

KA2- Cooperation for innovation and the exchange of good practices – Capacity Building in the
Field of higher Education

Call for Proposals: EAC/A04/2015

Contract Number: 573975- EPP-1-2016-1-AM-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP

BOOST

Boosting Armenian Universities Internationalization Strategy & Marketing

QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLAN

WP7: Quality Control

WP Coordinator: Instituto Superior Técnico

Document Title	Quality Management Plan	
Date of Issue	27/07/2017	
Author(s)	Carla Dickson, Ana Lucas, Rui Mendes	
Contributors	All Project Partners	
Contact name		
E-mail address		
Organisation	Instituto Superior Técnico (University of Lisbon)	
Approval Status	Draft ☐	Final ☒
Number of Pages	25	
Keyword list	Quality Management, Quality Planning, Quality, Assurance, Quality Control	
Recipients	Only Partners ☒	Public ☐
Method of Distribution	Email ☒	Internet ☐
Confidentiality Status	Confidential ☒	Public ☐

Document History		
Version No	Date	Revised by
1	July 2017	Ana Agante Lucas
2	November 2017	Rui Mendes
3		
Etc		

Summary

There are many approaches to quality management. In the context of the current project, quality is described as the degree to which the project fulfils requirements. The elements of quality management identified through this approach are quality planning, quality assurance and quality control.

Identifying standards is a major part of quality planning. Quality standards refer to the standards set for the assurance of the quality of project processes and project deliverables. Quality Management will be introduced to this project through the implementation of three key processes: establish quality criteria and standards, measure quality of deliverable, and enhance quality achieved.

The Quality Management Process is finalized only when all of the deliverables and management processes have been completed and approved prior to project closure.

The **Quality Control Plan (QCP)** will formalize the approach that will be followed by the partners of the project to ensure the highest possible quality of the project activities, outputs and outcomes and project management.

The deliverable itself is produced based on clear responsibilities, IST as WP7 leader, will coordinate efforts to:

- facilitate co-ordination between local evaluation activities and the overall project plan;
- provide common guidelines to the partners;
- facilitate the integration of local experiences to provide inputs to the summative project evaluation;
- provide links and feedback between the evaluation activities and the project management, to handle contingencies which may occur during the project lifecycle.

Quality Control will be developed by IST (as WP Coordinator) and ASPU (as Project Coordinator) to monitor and assess the quality of the activities. These activities will involve the Coordinators of the Project and the WP but also external key stakeholders (other Armenian HEI's as peer reviews). The QCP will be adopted by each Project Partner. The QCP will be made available on the project website. During the project implementation, staff involved in the project will also monitor the implementation and acceptance of the quality procedures and support the quality control in its reinforcement. This QCP will define the necessary procedures for internal monitoring, quality and risk management and external monitoring.

Any conflict that might arise during the project will be resolved in a friendly manner through adequate institutional bodies. Any delays or misunderstandings regarding project activities will be discussed and resolved at consortium meetings through generally reached consensus. Since the partners in the consortium were selected on the basis of established mutual trust, the project is based on the premise of the continuation of the fruitful and successful collaboration.

The QCP defines also the quality expectations regarding the project deliverables, i.e. reports and documents, events/workshops/meetings as well as procedures for internal and external monitoring.

The structure of the deliverable is as follows:

- Definition of quality objectives and indicators related to its deliverables, i.e. documents, trainings, meetings, events and other activities as well as the general guidelines to be followed.
- Internal monitoring strategy and responsibilities of the project partners with individual performance indicators. Among the potential indicators we can cite:
 - Monitoring the implementation of the different phases of the activities and the results of the surveys for external and internal stakeholders.
 - Perceived impact of the project in HEI development.

External monitoring:

- Peer review between Armenian universities and the Ministry: this activity is important in order to make own Armenian partners part of the evaluation process.
- Inter-project coaching: other similar on-going or already ended project teams will be contacted in order to peer evaluate the BOOST Project development.

Abbreviations of Project Partners in QMP

P1	Armenian State Pedagogical University after Khachatur Abovyan (ASPU)
P2	American University of Armenia (AUA)
P3	Gyumri state Pedagogical Institute after M. Nalbandyan (GSPI)
P4	Yerevan State Conservatory after Komitas (YKSC)
P5	Vanadzor State University after Hovhannes Toumanyan (VSU)
P6	Ministry of Education and Science (MoES)
P7	National Information Centre for Academic Recognition and Mobility (ARMENIC)
P8	Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya (UPC)
P9	Instituto Superior Técnico (IST)
P10	Royal Institute of Technology (KTH)
P11	Universitat Rovira i Virgili (URV)
P12	Tallin University of Technology (TUT)

Contents

Summary	4
Abbreviations of Project Partners in QMP	5
Contents	Ошибка! Закладка не определена.
1. INTRODUCTION	7
1.1. Purpose of the Project Quality Management Plan	7
1.2. Quality Management Strategy	7
1.2.1. Quality Planning:	7
1.2.2. Quality Assurance.....	8
1.2.3. Quality Control	8
2. ANALYSIS OF PROJECT'S PROCESSES QUALITY STANDARDS PER WORK PACKAGE	9
3. QUALITY ASSURANCE AND QUALITY CONTROL TOOLS.....	17
4. QUALITY AND CONSISTENCY OF OUTPUTS WITH THE PROJECT'S IMAGE	17
5. BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	19
6. APPENDICES	20
6.1. Quality Assurance Log	20
6.2. WPs' Verification Table	21
6.3. WP Success survey	22
6.3. Meetings' Evaluation Form	23

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Purpose of the Project Quality Management Plan

The Project Quality Management Plan (QMP) documents the necessary information required to effectively manage project quality from project planning to delivery. It defines the project's quality policies, procedures, criteria for and areas of application, and roles, responsibilities and authorities.

More specifically, the goals for quality for the BOOST project are to ensure:

- Project management processes are appropriately followed;
- Project deliverables meet their stated requirements.

The above goals are to be assured through:

- A quality system that is implemented and maintained;
- The identification of responsibilities of all involved partners regarding quality;
- The compliance and alignment of all deliverables with the grant agreement;
- The organization and monitoring of all processes relevant to the project at a high level of effectiveness and quality.

1.2. Quality Management Strategy

Quality management is performed throughout the project lifecycle through three main processes:

- **Quality Planning** – primarily during the project planning process;
- **Quality Assurance** – primarily during the project execution process;
- **Quality Control** – primarily during the project monitoring and controlling processes.

1.2.1. Quality Planning:

Quality planning is done during the development phase of the project life cycle. It determines quality policies and procedures relevant to the project for both project deliverables and project processes, defines who is responsible for what, and documents compliance.

The QMP focuses on the key components shown in Table 1, followed by an explanation of each of the key components:

Table 1: Key components of the QMP

Objects of quality review	Quality Measure	Quality Evaluation Methods
Project Processes	Process Quality Standards Stakeholder Expectations	Quality Assurance Activities
Project Deliverables	Deliverable Quality Standards Stakeholders Satisfaction	Quality Control Activities

Project Processes and Project Deliverables: The key project processes and deliverables subject to quality review.

Process Quality Standards: The quality standards that are the “measures” used to determine if project work processes are being followed.

Stakeholder Expectations: Stakeholder expectations describe when a project process is effective as defined by the project stakeholders. An example is the review and approval of all high impact changes to the project.

Risk identification: Risk identification describes possible risks identified for the processes of the project. After the risk identification, a risk analysis is performed in relevance to the risk level accompanied by relevant mitigation strategies. This is a process that takes place throughout the project’s life.

Deliverable Quality Standards: The quality standards that are the “measures” used to determine a successful outcome for a deliverable. These standards may vary dependent on the type of the project.

Stakeholders Satisfaction: The Stakeholders satisfaction criteria describe when each deliverable is complete and acceptable. Deliverables are evaluated against these criteria.

Quality Assurance Activities: The quality assurance activities monitor and verify that the processes used to manage and create the deliverables are followed and are effective.

Quality Control Activities: The quality control activities that monitor and verify that the project deliverables meet defined quality standards.

1.2.2. Quality Assurance

Quality assurance consists of what must be done during the actual tasks to ensure that the standards identified during quality planning are met. It is therefore done during the implementation phase of the project life cycle. The focus of quality assurance is on the processes used in the project. Quality assurance ensures that project processes are used effectively to produce quality project deliverables. It involves following and meeting standards, continuously improving project work, and correcting project defects.

1.2.3. Quality Control

The focus of quality control is on the deliverables of the project. Quality control monitors project deliverables to verify that the deliverables are of acceptable quality and meet the pre-established objectives. It also takes place during the implementation phase of the project life cycle.

2. ANALYSIS OF PROJECT'S PROCESSES QUALITY STANDARDS PER WORK PACKAGE

In the following tables an analysis of Project's deliverables quality standards per Work Package is being performed by respective WP Leaders, and Instituto Superior Tecnico (IST) as the leader of the work package. The quality control activities are being described and the responsible partner for each activity process is noted.

N.B. Editor's Note: To help the partners responsible for each WP to fill out the analysis of their assigned WP draft comments were inserted below in WP1 to WP8 to facilitate the work. Each WP Leader is free to change the tables that correspond to their WP as they see fit.

Table 2: Analysis of WP1: Preparation – Processes & Deliverables Quality Standards and Risks

WP 1: Preparation To develop comprehensive national internationalisation policy framework and tools for facilitating the internationalisation practices in Armenia Leader: P10 Royal Institute of Technology (KTH) Participating: All partners				
No.	WP Process & Deliverables	Quality Standards	Quality Assurance Activity	Risks
1	Preparation	All partners satisfaction with the processes and deliverables final results	Survey applied to the consortium in the end of the WP.	Not meeting expectations and deadlines
1.1.	HEIs to review the internationalisation practices & policy framework	Study tour impact	Survey reflects all pertinent issues addressed in the Study Tour.	Agenda lacking partial content/not focused on the defined goals. Participants from Partner Country not fluent in English. Survey missing some dimension of the Study Tour.
		Response rate	On-line survey applied on the week after the Study Tour.	Not obtaining at least 50% response rate.
1.2	Make a benchmarking analysis on internationalisation practices	Data collection covers all pertinent issues	Execution timings and procedures monitoring.	Missing a critical issue
		Accuracy of data on existing internationalisation practices	Results are presented in the partners meeting	Failing to take into consideration all relevant parameters and having an incomplete analysis
		Meet deadlines for publishing benchmarking analysis report	The report will be reviewed and assessed by ASPU and all partners.	Missing the deadlines and delaying 1.3 activities.
1.3	Develop a comprehensive 5-year national internationalisation strategy	Clearly identify and incorporate Armenian needs.	Feedback from all the Programme partners.	Low knowledge of English language and comprehension which constrains the process
		Accurate definition of a national strategic plan.	Feedback from all the Programme partners.	Political and economic risks connected with regional situations and lack of government bodies involvement
		Meet deadlines for delivering the national internationalisation report	Monitoring the procedures and timings.	Missing deadline

1.4	Develop a national model for the description of study programs of Armenia & guidelines to HEIs	Accuracy of national Armenian model for the description of study programs	Outcomes will be reviewed by all partners and published in the National Platform.	Discrepancies between government structures and participating HEI's understanding of the objectives
		Comprehensive guidelines to HEI's regarding the measurement, recognition and transfer of the ECTS credits gained outside Armenia	Outcomes will be reviewed by all partners and published in the National Platform.	Low preparedness of MoES to introduce the necessary changes

Table 3: Analysis of WP2: Development - Processes & Deliverables Quality Standards and Risks

WP 2: To create a National Platform for internationalisation in Higher Education and online tools for mapping and benchmarking the internationalisation processes Leader: P1 Armenian State Pedagogical University after Khachatur Abovyan (ASPU) Participating: All Partners				
No.	WP Process & Deliverables	Quality Standards	Quality Assurance Activity	Risks
2	Development	All partners satisfaction with the processes and deliverables final results	Survey applied to the consortium in the end of the WP	Meeting expecting deadlines to develop the website with an integrated National Platform
2.1	Develop a set of indicators to measure and compare the performance in HEIs for internationalisation	Intensive report with measurable performance indicators	Report delivery on time	Overpassing dead-lines
2.2	Organize focus-groups in each Partner HEI	>80% Armenian HEIs participation in focus-groups	Participants' attendance, participants list	Not being able to involve such range of HEI in the focus-group
		>80% Participants satisfaction with focus-group	Satisfaction survey application	
2.3	Develop short case-studies	A minimum of one short case-study, by all the members of the Consortia	Case-studies report delivery	Overpassing dead-lines
2.4	Develop a website with an integrated National Platform	Website creation	Website availableness with all the expected contents developed on 2.3.	Overpassing dead-lines

Table 4: Analysis of WP3: Development Quality Plan – Processes & Deliverables Quality Standards and Risks

WP 3: To build capacities of ICO staff of HEIs, MoES and social partners on strategic management, marketing and cultural challenges and implementation of credit mobility Leader: P8 Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya (UPC) Participating: All Partners				
No.	WP Process& Deliverables	Quality Standards	Quality Assurance Activity	Risks
3	Development	All partners satisfaction with the processes and deliverables final results	Survey applied to the consortium in the end of the WP	Low knowledge of English language within a part of academia so crucial for internationalisation
3.1	Develop training plan on strategic management, marketing, cultural challenges and implementation of credit mobility	Teaching materials elaboration to support the trainings	Teaching materials deliverance	Materials not aligned with the training or missing deadlines
3.2	Organize a training processes on strategic management of international cooperation in EU	>80% Participants satisfaction with training	Satisfaction survey application	Participants not fully satisfied with the provided training
		Minimum 10 participants per partner	Participants' attendance, participants list.	Lack of English language skills.
3.3	Organize a training on marketing and cultural challenges of HEIs	>80% Participants satisfaction with training	Satisfaction survey application	Participants not fully satisfied with the provided training
3.4	Organize a training on the implementation of credit mobility in Partner HEIs	>80% Participants satisfaction with training	Satisfaction survey application	Participants not fully satisfied with the provided training
3.5	Organize in house training at each partner HEI	>80% Participants satisfaction with training	Satisfaction survey application	
		10 in-house trainings	Participants' attendance, participants list.	Lack of participation
		80% Armenian HEI participation	Participants' attendance, participants list.	Lack of participation

Table 5: Analysis of WP4: Development Dissemination & Exploitation – Processes & Deliverable Quality Standards and Risks

WP4: To create ICO resources and service-oriented centres at the Armenian HEIs Leader: P11 Universitat Rovira I Virgili (URV) Participating: All Partners				
No.	WP Process& Deliverables	Quality Standards	Quality Assurance Activity	Risks
4	Development	All partners satisfaction with the processes and deliverables final results	Survey applied to the consortium in the end of the WP	Difference in study programs between EU and AM HEIs that might cause difficulties in planning mobility strategies and recognition tools
4.1	Organize a study tour for operational capacities of ICOs	Study tour relevance and alignment with the goals	Participants satisfaction with the study tour – survey application	Study Tour Programme not meeting the participant's expectations or needs. Participants lack of English language knowledge.
4.2	Specify the list of functions, services provided and internal communication model	Quality Manual procedures for internationalization	Deliver the report	Lack of extensiveness or comprehensiveness of the report
4.3	Develop a concept paper for operationalization of ICOs and service-oriented University centres'	Identify good practices	Minimum of good 10 internationalisation practices	Not being able to identify the good practices
		Create ICO Resources Centers	Minimum of 5 ICO resources centers created	Not creating the minimum ICO centers
4.4	Specify the main paths and tools for marketing and promoting internationalisation and attractiveness of Armenian HEIs	Strategic and marketing Plans for internationalisation development	Documents production and linkage to each specific needs	Not addressing all particular needs or contingencies. Missing deadlines on producing the documents.

Table 6: Analysis of WP5: Dissemination - Processes & Deliverables Quality Standards and Risks

WP 5: Dissemination strategy Leader: P2 American University of Armenia (AUA) with the support of Royal Institute of Technology (KTH) as European Partner Participating: All Partners				
---	--	--	--	--

No.	WP Process & Deliverables	Quality Standards	Quality Assurance Activity	Risks
5	Dissemination Strategy	All partners satisfaction with the processes and deliverables final results	Survey applied to the consortium in the end of the WP	Lack of communication skills of partners
5.1	Website creation and update	Website availability	Annual number of visits to the website >80% satisfaction with the website	Insufficient number of visits Consortium satisfaction below 80%
5.2	Leaflet, roll-ups, posters	Marketing tools availability	Timely production and distribution of the materials Number of people reached and contacted	Not meeting deadlines and insufficient message communication Non-occurrence of contacts outside the Project Consortia
5.3	Open conferences	Conferences realization	3 Open International Conferences Minimum of 11 national (6) and internal (5) dissemination conferences Participation of a minimum of 6 non-Consortia HEI's in the Final Dissemination Conference	Not attending the minimum number of conferences Not attending the minimum number of conferences Not attending the minimum number of participants

Table 7: Analysis of WP6: Management - Processes & Deliverables Quality Standards and Risks

WP 6: Management Leader: P1 Armenian State Pedagogical University after Khachatur Abovyan (ASPU) Participating: All Partners				
No.	WP Process & Deliverables	Quality Standards	Quality Assurance Activity	Risks
6	Management	All partners satisfaction with the processes and deliverables final results	Survey applied to the consortium in the end of the WP	Delays in reporting; falling short of time planning goals and milestones, non-realistic /over ambitious time-planning, internal communication and coordination problems

6.1	Project meetings	Occurrence of the Project meetings	Participants List signed sheets	Delay on the initial proposed dates for the Project meetings. Partner's participation on the meetings.
6.2	Financial management	Good execution of the financial guidelines and standards	EACEA management reports	Partners not submitting the duly reports or delivering the financial documents and expenses in time.

Table 8: Analysis of WP7: Quality - Processes & Deliverables Quality Standards and Risks

WP 7: Quality Leader: P9 Instituto Superior Técnico Participating: All Partners				
No.	WP Process & Deliverables	Quality Standards	Quality Assurance Activity	Risks
7	Quality	Efficiency of the quality framework	Monitoring consistency with project management plan	Delays in reporting and deadlines
		All partners satisfaction with the processes and deliverables final results	Survey applied to the consortium in the end of the WP	Not meeting expectations
7.1	Quality Plan	Effectiveness of the Group Discussions	Feedback from all partners involved	Lack of feedback
		Pertinence of the Questionnaires	Feedback from all partners involved	Lack of feedback
		Meeting deadlines established for the Reports	The plan will be reviewed by internal experts. All partners will contribute to the plan	Compliance with deadlines. Attainment of fixed goals

7.2	Quality evaluation reporting and indicators follow-up	Effectiveness of the six month reviews during the project lifespan of project overall functioning and benefits of participation	The review will be conducted and self-administered by each of the partners and co-ordinated by the WP leader	Failing to meet deadlines
		Quality of the summative evaluation examining the outcomes	Assessment of the panel of indicators expressed in the Logical Framework Matrix	Poor understanding of the proposed outcomes
		Pertinence of the Final Report with the results of inter-project coaching and peer reviewing	Implement corrective actions from evaluation reporting	HEI's lack of capacity to implement corrective actions

Table 9: Analysis of WP8: Dissemination & Exploitation - Processes & Deliverables Quality Standards and Risks

WP 8: Sustainability Leader: P6 Ministry of Education and Science (MoES) Participating: All Partners				
No.	WP Process & Deliverables	Quality Standards	Quality Assurance Activity	Risks
8	Sustainability	National comprehensiveness of the internationalisation strategies	Identifying the HEI's outside the Consortium that had integrated the new international National Strategy.	Insufficient resources and capacities in HEIs other than the Consortium to integrate the National strategic approaches into their internationalisation agenda
		All partners satisfaction with the processes and deliverables final results	Survey applied to the consortium in the end of the WP	Not meeting expectations
8.1	Meeting national authorities	Meetings occurrence with the national authorities	Meetings monitoring and follow-up	National authorities unavailability or lack of interest

3. QUALITY ASSURANCE AND QUALITY CONTROL TOOLS

Measuring deliverables and processes quality takes place through Quality Assurance and Quality Control.

Quality assurance and **quality control** will be performed through:

- **Processes Review:** Each process for each WP will be reviewed on a regular basis to check if they meet the set quality standards. This takes place to early identify if the process is successful or if it needs revision in order to result in quality deliverables.
- **Deliverables Review:** Each deliverable produced of each WP will be reviewed to check if they meet the quality standard set during their development stage.

The **Quality Assurance tool** used in the context of this project is the:

- **Quality Assurance log** (Appendix 1). The completion of the relevant log will take place once a month by reviewing all up to date processes for each WP by WP Leader and will be checked by the Project Manager (ASPU) and the Quality Manager Leader (IST).

The **quality control tools** used in the context of the BOOST project are listed below:

- **WPs' verification log** (Appendix 2): 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 a month by WP Leader and will be checked by the PM and the QM Leader.
- **WPs' Success Survey** (Appendix 3): a peer review questionnaire will be sent to each partner (An example is given below for WP2). For work packages 3, 4, 5, and 7, it will be released upon their completion. For ongoing WPs, namely 1, 2, 6 it will be released periodically (every 6 months, and in any case before any official reporting).
- **Meetings' Evaluation Form:** (Appendix 4): a peer review questionnaire that will be used to check partners' satisfaction after each meeting. It is distributed upon completion of each meeting and a report is prepared once all partners have sent their feedback.

4. QUALITY AND CONSISTENCY OF OUTPUTS WITH THE PROJECT'S IMAGE

All outputs of the project must be consistent with the image for the project in terms of uniformity. The Leader for the WP8: Dissemination and Exploitation - the American University of Armenia (AUA) is responsible for developing a dissemination plan and the creation of the project's image. Internal and external produced outputs must follow and use the instructions of the

respective WP Leader and the logo and templates produced for the quality of the visibility of the project.

Communication Rules:

Communication rules as set by the Project Leader:

- Always refer the project acronym [BOOST]
- When somebody refers to the work of other partners they should cc the mail/doc to the partner concerned (unless confidential)
- Communication should always be carried out by the Partners contact points especially when distribution lists (DL) are concerned.
- Information flow within the network of Partners should always be notified to the Beneficiary
- Publication of results and dissemination activities: should always mention in the introduction that BOOST is an EU co-funded project as well as the names of all participating partners
- Travels should always be reported in short (e.g. trip to EU partner institution) to the different Partners to achieve optimum organization.
- Task/sub-action leaders should be recipients along with the coordinator
- Written communication, Minutes of the Committee meetings
- Communication Language: English
- Changes in documents sent :
 - Revisions: Always highlight what was revised in the document or in the text, e-mail (corrections)
 - New version should be clearly stated with a summary of the new main points
 - New versions of Doc, automatically imply that older version should be deleted or saved as back up document

Internal communication between the partners through e-mails should follow the example shown below in terms of visibility and convenience: partners should start the subject with BOOST, then the work package that the communication concerns of and then a more specific brief description:

BOOST WP7 QMP 1st Draft

Reports (administrative or financial) will follow the guidelines that follow the relevant template sent by the project leader or the relevant WP leader.

Possible dissemination activities will be recorded by all partners in the dissemination template that will be prepared by the WP5 leader.

External communication with the Press or with identified stakeholders should always be done with reference to the project. The project logo, the Erasmus+ logo and the written mention of project funding should always be present in external communication.

5. BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Rose, H. K. (2005) 'Project Quality Management: Why, what and how', J. Ross Publishing
2. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 2013, 'Project Quality Management Plan'. Available at: <http://www.itplanning.org.vt.edu/pm/qualitymgmtplan.html> [17/04/14]

6. APPENDICES

6.1. Quality Assurance Log

Review Date	Review Person	WP	Process Reviewed	Findings	Problems encountered (if applicable)	Resolution (if applicable)	Resolution Date

6.2. WPs' Verification Table

The table below is an example for WP7: Quality. For each WP, a different table will be developed.

WP 7: Quality Leader: P9 Instituto Superior Técnico/University of Lisbon				
Review Date:				
Deliverable	Quality Standards	Met	Not Met	Comments
Quality Plan	Deadline: according to Project Proposal/Work Plan			
	Clear structure and purpose			
	Completeness			
	Partners' engagement			
Quality evaluation reporting and indicators follow-up	Deadline: According to Project Proposal/Work Plan			
	Thorough information analysis			
	Annexes with supporting data (IF RELEVANT)			
	Consistency with the objectives of the project			
	Provision of time to review			
	Partners' engagement			

6.3. WP Success survey

The table below is an example for WP7: 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

**Erasmus +: KA2- Cooperation for innovation and the exchange of good practices –
Capacity Building in the Field of higher Education**

BOOST: Boosting Armenian Universities Internationalization Strategy & Marketing

WP:

DATE:

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:

6.3. Meetings' Evaluation Form

The following evaluation form is an example, changes may be made in order to adapt the questions to specific contents of events.

EVALUATION FORM

Erasmus +: KA2- Cooperation for innovation and the exchange of good practices – Capacity Building in the Field of higher Education

BOOST: Boosting Armenian Universities Internationalization Strategy & Marketing

NAME / TITLE OF MEETING AND MEETING VENUE: _____

DATE OF MEETING: _____

Evaluation Scale 1: Very Unsatisfactory 2 Unsatisfactory 3: Neither Unsatisfactory / Nor Satisfactory 4: Satisfactory 5: Very Satisfactory

Please use the above mentioned scale to rate to what extent the Meeting satisfied the following parameters:

No	Performance Indicator	Themes	1	2	3	4	5
1	Structure, content and delivery of the event						
1.1	Organisation of the transnational event	Meeting took place at the agreed times and locations					
		Meeting followed an agreed agenda circulated beforehand					
		Minutes were taken during the Meeting					
1.2	Effectiveness of content and appropriate range and balance of activities	Appropriate content, clearly related to the aims and objectives of the event					
		Provision of sufficient time to network and share ideas with partners					
1.3	The quality of project management	Clarity of project coordination					
		Quality of the management of monitoring and evaluation by the project coordinator and introduced to administrative staff					
		Evidence of on-going assistance to participants, if appropriate					

Remarks about the theme:

Remarks about the theme:

No	Performance Indicator	Themes	1	2	3	4	5
2	Quality of the transnational element						
2.1	Input into the event by the project partners	The extent to which each partner contributed to the event					
		The evidence of partners sharing roles and responsibilities during the event					
2.2	Links between the aims of the event and the overall aims of the project	Mutual understanding amongst partners about the project and event rationale and the short term and long term objectives of the event					
		Clear evidence in the event programme of real synergy with the overall objectives of the project					

No	Performance Indicator	Themes	1	2	3	4	5
3	Quality of hospitality	Attention to practical details and catering					
		Suitability of the working venue					
		Provision for giving information and or assistance on accommodation and travelling details for the partners					

Remarks about the theme:

No	Performance Indicator	Themes	1	2	3	4	5
4	Overall satisfaction						

Remarks about the theme:

What aspects of this meeting were particularly good?

What aspects of this meeting, if any, need to be improved?

Do you have any suggestions or additional comments about this meeting?



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

Thank you!



Erasmus+

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission.
This communication reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.