



# **Engineering curricula modernization in renewable energy in Albanian Universities**

**ENGINE**

Project reference No. 619338-EPP-1-2020-1-AL-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

**(Deliverable 4.1)**

## **Evaluation Plan**

Michail Delagrammatikas  
CRE.THI.DEV.

June 2021

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

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





Responsible partner for deliverable:	CRE.THI.DEV.
Contributing partners:	
Target Group(s):	Partners of the consortium
Distribution level:	Partnership
Total number of pages:	25 (without annexes)
Version:	01
Reviewed by:	[initial comments from NKUA incorporated]
Status:	For review

#### Version control

Number	Date	Description
1.0	24/03/2021	First draft – distributed to all partners for comments
1.1	17/06/2021	Second draft for review
2.0	28/06/2021	Final Version
3.0	14/03/2023	Amended Annexes Version

All rights are reserved.

Copyright © ENGINE Consortium, 2020-2023



## 1. Table of Contents

<b>Abbreviations and Acronyms</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>1. Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>2. Introduction</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>3. Project description</b> .....	<b>6</b>
3.1 Summary .....	6
3.2 Partners.....	7
3.3 Project WPs and subtasks.....	7
<b>4. Project Management Structure/Responsibilities</b> .....	<b>10</b>
4.1 Project Coordinator (PC).....	10
4.2 The Steering Committee (SC), .....	10
4.3 The Quality Manager (QM) & the Project Quality Committee (PQC).....	11
4.4 External Quality Evaluators (EQE).....	13
4.5 Work Package Leader (WPL) and Work Package co-Leader (WPcL) .....	13
<b>5. Project Quality Assurance</b> .....	<b>14</b>
5.1 Quality of the project processes.....	14
5.2 Quality of deliverables - activities .....	15
5.3 External evaluation.....	16
5.3.1 By target groups (beneficiaries & stakeholders).....	16
5.3.2 By External Quality Evaluators (EQE).....	16
5.4 Elaboration of the questionnaires .....	16
<b>6. General Quality Issues</b> .....	<b>17</b>
6.1 Document Control .....	17
6.1.1 Documents' format .....	18
6.1.2 Documents for public use .....	18
6.1.3 Master List of Quality Plan Documents & Forms .....	18
6.2 Communication.....	19
6.3 Meetings .....	19
<b>7. Reporting</b> .....	<b>20</b>
<b>8. Conflict Resolution</b> .....	<b>20</b>



<b>9. Annexes .....</b>	<b>21</b>
9.1 Annex I – Quality Plan Spreadsheet (QPS) .....	21
9.2 Annex II – Document Template (DT) .....	21
9.3 Annex III – Quality Assessment Form (QEF) .....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
9.4 Annex IV – Deliverable Evaluation Form (DEF) .....	21
9.5 Annex V – Training Evaluation by Trainees (TET) .....	21
9.6 Annex VI – Pilot Evaluation of the KICenter (PIL) .....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
9.7 Annex VII – Event Evaluation Form (EEF) .....	21
9.8 Annex VIII – Meeting Evaluation Form (MEF) .....	21
9.9 Annex IX – External Quality Evaluators Selection Criteria (EESC) .....	21
9.10 Annex X – Deliverables Flow Chart (DFC) .....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
9.11 Annex XI – Internal Quality Control Teams Table (IQTT) .....	Error! Bookmark not defined.



## Abbreviations and Acronyms

### *Abbreviation/acronym*

CTET	Training Evaluation by Trainees
CTPR	Courses/Trainings Peer Review
DEF	Deliverable Evaluation Form
dCM	Deputy Quality Manager
DT	Document Template
EACEA	Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency
EC	European Commission
EEF	Event Evaluation Form
EU	European Union
EQE	External Quality Evaluator
GA	Grant Agreement
HEI	Higher Education Institution
KOM	Kick off Meeting
MEF	Meeting Evaluation Form
PQC	Project Quality Committee
QEP	Quality Evaluation Plan
QM	Quality Manager
QPS	Quality Plan Spreadsheet
SC	Steering Committee
TPM	Transnational Project Meeting
WP	Work Package
WPL	Work Package Leader
WPcL	Work Package co-Leader



## 1. Executive Summary

This Quality Evaluation Plan was prepared in the scope of the ENGINE project, and particularly according to what is foreseen in WP4 and D4.1: Evaluation Plan.

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

QEP's aim 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.

In this context, the main purpose of the QEP is to define the methodology to adopt in order to ensure a proper assessment and control of project activities, results deliverables and impact. It describes the principles/mechanisms for quality and performance control; the main indicators to be used in the project lifecycle; the data gathering process; tools and role of partners. A timetable (Quality Plan Spreadsheet) is included so partners can be aware of the moments and activities in which the indicators and instruments should be applied.

Three areas will be evaluated:

- A) Quality of core deliverables
- B) Quality of process - Process of transnational cooperation
- C) Sustainability of project results

## 2. Introduction

The main purpose of this QAP is to describe the Quality Assurance 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 ENGINE 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 for monitoring and evaluation to be applied throughout the project duration
- To provide guidelines for adequate implementation and thereby assure that certain quality standards in the performance of all the 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 description

#### 3.1 Summary

Albania's energy sector is a strategic source for sustainable economic growth, given the diversity of energy sources and its geographical location. Over the last decades, Albania has demonstrated a clear dependency on energy imports, mainly during summer periods. This high dependency on a volatile hydrological regime possesses a clear risk of failure if combined with high losses and irresponsible behavior towards energy consumption. During the third quarter of 2019, gross domestic product of electricity decreased by 1.4 times, reaching 1,186 GWh from 1,630 GWh of electricity produced in the third quarter of 2018. The decrease of electricity production has increased the gross electricity imports by about 1.6 times and decreased the gross electricity exports by about 2.7 times, compared to the previous year (Institute of Statistics of Albania, 2020). Moreover, a direct impact of the global climate change has been noticed in this sector, where recent drought and reduced rainfall has contributed to the reduction of hydropower catchments, thereby forcing OSSHEE to increase the imports on electricity. Apart from problems related to production and transmission, Albania is challenged by another serious problem such as 'irresponsible' consumption of the energy.

Albanian Government and the Ministry of Infrastructure and Energy have empathized the strategic importance of the energy sector in the economy and has listed it in the key priority agenda of the following years. The Albanian Power System (APS) inherits a series of problems and challenges of strategic, techno-technological and operational nature, commercial and financial that not only jeopardize the development and normal functioning of APS itself, its integration into regional energy systems and new investments, but have turned the sector into a serious obstacle to Albania's sustainable economic development. Among key identified challenges for this sector are: balancing the demand for electricity and supply of electricity from domestic sources and high technical and non-technical losses of electricity. The Albanian Government aims at developing a long-term efficient strategy for Albania's electricity system, with the aim of creating a sustainable, technically and financially viable Power System capable of meeting the growing demand for electricity within the country by transforming Albania from electricity importing country to exporting country.

The project aim is modernization and internationalization of VET and bachelor curricula in engineering for renewable energies in the targeted universities in Albania through innovation of curricula in line with the new development in the area and the labor market demand. Its specific objectives are:

- To analyze the educational needs in engineering for renewable energies through problem and job analysis, and to define the necessary knowledge, skills and competencies of engineers in the sector of renewable energies in terms of learning outcomes.
- To design syllabi and course content and assessment for compulsory and elective courses in VET and bachelor engineering education for renewable energy to meet the market needs and upgrade the university academic offer accordingly.



- To develop new e-learning courses with modular structure for the innovated curricula of Partner HEIs and to establish a platform for knowledge sharing between Albanian HEIs and program partner institutions.
- To innovate the laboratory equipment and to perform a pilot test and to start the implementation of the joint modules/courses' delivery during the last project year.

### 3.2 Partners

The ENGINE partnership is comprised of a total of 11 partners:

Partner Number	Name	Acronym	Country
P1	Polytechnic University of Tirana	UPT	Albania
P2	Katholieke Universiteit Leuven	KUL	Belgium
P3	Technical University of Sofia	TUS	Bulgaria
P4	National and Kapodistrian University of Athens	NKUA	Greece
P5	Kadir Has University	KHAS	Turkey
P6	European University of Tirana	UET	Albania
P7	Aleksandër Moisiu University Durrës	UAMD	Albania
P8	Professional College of Tirana	KPT	Albania
P9	Albenecon	Albenecon	Albania
P10	Quality Assurance Agency in Higher Education	ASCAL	Albania
P11	Creative Thinking Development	CRETHIDEV	Greece

### 3.3 Project WPs and subtasks

Aims and specific objectives:

The project aim is modernization and internationalization of VET and bachelor curricula in engineering for renewable energies in the targeted universities in Albania through innovation of curricula in line with the new development in the area and the labor market demand.



Its specific objectives are:

- 1) To analyze the educational needs in engineering for renewable energies through problem and job analysis, and to define the necessary knowledge, skills and competencies of engineers in the sector of renewable energies in terms of learning outcomes.
- 2) To design syllabi and course content and assessment for compulsory and elective courses in VET and bachelor engineering education for renewable energy to meet the market needs and upgrade the university academic offer accordingly.
- 3) To develop new e-learning courses with modular structure for the innovated curricula of Partner HEIs and to establish a platform for knowledge sharing between Albanian HEIs and program partner institutions.
- 4) To innovate the laboratory equipment and to perform a pilot test and to start the implementation of the joint modules/courses' delivery during the last project year.

The work packages, along with a set of Subtasks that will be performed, are as follows:

Work packages/ OUTPUTS	Title	Task Responsible
1	PREPARATION Electrical Engineering and Energy study practices analysis and in-depth needs assessment in Partner Albanian HEIs	<b>KHAS (WPL), UAMD (WPcL)</b>
1.1	In-depth desk research assessment and report for Albania and partner HEIs	KHAS & UAMD
1.2	Development of questionnaire and interviews with relevant stakeholders and creation of the competence matrix	Albanian HEIs
1.3	Report on the best practices in Programme HEIs and global trends	Programme Countries HEIs
1.4	Job/domain analysis and development of guidelines for learning outcomes for VET and bachelor new and updated study programs	Partner HEIs
2	DEVELOPMENT Syllabi and course content development	<b>TUS (WPL), KUL (WPcL)</b>
2.1	Design of the new VET degree in Electrical Engineering and Renewable Energy	UAMD & KUL
2.2	Design of the 6 new courses for existing relevant bachelor study programs	UPT & TUS
2.3	Design of the 6 new courses for existing relevant bachelor study programs	ASCAL & Albanian HEIs
3	DEVELOPMENT	<b>NKUA (WPL), UET (WPcL)</b>

	e-learning courses development and capacity building for staff	
3.1	Design, development and deployment of e-learning courses	NKUA
3.2	Capacity building for Partner HEIs teaching staff in micro learning, project-oriented teaching (new teaching methods) and gaming	UET & NKUA
3.3	Creation of the ENGINE online platform	NKUA & UET
3.4	Creation of the new teaching material for laboratory work	Albanian HEIs
4	<b>QUALITY PLAN</b> Quality and evaluation	<b>KUL (WPL), CRETHIDEV (WPcL)</b>
4.1	Evaluation Plan	KUL & CRETHIDEV
4.2	Interim and final evaluation reports	KUL & CRETHIDEV
4.3	External evaluation reports	KUL
5	<b>DISSEMINATION &amp; EXPLOITATION</b> Dissemination and exploitation activities of project results and achievements	<b>UET (WPL), KPT (WPcL)</b>
5.1	Setting up and maintaining the project Web site (including project visual identity – logo)	UET
5.2	Consolidation of Dissemination and Exploitation Strategy	UET
5.3	Two papers on project activities and results published in relevant scientific magazines and/or presented at relevant international conferences	Partner HEIs
5.4	Organizing 4 dissemination events with relevant stakeholders (workshops, info days)	Albanian HEIs
5.5	Final International Project Conference in Tirana	UET
5.6	Creation of the financial and institutional sustainability strategic plan	Albanian HEIs
5.7	Sustainable cooperation with labor market	Albanian HEIs
5.8	Creation of the partner network between all institutions involved in the project	Albanian HEIs
6	<b>MANAGEMENT</b> Project Management and coordination	<b>UPT (WPL)</b>
6.1	Steering Committee and Advisory Board establishment	All partners
6.2	Partnerships agreement signature and Management Plan	UPT
6.3	Progress and final project report	UPT

## 4. 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 consists of:

- The Project Coordinator (PC),
- The Steering Committee (SC)
- The Project Quality Committee (PQC),
- The Quality Manager (QM)
- External Quality Evaluators (EQE),

### 4.1 Project Coordinator (PC)

UPT 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 Steering Committee and Advisory Board. 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.

### 4.2 The Steering Committee (SC),

The SC, chaired by the PC, is composed by one member of each partner and will supervise the implementation of the whole programme. It will meet on the occasion of every Transnational Project Meeting (TPM). SC was formed during the kick-off meeting (KOM), and is composed of the following persons:

Steering Committee		
Participant	Member of the board	Email
P1-UPT	Alma Afezolli	aafezolli@upt.al

P2-KUL	Geert De Lepeleer	geert.delepeleer@kuleuven.be
P3-TUS	Slavka Tzanova	slavka@ecad.tu-sofia.bg
P4-NKUA	Aphrodite Ktena	apktena@uoa.gr
P5-KHAS	Meltem S. Ucal	meltem.sengun@gmail.com
P6-UET	Kebjana Haka	kebjana.haka@uet.edu.al
P7-UAMD	Luciana Toti	luciana.toti.kini@gmail.com
P8-KPT	Diana Biba	diana.biba@kpt.edu.al
P9-Albenecon	Andi Zhugli	zhuglia@gmail.com
P10-ASCAL	Xhiliola Bixheku	xhiliola.bixheku@ascal.al
P11-CRETHIDEV	Dimosthenis Papakonstandinou	dpapakon7@yahoo.gr

The SC 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;
- on time completion of activities;
- 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;
- provide advise to partners who may refer to the PC and the SC for this reason.

### 4.3 The Quality Manager (QM) & the Project Quality Committee (PQC)

The Quality Manager will be appointed by KUL (WPL). The QM 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 QM will be responsible for introducing the EQEs suggestions to the PQC and the SC. The QM will be assisted by a deputy Quality Manager (dQM) appointed by CRETHIDEV (WPcL).

In order to achieve the quality objectives of the project, a Project Quality Committee (PQC), was decided to be formed during the kick-off meeting, and is composed of one representative of each programme country institution. The PQC will comprise of the following persons:

Project Quality Committee		
Participant	Member of the board	Email
P2-KUL	Geert De Lepeleer (QM)	geert.delepeleer@kuleuven.be
P11-CRETHIDEV	Michail Delagrammatikas (dQM)	mdelagram@yahoo.com
P1-UPT	Valma Prifti	vprifti@upt.al
P3-TUS	Slavka Tzanova	slavka@ecad.tu-sofia.bg
P4-NKUA	Aphrodite Ktena	apktena@uoa.gr
P5-KHAS	Meltem S. Ucal	meltem.sengun@gmail.com
P6-UET	Kebjana Haka	kebjana.haka@uet.edu.al
P7-UAMD	Luciana Toti	luciana.toti.kini@gmail.com
P8-KPT	Diana Biba	diana.biba@kpt.edu.al
P9-Albenecon	Andi Zhugli	zhuglia@gmail.com
P10-ASCAL	Xhiliola Bixheku	xhiliola.bixheku@ascal.al

The duty of the PQC is to support QM in the monitoring and evaluation of 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 PQC will design a proper evaluation process and be responsible for creating a set of indicators. The PQC will hold regular web meetings and will meet in person during the f2f coordination meetings. The PCQ will report to the SC.

The monitoring and evaluation procedures will monitor the project execution through three (3) yearly monitoring reports. An intermediate and a final report will also be elaborated, showing the first impact on organizations, and beneficiaries involved that will be communicated to the EACEA. These reports will contain EQE recommendations.

#### 4.4 External Quality Evaluator (EQE)

An expert from non-participating EU institutions will be subcontracted the role of External Quality Evaluator. The EQE will have access to all documents prepared during the project implementation and propose further improvement of the project activities. After discussion amongst partners during the online meeting on 09.06.2021, it was decided that the EQE will be appointed on M23 and follow the last year of the project implementation. The main reason for this was that budget allocation did not allow for an expert following the project for three years and produce reports of high quality. The new scheme is a common practice that has been practiced by many partners and focuses on the last year of the project implantation, when sustainability and impact are the in the focus and when piloting provides the ground for OER finetuning.

#### 4.5 Work Package Leader (WPL) and Work Package Co-Leader (WPcL)

For each deliverable, one partner is defined as Work Package Leader (WPL) and for most a different partner as Work Package Co-Leader (WPcL).

Each Work Package Leader will be responsible for the detailed co-ordination and reporting of a specific WP. Depending on the nature of the WP, in multi-task WPs, the Work Package Co-Leaders will be assigned specific task and receive responsibilities for leading them, while in transversal WPs they will assist the WPL in its duties. If needed, meetings of the partners involved in the WP will be organized and chaired by the Leader or co-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 or co-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.

## 5. Project Quality Assurance

Certain indicators of effectiveness are determined in order to guarantee the reaching of the project goals and objectives, each of which is related to a certain standard (requirement or metric), a measure of the success in producing the project results with the desirable level of quality.

These indicators and respective objectives are described in the Logical Framework Matrix (LFM) as well as the qualitative and quantitative indicators listed in the chapter. Additional indicators can also be defined by the WPL or the SC, if deemed necessary. The QM will use these indicators to measure the rate of success of foreseen results on a regular basis.

Indicators are described from a qualitative and quantitative point of view from the perspectives of the overall implementation of the project and particular project objectives.

Quality will be measured by using tools such as the monitoring and evaluation questionnaires issued regularly by the QM and answered by all relevant partners or stakeholders, as well as evidence collected during project activities.

In particular, during project execution, the quality of the project and its deliverables are measured against selected quality standards regarding:

- Project Processes, to ensure the involvement and alignment of all partners according to the topics and tools to measure effectiveness.
- Project Deliverables, to measure the degree of achievement of the expected results, both in qualitative and quantitative form.

For each project component, both project processes and deliverables, one or more indicators is set, accompanied by the relevant metrics, according to which compliance is measured. The complete list of indicators and metrics is shown in the Quality Plan Spreadsheet.

### 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 QAF. 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 5.4, 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 of the project processes will be performed at the end of year one, two and three, during the lifecycle of the project and the results of the analysis will be incorporated in the yearly reports.

## 5.2 Quality of deliverables - activities

The deliverables – activities of ENGINE project consist of the results of the 6 Work Packages, as described in the work plan of the project, included in par. 3.3 of this document and in the Quality Plan Spreadsheet. Each WP contains one or more subtasks.

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

The parameters for the evaluation (due dates, indicators and target values, evaluators, method and tools of evaluation and approval threshold) are described in the - Quality Plan Spreadsheet.

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 or activity are specific or all the members of the consortium, while “external” means that persons other than the partners of the project (e.g. the public, participants, trainees, beneficiaries, external evaluators-EQE etc.) evaluate the results. The evaluation is made with the aid of specific forms that are included as annexes to this manual. Besides these documents, additional evaluation forms may be produced during the lifetime of the project. These forms are mainly circulated to the evaluators as google forms.

Regarding the internal evaluation of a deliverable (document, report) the following procedure is followed. When a deliverable is finished, the WPL sends the “first draft version” of the relevant document to the reviewer(s) as described in the Quality Plan Spreadsheet, who check it for its completeness, clarity and comprehensiveness.

The results of the evaluations are elaborated by the QM who sends them to the WPL and the other members of the consortium. The WPL is 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.

Once the document/report 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 approved document/report is included by the PC in the formal progress report/s of the project. It is also uploaded in the website of the project.

### 5.3 External evaluation

#### 5.3.1 By target groups (beneficiaries & stakeholders)

ENGINE project includes several 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. In general, the evaluation is done by beneficiaries of the activities & by stakeholders (target groups), which are asked to evaluate them by answering specific questions using the forms which are attached as annexes to this quality manual.

#### 5.3.2 By External Quality Evaluator (EQE)

Furthermore, the External Quality Evaluator, will ensure a neutral review and a consistency assessment of the project deliverables versus project target groups' needs/expectations, and will conduct constructive evaluation by working according to the terms set by the project QM, PQC and the Project Coordinator. The purpose of subcontracting the EQE is to ensure independence from project partners. The EQE will be selected after a public call and will have to comply with the criteria set in the call.

### 5.4 Elaboration of the questionnaires

When questionnaires are used for the evaluation of project results, events etc, they will consist mostly of questions that can be answered with the aid of a five-point rating scale (1: poor and 5: very good). Additionally, they may also include open-ended and/or YES/NO questions. The elaboration of the answers to the questionnaires is made by the QM and circulated to the WPL and the other members of the consortium.

The activity is considered successful if the percentage of satisfaction is more than 70% (based on weighted answers). Answers to the open-ended questions are taken into consideration for improvements. In case the percentage of satisfaction is less than 70% (for questions rated from 1 to 5) the QM proposes proper corrective actions (improvements, repetition of activity etc,) which should be agreed with the PC and the WPL.

## 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 ENGINE project. These documents include but are not limited to the following:

1. Quality plan and mechanisms created
2. Quality Plan Spreadsheet
3. Quality forms (as annexed to the Quality Plan Manual)
4. Minutes of the meetings
5. Deliverables of WPs
6. Progress reports
7. External documents like the Erasmus plus program guide or other instructions by the EACEA or the European Commission, the grant agreement, the partnership agreements (PA) between the PC and the partners etc.

The Quality Manager with the contribution of the PQC is responsible for drafting and issuing the Quality plan and mechanisms created document, the Quality Plan Spreadsheet and the Quality forms annexed to it.

All the internal documents (except quality forms) are drafted using the DT (document template). The first draft version is numbered with 1. For the description of the different versions the version control table in the beginning of each document is completed. The version nr is also inserted in the bottom of each page of the document.

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 last approved versions are also uploaded to ENGINE folder in google drive.

The first draft version of the documents (v1) is sent to all partners who have 7 days to submit their comments. The WPL makes the necessary amendments and issues the second draft version (2) which is also distributed to all partners. If no comments are received in a period of 7 days maximum, this second draft version is considered to be the final one. Further amendments to the documents, during the lifecycle of the project can be made given a new version nr.

The last approved version (controlled copy) of ENGINE documents is also uploaded to the website of the project by the WPL of WP 5 (Dissemination) who is also responsible for its substitution in case of revision (new version).

External documents that are not available on the website shall be properly collected and maintained by the PC and made available to the partnership if deemed necessary or requested by partner(s)



### 6.1.1 Documents' format

All the documents of ENGINE 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 and/or external evaluators of the project the google forms tool is mostly used.

The final deliverables are also made available in pdf format in order to avoid not desired changes.

### 6.1.2 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 ENGINE project
- The logo of ERASMUS PLUS
- The title and reference number of the project
- The following disclaimer: "This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein"

Sized and positioned according to the EC guidelines.

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.).

### 6.1.3 Master List of Quality Plan Documents & Forms

The Quality documents and forms are described in the following table and annexed to this Quality Plan Manual.

Abbreviation	Full name of document	
QEP	Quality and Evaluation Plan	
QS	Quality Spreadsheet	Annex 1
DT	Document Template	Annex 2
DEF	Deliverable Evaluation Form	Annex 3
CTPR	Courses/Trainings Peer Review	Annex 4
CTET	Training Evaluation by Trainees	Annex 5
EEF	Event Evaluation Form	Annex 6
MEF	Meeting Evaluation Form	Annex 7
EESC	External Quality Evaluators Selection Criteria	Annex 8

## 6.2 Communication

Communication between the members of the consortium, between the PC and the project officer and between the PC and the EACEA is very crucial for the successful implementation of ENGINE project.

Day by day communication of the partnership is conducted by e-mail, telephone conversations and online platform meetings when deemed necessary. Each partner appoints a representative for the list of recipients for communications. For the avoidance of any confusion, special attention is paid to the clear drafting of the subject of the e-mail. Periodic online conferences/meetings will be organized to complement face to face meetings in order to facilitate follow upon decision taken, monitor on project implementation and trouble shooting.

In general, all information relevant to the project is sent to all partners, except in cases of specific action(s) that involve only some of the partners. Each WPL shall communicate the WP results to all partners during transnational meetings.

External communication with the Project Officer and with the EACEA is the responsibility of the PC. This communication takes place mainly by e-mail, telephone conversations, online meetings or face-to-face discussions when it is needed and its results are communicated to the partnership.

## 6.3 Meetings

Meetings are important to ensure the progress of and to maintain the technical and social relationships among the partners in the project. Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic some of the meetings will be reorganized internally by the partners and held online, as the case for the Kick-off meeting.

During project meetings, the work already done will be presented, jointly reviewed, and - when necessary - possible steps for improvements agreed. Having the necessary information at certain points in time on actual variances against the planning, it allows to decide suitable corrective/preventive actions when detecting lacks or gaps related to the project scheduling and/or planning. These measures decided after analysing the associated risks (in delays, additional costs, overall implications), are to assure that the project meets the declared project objectives and targets, and produces the foreseen results, according to the project planning.

Each meeting should be attended by preferably the same team of project participants in order to assure smooth project execution. The host of the meeting and the PC are jointly responsible for preparation of agenda for each transnational meeting. During the meeting a list of participants has to be signed. After each meeting, the minutes will be written down. The minutes have to be accepted by all project partners.

Decisions in partner meetings will be made based on simple majority. If the distribution of votes is even, the PC vote decides.



## 7. Reporting

An interim and an annual report will give a detailed overview of the activities and outcomes of the project to date and a clear account of the budget. Their production will be led by FM and QM, for financial and quality issues respectively, and will be based on partners' individual reports in the different activities of the project and according to external assessment. Quality reports will be issued every year, as decided during the June 2021 online meeting

A Project Final Report will also be produced during the last month of the project. It will give a detailed overview of the activities and outcomes of the project and a clear account of the budget and will be based on partners' individual reports in the different activities of the project and according to external assessment. The final report will be assessed and approved by the SC by month 36.

These reports will be linked with the official project financial and narrative reporting that is due on months 21 & 36 that will be sent to program managing authorities.

## 8. Conflict Resolution

In the course of the project, partners will have to agree on and develop specific outputs. Usually, agreement is first reached through regular contact, followed by official confirmation via electronic mail, letter or minutes. For important issues, agreement may be a report to be signed by those responsible for decisions. Non-technical factors such as resource allocation and contractual terms also need to be agreed and documented in writing. The Project Coordinator should immediately take action if potential conflict situations arise. Technical issues/conflicts within contractual commitments that do not involve a change of contract, a change of budget and/or a change of resources/overall focus will be discussed/solved by the Project Coordinator. Decisions will be normally taken through consensus. However, after a reasonable amount of time has passed for illustration and defence of conflicting positions, in order to avoid deadlock in project operational progress, the approval by a two-third majority of partners will be sufficient. If the decision being taken is unacceptable to partners found in the minority positions, then the problem is elevated to a higher level at the partners in conflict. If again the problem cannot be resolved the Project Coordinator has to call a management meeting to vote it out and in case of a tie cast the decisive vote or call a new management meeting within 4 weeks.

Major conflicts requiring change of contract will be discussed at managerial level. The Project Coordinator has to inform the partners in writing of any decisions to enforce a final solution by majority vote at least one week in advance. In addition, the PC will inform the Executive Agency in writing and discuss the topics with the Agency before a final decision is made. Any changes regarding budget/contractual issues will be reported to the Agency and occur upon approval only.

## 9. Annexes

### 9.1 Annex I – Quality Plan Spreadsheet (QPS)

[https://engineproject.eu/?page\\_id=222#elf\\_11\\_VGVjaG5pY2FsIERvY3VtZW50YXRpb24vV1A0LzQuMSBFdmFsdWF0aW9uIFBsYW4](https://engineproject.eu/?page_id=222#elf_11_VGVjaG5pY2FsIERvY3VtZW50YXRpb24vV1A0LzQuMSBFdmFsdWF0aW9uIFBsYW4)

### 9.2 Annex II – Document Template (DT)

[https://engineproject.eu/?page\\_id=222#elf\\_11\\_VGVjaG5pY2FsIERvY3VtZW50YXRpb24vV1A0LzQuMSBFdmFsdWF0aW9uIFBsYW4](https://engineproject.eu/?page_id=222#elf_11_VGVjaG5pY2FsIERvY3VtZW50YXRpb24vV1A0LzQuMSBFdmFsdWF0aW9uIFBsYW4)

### 9.3 Annex III – Deliverable Evaluation Form (DEF)

<https://forms.gle/h9VPNV2U7nwXNGkS7>

### 9.4 Annex IV - Courses/Trainings Peer Review (CTPR)

<https://forms.gle/jbXvEtzAJx8nm9FZ9>

### 9.5 Annex V – Course/Training Evaluation by Trainees (CTET)

<https://forms.gle/bwjSpor1C8UPqe2eA>

### 9.6 Annex VI – Event Evaluation Form (EEF)

<https://forms.gle/ExnLmVjXfnW2s8aN8>

### 9.7 Annex VII – Meeting Evaluation Form (MEF)

<https://forms.gle/k34gBrjexCGVAv176>

### 9.8 Annex VIII – External Quality Evaluators Selection Criteria (EESC)

[Microsoft Word - ENGINE External Auditor Selection Criteria.docx \(engineproject.eu\)](#)