on practice and workplace needs. | M32 | | Review of the document by members of | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|--|------------|--|--|--|
| <p>non-partner HEIs, policy makers and the wider society</p> | | <p>The manual provides recommendations to non-partner HEIs, policy makers and the wider society</p> <p>The manual fits the purpose: corresponding information to stakeholders concerned to take appropriate decisions</p> <p>Only relevant up-to-date information is gathered, evaluated and analysed</p> <p>The manual is user-friendly and readable, scientific or technical jargon is avoided</p> <p>Manual is structured in logical and coherent manner, grammar and punctuation are proof-read</p> <p>References are always quoted and checked for accuracy</p> | | | <p>the Leaders and Co-leaders</p> <p>Feedback from partners, non-partner HEIs, policy makers and the wider society</p> | |
| <p>2.4.4 3-day WBL Policy Development Training</p> | <p>Event</p> | <p>14 days before the 3-day WBL Policy Development</p> | <p>M26</p> | | <p>Presentations are prepared</p> | |

| | | | | | | |
|----------|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| Workshop | | <p>Training Workshop draft meeting agenda and info on the venue, recommendations on travel/ accommodation are circulated for amendments/additions</p> <p>7 days before the Workshop the agenda is agreed with partners and disseminated</p> <p>Registration of participants is organized before the Workshop via online registration form or mail</p> <p>Registration list is available for every day</p> <p>Photos of the Workshop are taken (for online meetings screenshots and video recordings are available)</p> <p>Secretary to the workshop is assigned before the event and minutes are taken during the event</p> | | | <p>and demonstrated;</p> <p>Participatory exercises are used to facilitate group discussions, brainstorm issues, analyse information, and develop recommendations and strategies</p> | |
|----------|--|---|--|--|--|--|



| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>Targeted post-event evaluation is organized depending on the types of the participants during 7 days after the event</p> <p>Post-evaluation survey is analysed during 21 days after the Workshop</p> <p>Minutes, presentations and recordings are disseminated among partners during 7 days after the event</p> <p>List of immediate actions required on behalf of each partner is combined and sent to Partners during 7 days after the Workshop</p> <p>Dissemination measures by each Partner are taken during 1 month after the Workshop</p> | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

WP3. QUALITY ASSURANCE AND EVALUATION

| WP 3: QUALITY ASSURANCE AND EVALUATION- QUALITY PLAN | | | | | | |
|--|--------|---|-------------------|-------------|--|---------------------------|
| Leader: P 8 Brusov State University | | | | | | |
| Review Date: | | | | | | |
| Deliverable | Type | Quality Standards | Delivery deadline | Met/Not Met | Tools | Comments on the processes |
| 3.1 Quality Assurance & Evaluation Plan - Requirements/Specifications for Each Major Deliverable | Report | <p>User-friendly and readable plan with comprehensive methods and guidelines has been produced and is serving as an internal working document.</p> <p>QA plan is structured in logical and coherent manner, scientific or technical jargon is avoided.</p> <p>References are always quoted and checked for accuracy, all authors are acknowledged</p> | M36 | | <p>Review of the QA plan by the QA Team and other stakeholders.</p> <p>Feedback from the relevant department of the partner University</p> | |

| WP 3: QUALITY ASSURANCE AND EVALUATION- QUALITY PLAN | | | | | | |
|---|--------|--|-------------------|-------------|--|---------------------------|
| Leader: P 8 Brusov State University | | | | | | |
| Review Date: | | | | | | |
| Deliverable | Type | Quality Standards | Delivery deadline | Met/Not Met | Tools | Comments on the processes |
| | | Deliverables have been evaluated according to the Manual | | | | |
| 3.2Quality Assurance Manual for online modules and training courses | Report | User-friendly and readable manual with comprehensive methods and guidelines has been produced and is serving as an internal working document. Manual is structured in logical and coherent manner; scientific or technical jargon is avoided. References are always quoted and checked for accuracy, all authors | M28 | | Review of the Manual by the QA Team and other stakeholders. Feedback from the relevant department of the partner University | |

| WP 3: QUALITY ASSURANCE AND EVALUATION- QUALITY PLAN | | | | | | |
|--|--------|--|---------------------------------------|-------------|---|---------------------------|
| Leader: P 8 Brusov State University | | | | | | |
| Review Date: | | | | | | |
| Deliverable | Type | Quality Standards | Delivery deadline | Met/Not Met | Tools | Comments on the processes |
| | | are acknowledged Online modules and training courses have been evaluated according to the Manual | | | | |
| 3.3 Quality Evaluation Reports (Internal Quality Monitoring and reporting) | Report | More than 75% of partners expressed satisfaction with the processes and deliverables The Project follows the time-line set forth in the Project application Report is dated and signed. References are always quoted and | M8, M12, M14, M17, M20, M24, M32, M36 | | Peer review questionnaire is sent to each partner. Feedback from the partners received | |

| WP 3: QUALITY ASSURANCE AND EVALUATION- QUALITY PLAN | | | | | | |
|--|--------|---|-------------------|-------------|---|---------------------------|
| Leader: P 8 Brusov State University | | | | | | |
| Review Date: | | | | | | |
| Deliverable | Type | Quality Standards | Delivery deadline | Met/Not Met | Tools | Comments on the processes |
| | | checked for accuracy. All authors are acknowledged. | | | | |
| 3.4 External Evaluation Report (Interim & Final Reports) | Report | All the project processes have been effectively implemented to produce quality deliverables The Project has been implemented following the time-line set forth in the Project application Timely decisions have been made to mitigate | M36 | | Peer review questionnaire is sent to each partner. Feedback from the partners received | |

| WP 3: QUALITY ASSURANCE AND EVALUATION- QUALITY PLAN | | | | | | |
|--|--------|---|-------------------|-------------|---|---------------------------|
| Leader: P 8 Brusov State University | | | | | | |
| Review Date: | | | | | | |
| Deliverable | Type | Quality Standards | Delivery deadline | Met/Not Met | Tools | Comments on the processes |
| | | <p>the possible risks</p> <p>Report is dated and signed. References are always quoted and checked for accuracy.</p> <p>All authors are acknowledged.</p> | | | | |
| 3.5 Assessment by stakeholders | Report | <p>More than 75% of partners expressed satisfaction with the processes and deliverables</p> <p>The Project deliverables fit the needs and aspirations of the stakeholders</p> <p>References are always quoted and checked for</p> | M 32, M36 | | Peer review questionnaire is sent to each partner | |

| WP 3: QUALITY ASSURANCE AND EVALUATION- QUALITY PLAN | | | | | | |
|--|--------|---|-------------------|-------------|---|---------------------------|
| Leader: P 8 Brusov State University | | | | | | |
| Review Date: | | | | | | |
| Deliverable | Type | Quality Standards | Delivery deadline | Met/Not Met | Tools | Comments on the processes |
| | | accuracy; All authors are acknowledged. | | | | |
| 3.6 Quality Review Mechanism (SC meetings) | Report | SC meetings have been held according to the schedule set forth in the Project application Decisions have been made and disseminated among the Partners Minutes of SC have been drafted and uploaded to the cloud drive References are always quoted and checked for accuracy; All authors are | M36 | | Review of the documents by QA Team Feedback from partner is received | |

| WP 3: QUALITY ASSURANCE AND EVALUATION- QUALITY PLAN | | | | | | |
|--|------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------|---------------------------|
| Leader: P 8 Brusov State University | | | | | | |
| Review Date: | | | | | | |
| Deliverable | Type | Quality Standards | Delivery deadline | Met/Not Met | Tools | Comments on the processes |
| | | acknowledged. | | | | |

WP4. DISSEMINATION AND EXPLOITATION

| WP 4: DISSEMINATION AND EXPLOITATION CAMPAIGN- QUALITY PLAN | | | | | | |
|---|--------|--|-------------------|-------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Leader: P 4 Tver State University | | | | | | |
| Review Date: | | | | | | |
| Deliverable | Type | Quality Standards | Delivery deadline | Met/Not Met | Tools | Comments on the processes |
| 4.1 Dissemination & Exploitation | Report | User-friendly and readable Dissemination and Exploitation Action Plan has been | M8, M24, M36 | | Distribution | |

| WP 4: DISSEMINATION AND EXPLOITATION CAMPAIGN- QUALITY PLAN | | | | | | |
|---|------|--|-------------------|-------------|--|---------------------------|
| Leader: P 4 Tver State University | | | | | | |
| Review Date: | | | | | | |
| Deliverable | Type | Quality Standards | Delivery deadline | Met/Not Met | Tools | Comments on the processes |
| Action Plan | | <p>produced and is serving as an internal working document.</p> <p>The Dissemination and Exploitation Action Plan introduces the FlexWBL project dissemination, exploitation and communication strategy.</p> <p>Its implementation plan is used by the partners to ensure the high visibility, accessibility and promotion of the project.</p> <p>This D&E Plan is a reference framework to provide quality communication and dissemination activities and to be updated and adjusted as the project progresses. D&E Plan is structured in logical and coherent manner, scientific or technical jargon is avoided.</p> <p>Performed dissemination activities are</p> | | | <p>of the FlexWBL info, news, and materials via Partners' and external websites</p> <p>Distribution of the FlexWBL info in printed version (flyers, newsletters, etc.)</p> | |

| WP 4: DISSEMINATION AND EXPLOITATION CAMPAIGN- QUALITY PLAN | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|--|-------------------|-------------|--|---------------------------|
| Leader: P 4 Tver State University | | | | | | |
| Review Date: | | | | | | |
| Deliverable | Type | Quality Standards | Delivery deadline | Met/Not Met | Tools | Comments on the processes |
| | | clearly reported | | | | |
| 4.2 Project Branding | Service/Product | <p>Visualization elements are developed and implemented (Logo, Materials for the website, Leaflets, Roll UP, Text document template, Presentation template)</p> <p>Project templates with the respective project logo, number etc. are available for all Partners (report templates, presentation templates, timesheet templates, etc.);</p> | M26 | | <p>online and interactive tools and channels</p> <p>website</p> <p>physical interactive tools and channels</p> <p>Logo, Materials for the website, Leaflets, Roll UP, Text document template, Presentation</p> | |

| WP 4: DISSEMINATION AND EXPLOITATION CAMPAIGN- QUALITY PLAN | | | | | | |
|---|-------|--|-------------------|-------------|---|---------------------------|
| Leader: P 4 Tver State University | | | | | | |
| Review Date: | | | | | | |
| Deliverable | Type | Quality Standards | Delivery deadline | Met/Not Met | Tools | Comments on the processes |
| | | | | | template | |
| 4.3 Networking & Exploitation at Partner Level and European Level | Event | The development of the FlexWBL network of National FlexWBL Representatives Networking at EU level through the participation in 2 highly visible events 3 National FlexWBL Workshops at each Partner Country. Presentations of project's outcomes at external events | M36 | | Project Links at European Level, e.g. project presentation, participation in any events, EU forums, Member State conferences etc. Presentation of the FlexWBL project within the related non-project | |

| WP 4: DISSEMINATION AND EXPLOITATION CAMPAIGN- QUALITY PLAN | | | | | | |
|---|--------|--|-------------------|-------------|--|---------------------------|
| Leader: P 4 Tver State University | | | | | | |
| Review Date: | | | | | | |
| Deliverable | Type | Quality Standards | Delivery deadline | Met/Not Met | Tools | Comments on the processes |
| | | | | | internal and external events (including interproject coaching) | |
| 4.4 WBL Policy Recommendation Report | Report | <p>WBL Policy Recommendation Report compiles all the outcomes of the workshops.</p> <p>Includes proceedings, attendee list, press clippings, and the results of the working sessions.</p> <p>Only relevant up-to-date information is gathered, evaluated and analysed;</p> | M24 | | <p>Review of the document by members of the Leader-Team and Co-leaders, as well as QA Team</p> <p>Feedback from stakeholders</p> | |

| WP 4: DISSEMINATION AND EXPLOITATION CAMPAIGN- QUALITY PLAN | | | | | | |
|---|-------|---|-------------------|-------------|--|---------------------------|
| Leader: P 4 Tver State University | | | | | | |
| Review Date: | | | | | | |
| Deliverable | Type | Quality Standards | Delivery deadline | Met/Not Met | Tools | Comments on the processes |
| 4.5 WBL – Policy Conference | Event | <p>14 days before Conference draft meeting agenda and info on the venue, recommendations on travel/accommodation are circulated for amendments/additions</p> <p>7 days before the Conference the agenda is agreed with partners and disseminated</p> <p>Registration of participants is organized before the Conference via online registration form or mail</p> <p>Registration list is available for every day</p> <p>Photos of the Conference are taken (for online meetings screenshots and video recordings are available)</p> <p>Secretary to the workshop is assigned before the event and minutes are taken during the event</p> <p>Targeted post-event evaluation is</p> | M36 | | <p>Presentations are prepared and demonstrated ;</p> <p>Participatory exercises are used to facilitate group discussions, brainstorm issues, analyse information, and develop recommendations and strategies</p> | |

| WP 4: DISSEMINATION AND EXPLOITATION CAMPAIGN- QUALITY PLAN | | | | | | |
|---|--------|--|-------------------|-------------|-------|---------------------------|
| Leader: P 4 Tver State University | | | | | | |
| Review Date: | | | | | | |
| Deliverable | Type | Quality Standards | Delivery deadline | Met/Not Met | Tools | Comments on the processes |
| | | <p>organized depending on the types of the participants during 7 days after the event</p> <p>Post-evaluation survey is analysed during 21 days after the Conference</p> <p>Minutes, presentations and recordings are disseminated among partners during 7 days after the event</p> <p>List of immediate actions required on behalf of each partner is combined and sent to Partners during 7 days after the Conference</p> <p>Dissemination measures by each Partner are taken during 1 month after the Conference</p> | | | | |
| 4.6 Sustainability Plan | Report | Sustainability plan includes specific actions referring to sustainability activities explored during the project | M36 | | | |

| WP 4: DISSEMINATION AND EXPLOITATION CAMPAIGN- QUALITY PLAN | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|---|-------------------|-------------|--|---------------------------|
| Leader: P 4 Tver State University | | | | | | |
| Review Date: | | | | | | |
| Deliverable | Type | Quality Standards | Delivery deadline | Met/Not Met | Tools | Comments on the processes |
| | | <p>implementation</p> <p>It is agreed and signed by all partners.</p> <p>Special focus of the sustainability plan is put on the operations and activities of the six FlexWBL Labs (3 in Russia and 3 in Armenia)</p> <p>A common agreement plan about the operations is developed.</p> | | | | |
| 4.7 Social Media Support | Service/Product | <p>Social media and professional networks are used for dissemination of the project and its activities</p> <p>Social media is focused on strengthening project's presence in the Russian and Armenia Social Media space</p> <p>Feedback on used Social media tools from Partners is provided within 10 days after</p> | M36 | | <p>Website, logo, flyers</p> <p>Distribution of the FlexWBL info, news, and materials via Partners' and external</p> | |



| WP 4: DISSEMINATION AND EXPLOITATION CAMPAIGN- QUALITY PLAN | | | | | | |
|---|------|---|-------------------|-------------|---|---------------------------|
| Leader: P 4 Tver State University | | | | | | |
| Review Date: | | | | | | |
| Deliverable | Type | Quality Standards | Delivery deadline | Met/Not Met | Tools | Comments on the processes |
| | | the receipt of the email/assignment FlexWBL project under common Facebook, YouTube, Instagram accounts is mutually beneficial action that the projects' respective partners welcomed and agreed upon | | | websites Distribution of the FlexWBL info in printed version (flyers, newsletters, etc.) Published Articles and Reports | |

WP5. MANAGEMENT

| WP 5: PROJECT MANAGEMENT-MANAGEMENT | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|--|-------------------|-------------|--|---------------------------|
| Leader: P 1 Liepaja University | | | | | | |
| Review Date: | | | | | | |
| Deliverable | Type | Quality Standards | Delivery deadline | Met/Not Met | Tools | Comments on the processes |
| 5.1 Internal Communication Platform (Online Project Management) | Service/Product | Contact information of people responsible for WP implementation is up-to-date and available for all Partners on Own Cloud platform; Combination of various communication tools (email, messengers, conference calls, etc.) is used to ensure the efficiency and promptness of | M4 | | Own Cloud platform, email, messengers, conference calls, | |

| WP 5: PROJECT MANAGEMENT-MANAGEMENT | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--|-------------------|-------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| Leader: P 1 Liepaja University | | | | | | |
| Review Date: | | | | | | |
| Deliverable | Type | Quality Standards | Delivery deadline | Met/Not Met | Tools | Comments on the processes |
| | | interaction; Deliverables' drafts are available on Own Cloud platform 14 days before the discussion. WP leaders notify of the receipt of the inquiry regarding their WP within 3 days, the response to the inquiry is provided within 14 days; | | | | |
| 5.2 Project Management System (PMS) | Service/Product | WP's objectives, development stages | M4 | | Communication tools used | |

| WP 5: PROJECT MANAGEMENT-MANAGEMENT | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|------|--|-------------------|-------------|--|---------------------------|
| Leader: P 1 Liepaja University | | | | | | |
| Review Date: | | | | | | |
| Deliverable | Type | Quality Standards | Delivery deadline | Met/Not Met | Tools | Comments on the processes |
| | | <p>and anticipated results are clear to all Partners;</p> <p>Consortium online meetings are organized regularly (at least once per month). Date and time is agreed by doodle voting or at previous meeting;</p> <p>Combination of various communication tools (email, messengers, conference calls, etc.) is used to ensure the efficiency and</p> | | | (email, messengers, conference calls, zoom meetings) | |

| WP 5: PROJECT MANAGEMENT-MANAGEMENT | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|--|---------------------------------|-------------|-------|---------------------------|
| Leader: P 1 Liepaja University | | | | | | |
| Review Date: | | | | | | |
| Deliverable | Type | Quality Standards | Delivery deadline | Met/Not Met | Tools | Comments on the processes |
| | | promptness of interaction; | | | | |
| 5.3 Transnational SC Meetings & Technical Workshops | Event/Service/Product | Consortium online meetings are organized regularly (at least once per month). Date and time is agreed by doodle voting or at previous meeting; All the stakeholders are involved in the development process and feedbacks are provided | M2, M8, M14, M20, M26, M32, M35 | | | |

| WP 5: PROJECT MANAGEMENT-MANAGEMENT | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------|---|-----------------------------|-------------|---|---------------------------|
| Leader: P 1 Liepaja University | | | | | | |
| Review Date: | | | | | | |
| Deliverable | Type | Quality Standards | Delivery deadline | Met/Not Met | Tools | Comments on the processes |
| | | Before the meetings draft meeting agenda is circulated Dissemination measures by each Partner are taken | | | | |
| 5.4 Progress reports per WP | Report | WP's objectives, development stages and anticipated results are clear to all Partners; Partners are acknowledged and agreed Project visibility measures are respected; Report is structured in | M8, M14, M20, M26, M32, M35 | | Review of the documents by all partners | |

| WP 5: PROJECT MANAGEMENT-MANAGEMENT | | | | | | |
|--|--------|---|-------------------|-------------|---|---------------------------|
| Leader: P 1 Liepaja University | | | | | | |
| Review Date: | | | | | | |
| Deliverable | Type | Quality Standards | Delivery deadline | Met/Not Met | Tools | Comments on the processes |
| | | logical and coherent manner Report is dated and signed. | | | | |
| 5.5 Reporting to EC – Interim and Final Report | Report | Only relevant up-to-date information is gathered, evaluated and analysed; authors are acknowledged; Report is dated and signed. Financing is issued in line with the project plan; | M18, M36 | | Review of the documents by all partners Feedback | |

| WP 5: PROJECT MANAGEMENT-MANAGEMENT | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|------|---|-------------------|-------------|-------|---------------------------|
| Leader: P 1 Liepaja University | | | | | | |
| Review Date: | | | | | | |
| Deliverable | Type | Quality Standards | Delivery deadline | Met/Not Met | Tools | Comments on the processes |
| | | Equipment purchase process is organized in line with the project timeline; Fits the purpose: corresponding information to stakeholders concerned to take appropriate decisions | | | | |

Annex 1. WP Success survey

The table below is an example for WP3: Quality. For each WP, a different table will be developed. The form is an example; changes may be made in order to adapt the questions to specific contents of events.

WP SUCCESS SURVEY

WP:

DATE:

Leader:

PARTNER:

The questions below refer to the WP's success. Please rate to what extent The WP fulfils the following parameters from 1 to 5 where 1: Not at all and 5: Very Much.

| WP7 – Quality Assurance Plan | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| The WP was well organized and professionally administered | | | | | |
| The objectives of the WP were clearly and efficiently communicated to partners | | | | | |
| Sufficient guidelines were provided for the accomplishment of the WP objectives | | | | | |
| Quality deliverables for the WP were achieved | | | | | |
| Partners' engagement was adequate and efficient | | | | | |
| Difficulties, problems, and issues were successfully resolved | | | | | |

Comments:



Annex 2. Meetings' Evaluation Form