WP4 – Quality Control and Monitoring

QUALITY PLAN MANUAL

University of Basrah

September 2018

Document Data

Distribution List*	PU
Document Version	0.1
Reviewed by	
Review Date	

*Choose from:

PU (Public)

RE (Restricted to a group specified by the Consortium (including the Commission Services)

CO (Confidential, only for members of the Consortium (including the Commission Services)

Version	Date	Author/Organization
0.1	September 2018	University of Basrah

Disclaimer

This project has been co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union.

The information and views set out in this publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the European Union. Neither the European Union institutions and bodies nor any person acting on their behalf may be held responsible for the use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged.

Table of Contents

**Training for Medical education via innovative
eTechnology/MediTec**

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

3 | P a g e

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

1 Executive Summary

In the scope of the MediTec project, and particularly according to what is foreseen in the WP4 Project assurance and efficiency, the consortium decided that it is to the benefit of the satisfaction of its quality objectives to prepare a Project Quality Plan Manual.

The objective of this Quality Plan Manual is to ensure the production of concrete and high–quality results in line with the project plans.

In this context, the main purpose of the Quality Plan Manual is to facilitate the project's management and guide all partners on the evaluation and quality issues, by establishing a coherent set of guidelines by which all aspects of the project are managed and measured. It will be the use of these guidelines that will ensure better collaboration among the consortium members, individuals and groups, and will also ensure that the entire consortium is responsible for and engaged in the work that is produced by the project.

2 Introduction

The main purpose of this Project Quality Plan is to describe the Quality Management procedures that the project team will follow in order to ensure, monitor and control the quality of all processes and deliverables produced during the MediTec project lifecycle. In particular:

- To clearly define the content, format, review and approval process of the project deliverables;
- To define the responsibilities of the project partners regarding those deliverables.
- To identify all the different tools and means to be applied throughout the project duration
- To provide guidelines for adequate implementation and thereby assure that certain quality standards in the performance of our tasks are fulfilled.
- To define the quality requirements that must be obtained throughout the project lifecycle, those that the deliverables, actions and results must conform to.

3 Project Management Structure/Responsibilities

The project will be managed in such a way as to promote a sense of ownership and motivation for each of the partners.

The structure of the project management will consists of:

- The Project Coordinator (PC),
- The Project Steering Committee (StC),
- The Scientific and Technical Committe (STeC),
- The Quality Committee (QC).

3.1 Project Coordinator (PC)

HTWK will be the Project Coordinator and responsible for the overall operation of the project and its smooth running, financial and administrative management including the preparation

of budget and reports, timeliness and accomplishment. The PC will supervise and coordinate all activities, ensuring that all partners are working towards the same objectives; contractually, technically and administratively and strictly collaborating with the Management Team. The PC will ensure that all partners' contributions meet the Work Plan expectations.

The PC will be responsible for:

- representing the consortium towards the EC,
- ensuring effective flow of information between partners,
- ensuring the implementation of the agreed action plan to the agreed standards and deadlines,
- ongoing evaluation of project activities and reporting on project progress to the EU, and
- defining and identifying the project deliverables for the Commission from the inputs received by participants,
- managing and monitoring the project activities and resources,
- ensuring the collaboration and communication to EC and among partners,
- ensuring the consistency between the development and the strategic objectives of the partners,
- collecting and transmitting the project deliverables to the Steering Committee and the participants,
- monitoring any significant difference between planned and actual advancement of participants' work, particularly with respect of project results and deliverables,
- reviewing the reports (both scientific and financial ones) to verify consistency with the project tasks before transmitting them to the EC.

3.2 The Project Steering Committee (StC),

The StC, chaired by the PC, will be composed by one member of each partner and will supervise the implementation of the whole programme.
The StC is the project operational decision-making and arbitration body, which will implement the provisions of the Grant Agreement and shall decide on the following matters:
- strategic orientation of the project;
- identification of the Foreground that could be the subject matter of protection and consequential decisions on dissemination and exploitation activities;
- allocation of the co-ownership shares over Foreground obtained by several participants; acquisition of rights from third parties, if applicable;
- take all decisions required for the successful progress of the project;
- implement the scientific decisions and orientations, taken by the coordinator, by redefining the work plan and schedule and/or re-defining partner roles, contributions and budgets;
- elaborate progress reports on the state of advancement of each work package; monitor any significant difference between planned and actual advancement of participants' work, particularly with respect of project results and deliverables;
- in case of default by a contractor, to propose to the Steering Committee to review participants roles and budget as well as any new entity to replace the defaulting contractor.

3.3 The Scientific and Technical Committes (STeC).

The STeC, composed by the PC and the Leaders of technical and scientific WPs, will supervise all technical and scientific activities, managing the actions of all partners, deciding appropriate strategies, monitoring the achievement of final results. The STeC will plan the technical and scientific activities through a specific plan and timetable, scheduling tasks and roles for the preparation and carry out of the technical and scientific contents.

3.4 The Quality Committee (QC)

In order to achieve the quality objectives of the project, a Quality Committee (QC) is established. This is Coordinated by the UoB and co-led by PSUT and TUMS. It is also assisted by a EU partner: the University of Malta, to support an independent evaluation.

The duty of the QC is to monitor and evaluate the progress of the project and to ensure that all its activities are carried out properly according to European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance and ensuring proper execution of the project to achieve its objective. The QC will design a proper evaluation process and be responsible for creating a set of indicators.

The QC will monitor the project at different points using different types of evaluation practices and tools, such as questionnaires, interview grids and check-lists, devised to assess on an ongoing basis project relevance, efficiency and impact, to measure progress throughout its life cycle, to determine if the project responds to main target groups' needs, to measure the level of satisfaction of beneficiaries of project activities, and to evaluate unexpected results and control all processes.

The monitoring and evaluation procedures will monitor the project execution through monitoring reports which will be edited every 6 months. An intermediate and a final report will be elaborated, showing the first impact on organizations, and beneficiaries involved.

3.5 Work Package Leader (WPL)

For each deliverable, one or more partners are defined as Work Package Leader/s (WPL) as more than one partner, depending on their role in the project, can be involved in the implementation of each WP and its subtasks.

Each Work Package Leader will be responsible for the detailed co-ordination and reporting of a specific WP. If needed, meetings of the partners involved in the WP will be organized and chaired by the Leader. For each deliverable, within the WP, the Leader will assign direct responsibility either to himself or to an associate individual. The work package Leader is, in the first instance, the person who will be contacted by the PC as part of the monitoring of progress towards completion of the deliverables and of the assigned WP.

At the end of each project period, each partner will report to the Leader of the WP he is involved in and for which he has performed tasks during the reporting period, on progress of the activities within the agreed work packages. The WP Leader will forward a consolidated progress report to the Coordinator. He/she will also prepare a report at the achievement of

each milestone, describing the actual results obtained, and discussing it in relation to the project specific objective and a WP report at the completion of the WP.

4   Project WPs and subtasks

The basic result of the project develop new teaching methodologies focused on training methods on innovative ICT for the improvement of quality and quantity of teachers and professionals working in the area of medical and health sciences using the experience of advanced EU universities and apply it at a national and international level in the future, in order to support and modernize the medical education by establishing an innovative training center with Immersive Medical Learning Platform and realistic simulation models in order to improve the training of practical skills and soft skills in medical education. In order to obtain this main goal, the project shall use a series of steps that are depicted in a set of work packages. The work packages, along with a set of Subtasks that will be performed, are as follows:

WP1 - Review, state of the art, Agreement and Network between partners

1.1 Project start up activities

1.2 Studies for the needs of students, doctors and teachers

1.3 Prepare operation plans for the training on innovative medical technology

WP2 – Purchase of training equipment and training materials

2.1 Delivery of technical and didactic equipment

2.2 Hardware installation and adjustment of software

WP3 – Training and integration the training program in teaching system

3.1 Studying of EU experience by mobility of staff and students

3.2 Develop training programs for the training on innovative medical technology

3.3 Improvement of training methodical complexes on base of modernized training and training instructors

3.4 Integration the medical training program in study programs at the universities

3.5 Development of multimedia approach and manuals for the modernized training

WP4 - Quality control and monitoring

4.1 Quality control, monitoring and budgetary control

4.2 Monitoring of the development process

4.3 Expertise and quality control of developed methodical training and manuals

4.4 project task supervision, result evaluation and reports

WP5 – Project Dissemination, exploitation and sustainability

5.1 Publication of information on project activity via internet

5.2 carrying out workshops, conferences and seminars, internal and external meetings

5.3 distribution of project documentation material

5.4 training sustainability in long – term perspective, update

5.5 cooperation networks and funding

WP6 – Management of the Project

6.1 Coordination meeting

6.2 Controlling of the project activity, Monitoring and evaluation of results

6.3 Reporting and control of the budget

5   Project Quality Assurance

5.1   Quality of the project processes

The quality of the project processes will be done through self-evaluation of the consortium by the project partners themselves, using the Project Quality Assessment Form (PQAF). For the evaluation of the project as a whole, a set of indicators have been established, which can be measured on a scale from 1 to 5, where 5 is very positive and 1 is very negative. The indicators are generally relevant to the quality of the project management, coordination, structure, support mechanisms, content, and resources.

The evaluation is primarily done by each partner, who must answer each question with an assessment of the performance of the consortium. The QM will collect all the answers from the partners and integrate them into a report, using the technique and the approval limit described in 5.2.1.3, which will reflect the views of the consortium on its progress. In case the QM, upon processing the results finds that one or more are below the expected performance, notifies the PC in order to set forth problem-solving procedures.

The evaluation will be performed at the end of year one, two and three, during the lifecycle of the project.

5.2   Quality of deliverables

The deliverables of MediTec project consist of the results of the 6 Work packages, as described in the work plan of the project and included in section 4 of this document. Each WP may contain one or more subtasks.

In order to assure a high level of quality regarding the results of the project, each deliverable is evaluated for its completion in due time as well as for its completeness, clarity and comprehensiveness.

Regarding the on-time completion and the monitoring of the WPs, the PC uses the PQAF-WP: Work packages assessment form.

5.2.1 Quality evaluation

Depending on the nature of the activity implemented, for each WP and its subtask(s), the evaluation can be of two kinds: a. Internal or b. external. "Internal" means that responsible for the review of the document are specific or all the members of the consortium, while "external" means that the persons other than the partners of the project (e.g. the public, participants, trainees, beneficiaries etc.) evaluate the result. The evaluation is made with the aid of specific documents that are included as annexes to this manual. Some WPs may include inherent evaluation tools, that are used for the evaluation instead of the specific documents included in the Quality Plan Manual.

Besides this evaluation, each WPL takes also into consideration the indicators and respective objectives that are described in the Logical Framework Matrix (LFM) as well as the qualitative and quantitative indicators listed in the chapter "Overview of short and long term impact indicators" of the approved proposal. The result of this evaluation that is made by the WPL is included in the deliverable report.

In case the deliverable/WP result is not considered as accepted, necessary corrective actions are initiated by the WPL according to the results of the evaluation.

5.2.1.1 Internal evaluation

Many of the deliverables of MEDITEC are addressed to the partners of the consortium. These deliverables of the WPs and subtasks undergo an internal evaluation. The specifics of the internal evaluation, as regards to the tools/forms used, the reviewer, the date of review, indicator(s) etc., are described in the PQAF-WP spreadsheet.

Where appropriate, the deliverables are drafter with the use of PQAF-DT (Document Template). When a deliverable is finished, the WPL sends the "draft version" of the relevant document to the Project Coordinator (PC) for an initial, more formal evaluation. The PC examines the deliverable for its compliance with the QPAF-DT reporting template and the general objectives of the project. After the document is approved by the PC it is sent by the WPL to the reviewer(s) who check it for its completeness, clarity and comprehensiveness. The evaluation, depending on the nature of the deliverable is made primarily with the use of QPAF-DE (Delivery Evaluation) spreadsheet or by other means as minutes of the meetings, contracts, lists of equipment, proof of purchase etc. (as described at the QPAF-WP form). When the QPAF-DE document is used, it is filled in and sent by the reviewer(s) to the WPL, who is then responsible for amending the document according to the review results, if needed. The time for this amendment is agreed between the WPL and the PC.

Minutes of the meetings are record in the Minutes of Meeting template (QPAF-MM). Project meeting and other meetings and workshops are evaluated by the participants. The host

organization is responsible to distribute and collect from the participants the correspondent Project Meeting and Workshop Evaluation form (QPAF-ME).

Once the document is amended (if needed) its revised version is sent by the WPL to all members of the consortium. This procedure can last one week maximum and the WPL is responsible for any changes or additions to the document.

In case the WPL considers the suggested improvements (by the reviewer(s)) as not relevant he has to present his reasons to the respective evaluator and ask for his agreement.

The document that is finally approved takes the status of "final version/version 1" and is included by the PC in the formal progress report/s of the project. WPL is also responsible to collect the QPAF-DE from the all the partners and submit it to the PC.

5.2.1.2   External evaluation

MEDITEC project includes some deliverables that are addressed to people out of the core of the consortium. These deliverables of the WPs and subtasks undergo an external evaluation. The specifics of the external evaluation, as regards to the tools used, the reviewer, the dates of review, the indicator(s) etc., are described in the QPAF-WP spreadsheet.

The evaluators of these activities are: staff, lecturers, teachers and administrators of the of the IR and IQ universities that will be trained in competency based learning that will attend the training and dissemination activities (conferences, seminars, workshops). In general, the evaluation is done by beneficiaries of the activities, which are asked to evaluate them by answering specific questions using the QPAF-TE (Training Evaluation) and QPAF-EE (Event Evaluation), respectively. The partners hosting/organizing the training and events are responsible to distribute and collect the QPAF forms from the participants and to send to the PC.

5.2.1.3   Elaboration of the questionnaires

The questionnaires consist mostly of questions that can be answered with the aid of:

   a)   a five points rating scale where 1 is poor and 5 is very good and
   b)   a 4 points rating scale (1 strongly disagree, 2 disagree, 3 agree, 4 strongly agree)

The elaboration of the answers to the questionnaires is made by the WP/subtask leader and circulated to the members of the consortium.

The formula for the evaluation of results rated with the five point scale is the following

$$[(1a + 2b + 3c + 4d + 5e)/5 (a+b+c+d+e)] \%$$

Where:

a, b, c, d, and e are the numbers of questionnaires that rated the activity with 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 respectively.

The activity is considered successful if the percentage of satisfaction is more than 75%. In case the percentage of satisfaction is less than 75%, the WPL proposes proper corrective actions (repetition of activity, distribution of more training or informative material, improvements of the database and the website etc.) which should be agreed with the PC.

Regarding questions that are rated with a 4 points rating scale, the threshold for a successful evaluation is 70% of answers with score ≥ 3. Scores less than this will require corrective actions as above.

6 General Quality Issues

6.1 Document Control

This section describes the control system for preparing, reviewing, approving, distributing, revising and updating documents that are required for the Quality Plan of MEDITEC project. These documents include but are not limited to the following:

1. Quality Plan Manual
2. Quality forms (as annexed to the Quality Plan Manual) (QPAF-WP, QPAF-DT, etc.)
3. Minutes of the meetings
4. Reports on deliverables of WPs
5. Progress reports
6. External documents like the Erasmus plus program guide or other instructions by the National Agencies from Iran and Iraq or the European Commission, the partnership agreements (PA) between the PC and the partners etc.

The Quality Committee is responsible for drafting and issuing the Quality Plan Manual and the Quality forms annexed to it. The partners who are responsible for the review of the above documents, are those mentioned in the QPAF-WP.

All the internal documents (except quality forms) are drafted using the QPAF-DT (document template). Draft versions are numbered with 0.1, 0.2, … in order to be distinguished from the released versions which are numbered with 1, 2, … . Quality forms are drafted using the QPAF-QT (Quality Template).

6.1.1 Revision of documents

Responsible for the revision of the different documents are the respective WPLs who are also responsible for distributing to all partners the last approved version of each document.

The first version of the documents (0.1) is sent to all partners who have 15 days to submit their comments. The WPL makes the necessary amendments and issues the second version (0.2) which is also distributed to all partners. If no comments are received in a period of 7 days, this second version is considered final and takes the number 1.0.

The last approved version (controlled copy) of MEDITEC documents is also uploaded to the web-based collaboration platform (Dropbox) by the WPL who is also responsible for its substitution in case of revision (new version). Responsible for the approval of the final version is the Project Coordinator.

External documents that are not available on the web-based platform shall be properly collected and maintained by the PC (Project Coordinator).

6.1.2 Abbreviation System for the naming of documents

The abbreviation system for the naming of Quality Plan documentation is as follows:

1. Quality Plan Manual: QPM
2. Quality Project Assessment Form: QPAF-two initial capital letters of the form (e.g. QPAF-WP)

All the documents of MEDITEC are elaborated in MS Word™ format (or equivalent) for documents, MS Excel™ format (or equivalent) for spreadsheets and MS Power Point™ (or equivalent) format for presentations. For questionnaires that are circulated to the partners of the project the google forms tool can be used.

6.1.3 Documents for public use

Documents or other material that is addressed to the public (informative material, brochures, leaflets, posters, presentations, DVDs etc.) must bear:

- The logo of MEDITEC project
- The logo of the National Agency (Iran or Iraq)
- The logo of ERASMUS PLUS
- The title and reference number of the project
- The following disclaimer:

  "This project has been funded by the Erasmus+ Program of the European Union.

  The information and views set out in this publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the European Union. Neither the European Union institutions and bodies nor any person acting on their behalf may be held responsible for the use which may be made of the information contained therein".

The same logos and disclaimer shall be also mentioned at the web-site of the project as well as at any other social network page (facebook, twitter etc.).

6.1.4 Master List of Quality Plan Forms

Abbreviation	Full name of document	
QPM	**Q**uality **P**lan **M**anual	-
QPAF-WP	**W**ork **P**ackages Monitoring	Annex I
QPAF-DT	**D**ocument **T**emplate	Annex II
QPAF-DE	**D**eliverable **E**valuation Sheet	Annex III
QPAF-MM	**M**inutes of **M**eeting Template	Annex IV
QPAF-PE	**P**roject Meeting and Workshop **E**valuation	Annex V

Abbreviation	Full name of document	
QPAF-TE	Training Evaluation Sheet	Annex VI
QPAF-EE	Event Evaluation Sheet	Annex VII
QPAF-QT	Quality Template	Annex VIII
QPAF-PQ	Project Quality Assessment	Annex IX
QPAF-PR	Progress Report Template	Anne X
QPAF-VE	Staff Visits Evaluation	Annex XI
QPAF-WQ	Website Questionnaire	Annex XII

6.2 Communication

Communication between the members of the consortium, between the PC and the National Agency and between the PC and the European Commission is very crucial for the successful implementation of MEDITEC project.

Day by day communication is conducted by e-mail, telephone conversations and skype meetings when deemed necessary. For the avoidance of any confusion, special attention is paid to the clear drafting of the subject of the e-mail.

In general, all information relevant to the project is sent to the PC, who then forwards it to the partners involved in the specific action(s). Each WP leader shall also communicate the WP results to all partners during transnational meetings.

Direct partner/partner communications flows will be set up in those cases where an increase in efficiency can be achieved.

Dropbox, a web based collaboration platform is implemented by the coordinator for the project. This Internet site is secured, and enables the consortium to have a very efficient diffusion of the information connected to the release of minutes, deliverables, reports and exchanges between partners.

External communication with the National Agency for ERASMUS+ and with the European Commission is the responsibility of the PC. This communication takes place mainly by e-mail, telephone conversations and face-to-face discussions when it is needed.

7 Reporting

Each WPL is responsible for reporting the progress of the specific WP every six months and at the end of the WP by sending the report to the PC. The progress of the WP is also presented during the every-six-months meetings of the consortium. The same stands for the mid-term and final reporting.

Partner are asked every six months by the PC to do a general project evaluation. This evaluation is done by the Project Quality Assessment form – Project Quality (PQAF-PQ).

The Project Coordinator will consolidate and distribute to the consortium the progress reports as well as the detailed mid-term and final reports that will also be sent to the European Commission.

Reports will be drafted using the progress report template (QPAF-PR) and will be distributed for review to all partners of the consortium according to Section 6.1 (Document control).

The PC will be responsible for the approval of WPs progress reports and the Steering Committee (StC) will be responsible for the approval of six months, mid-term and final reports.

8 Annexes

Annex I: QPAF-WP - Work Packages Monitoring

Annex II: QPFA-DT - Document Template

Annex III: QPAF -DE - Deliverable Evaluation Sheet

Annex IV: QPAF-MM - Minutes of Meeting Template

Annex V: QPAF-PE – Project Meeting and Workshop Evaluation

Annex VI: QPAF - Training Evaluation Sheet

Annex VII: QPAF-EE-Event Evaluation Sheet

Annex VIII: QPAF-QT - Quality Template

Annex IX: QPAF-PQ – Project Quality Assessment

Annex X: QPAF-PR- Progress Report Template

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

Annex XI: QF-WQ-Staff Visits Evaluation

Annex XII: QPAF-WQ - Website Questionnaire