

Strengthening University-Enterprise Collaboration for Resilient Communities in Asia

SECRA QUALITY CONTROL AND ASSURANCE PLAN

VERSION 1.0

Composed by: Tallinn University of Technology

Strengthening University-Enterprise Collaboration for Resilient Communities in Asia

Summary of the quality control and monitoring plan

The process of quality assurance for the proposed project is assigned to WP7. WP7, led by P4 and P11 will ensure, with the participation of all the partners, that the project is meeting its milestones and indicators on time and with high quality performance. The participation of all the partners goes a long way into ensuring partner buy-in as well as the design of a better quality assurance plan. This is because the plan will take all possible perspectives into consideration rather than imposing a top-down set of arbitrary indicators. If all partners agree to the rules of engagement, they are more likely to self-monitor facilitate the process of quality assurance, minimizing the possibility for the emergence of power differentials.

To that end, a quality assurance plan will be drafted (due early in the project, M2), led by the WP7 co-leads and discussed and developed with all the partners in the very beginning of the project, during the kick-off meeting. This plan will require monitoring mechanisms, which in turn rely on a clear project structure and mechanisms for conflict resolution, should any arise. In a lot of respects SECRA is starts from a favourable position because the majority of the partners have worked together in different settings and have already developed trust and a good working relationship. However, if disagreements will still arise, the quality assurance plan will be used as a basis for finding the best solution to the conflict with the aim to ensure project variables.

Ongoing evaluations of the training events, meetings, and workshops will allow us to catch any issues that arise early, address them and improve the quality of the activities and the output. The annual review will be both a self-assessment and an external one. These reviews will concern both the form and the substance of the project. SECRA has two kinds of activities and results built-in that speak for the progress of the collaboration in terms of substance: the longitudinal social network analysis and the UEC Compass tool. Self-assessments will reflect both on the performance of the partners and the quality of the material.

The quality control and monitoring includes four steps:

1. **Establishing Quality Assurance Plan:** The quality plan (see **Table 1 and Table 2**) will document agreed standards, objectively verifiable indicators, and methods of verification to maximize the probability that the network will deliver its planned outputs and achieve its intended outcomes. These will form the basis from which WP Leaders will be required to report progress in quarterly reports, and will identify standard reporting templates for individual WPs. The plan will also set out means for evaluations from CoP members.

Strengthening University-Enterprise Collaboration for Resilient Communities in Asia

2. **Setting up Monitoring Mechanisms:** Attendees of project events and activities in all WPs, both internal and external to the project, will be asked to complete participant surveys in accordance with the quality plan. Survey results will be shared with the event organiser and quality board.
3. **Conducting Ongoing Evaluations:** A series of evaluations of all project activities will be conducted according to the quality plan. These evaluations are important 100 Capacity Building in the field of higher education – EAC/A02/2019 – Joint Projects Strengthening University-Enterprise Collaboration for Resilient Communities in Asia/SECRA tools to assure a proper alignment between the plan and the development of the project.
4. **Conducting Annual Review:** The management group will be responsible for an annual review, which will shed light on issues of accountability and different aspects of the projects, such as timely delivery, quality of outputs and satisfaction of consortium members. It can be broken down into two stages: Identifying standards and/or criteria to apply to an understanding of project content (the quality plan) and making judgements about the extent to which the project has met these criteria and standards. Additionally, a self-evaluation will be conducted at two instances during the project. It is anticipated that this process will improve the project learning by passing on skills of evaluation and critical judgement to the project’s members. The self-evaluation will identify and rectify any shortcomings in the performance of the project and inform the interim and final reporting.

The quality plan is organised in the form of 2 related tables:

- Table 1 – A summary of the different types of project deliverables for the SECRA project
- Table 2 – Objectively Verifiable Indicators and Means of Verification for all the project work packages and their deliverables

Table 1 is intended to ensure a standard approach to quality assurance in all project activities (for example, standards for meetings, progress reporting templates, participant evaluations of events and so forth).

Table 2 compiles both quantitative and qualitative objectively verifiable indicators which have been identified and agreed by the project partners. These indicators are to be captured to demonstrate that the deliverable or work package has been successfully achieved to an appropriate level.

Table 1

Strengthening University-Enterprise Collaboration for Resilient Communities in Asia

Deliverable Type	Requirements / Standards / guidelines
All project documents, reports, and presentations	EU Erasmus+ logo ASCENT project logo European commission disclaimer
Overall project	Project (interim and closure) reporting Annual self-evaluations Annual internal and external evaluations
Conference papers, journal papers & editorials	EU funding acknowledgement with disclaimer
Meetings	Agenda Meeting minutes Participant evaluation
Project Management	EU Lifelong Learning – Erasmus program standards Progress reporting with reference to measurable indicators from Quality Plan (Table 2)
Online platform for UEC	Functional and technical specifications User manual User feedback
Training program and training events	Training materials Training program schedule Participant registration Participant feedback

Strengthening University-Enterprise Collaboration for Resilient Communities in Asia

Table 2 Quality indicators and means of verification for all project work packages and their deliverables

Work Package / Deliverable	Description	Verifiable quality indicators		Means of Verification
		Qualitative Indicators	Quantitative Indicators	
Project Overall		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality of project results Feedback from end-users International cooperation among EU and PC HEIs in education and research Knowledge assessment, employability of graduates 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partnership agreements Number of members involved in consortium Number of upgraded study programmes in PC universities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work package progress reports Annual self-evaluation reports Independent evaluation reports Project (interim and closure) reports
WP1	Mapping the Collaborative Landscape			
WP1 Overall				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Country Reports (Sri Lanka, the Philippines, Thailand) Literature Review Report National Social Network Map
1.1	Conducting Document Studies on Collaborative Frameworks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National policies of 3 countries (Sri Lanka, the Philippines, Thailand) Types of UEC Gap, Barriers and Enablers of UEC Best practices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of reviewed documents Number of academic institutes involved in each country report 	
1.2	Conducting Social Network Analyses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relationship types UEC activities Gap, Barriers and Enablers of UEC Benefits from UEC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of respondents 	
1.3	Mapping the Institutional Landscape at Partner Institutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gap, Barriers and Enablers of UEC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of respondents 	
1.4	Conducting Market Analyses (secondary data)			
WP2	Institutional Landscape Optimization			
WP2 Overall				

Strengthening University-Enterprise Collaboration for Resilient Communities in Asia

Work Package / Deliverable	Description	Verifiable quality indicators		Means of Verification
		Qualitative Indicators	Quantitative Indicators	
2.1 a	Developing the UEC Relational Framework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The draft framework will be developed based on the input from the country reports produced by WP1 Considers multilevel factors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National level- national norms and institutions Meso level- organizational processes Micro level- relations Partners consultative meetings for improving the framework 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1- Draft UEC relational framework 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft framework document Meeting minutes
2.1 b	Testing and Re-evaluating the UEC Relational Framework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UEC framework will be tested in all 9 HEIs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 -Finalised UEC Relational Framework 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finalised UEC Relational Framework document Project report Newsletters Publications based on the UEC framework Meeting minutes Project publicity documents
2.2 a	Preparing Policy Briefs (Thailand)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy briefs are developed based on the WP 1 outcome report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 Policy Briefs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thailand Philippines Sri Lanka 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Soft and hard copies of policy briefs Newsletters Website
2.2 b	Preparing Policy Briefs (Philippines)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contact policymakers for drafting policy briefs 		
2.2 c	Preparing Policy Briefs (Sri Lanka)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work package partners' meeting 		
2.3	Preparing Material and Running Workshops	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program countries lead the development of training materials with their expertise Multiple stakeholders' participation as beneficiaries and resource persons 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Training materials 9 online and on-site training workshops 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participant survey Photographs Meeting minutes Attendance sheet Training materials

Strengthening University-Enterprise Collaboration for Resilient Communities in Asia

Work Package / Deliverable	Description	Verifiable quality indicators		Means of Verification
		Qualitative Indicators	Quantitative Indicators	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HEI surveys and evaluations Self-assessments 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of participants (between 30-45)
2.4a	Policy dialogue (Thailand))	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy dialogues are guided by policy briefs Multiple stakeholders' participation Participant surveys and evaluations Self-assessments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3- Policy dialogues in partner countries <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thailand Philippines Sri Lanka Number of stakeholders participated (number of relevant policy makers attending in each country) Number of meetings held 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participant survey Photographs Meeting minutes Attendance sheet Partner HEI surveys Number of participants (between 30-45) Project website Newsletters
2.4 b	Policy dialogue (Philippines)			
2.4 c	Policy dialogue (Sri Lanka)			
WP3	UEC Community of Practice			
WP3 Overall		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Knowledge exchange 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of training events and participants in the CoP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participant surveys Moodle metrics Training session reports SNA snapshot report
3.1	Developing an online platform for UEC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timely launching of platform Platform developed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of users (at least 40 per partner institution) Web site metrics 	
3.2	Preparing Material and Running On-Site Training Sessions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participant satisfaction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of participants (at least 60 participants) 	
3.3	Preparing Material and Running Online Training Sessions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participant satisfaction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of participants (at least 40 per institution and 15-20 ego-networks respondents) 	
3.4	Conducting Social Network Analyses (snapshot)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timely conduct of SNA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Response rate at least 80% 	

Strengthening University-Enterprise Collaboration for Resilient Communities in Asia

Work Package / Deliverable	Description	Verifiable quality indicators		Means of Verification
		Qualitative Indicators	Quantitative Indicators	
3.5	Maintaining and Adjusting the Online Platform for UEC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regular updates on the platform Assigned responsible person per institution for Moodle maintenance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of updates 	
WP4	Innovation and Enterprise			
WP4 Overall				
4.1	Carrying out a Corporate Start-Up Lab	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluation form: open-ended questions on feedback on the engagement days 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number and breakdown of attendees, e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of students per year level, per program; Number of faculty per department Number of enterprises per sector Evaluation form with quantitative scoring 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Registration / attendance sheets Evaluation forms
4.2	Preparing and Running University-Enterprise Engagement Days	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluation form: open-ended questions on feedback on the engagement days Follow-up: whether communications/engagement between students/faculty/staff and enterprise continued, in what form and for what purpose 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number and breakdown of attendees, e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of students per year level, per program; Number of faculty per department Number of enterprises per sector Evaluation form with quantitative scoring 	
4.3	Promoting Equity and Diversity Within Innovation and Enterprise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of female participants (students, faculty, enterprise representatives) 	
4.4	Preparing Material and Running Online Training Sessions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluation form: open-ended questions on feedback on the engagement days 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number and breakdown of attendees, e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of students per year level, per program; Number of faculty per department 	

Strengthening University-Enterprise Collaboration for Resilient Communities in Asia

Work Package / Deliverable	Description	Verifiable quality indicators		Means of Verification
		Qualitative Indicators	Quantitative Indicators	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Number of enterprises per sector • Evaluation form with quantitative scoring 	
4.5	Partner Institution Staff Mobility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of staff participating in outbound exchange • Number of staff participating in inbound exchange • *to the extent that pandemic conditions will allow 	
WP5		UEC compass		
WP5 Overall		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of the Design and Documentation • Effectiveness of the Implementation (of the compass model) • Acceptability of the Compass Model 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. of Trainings Conducted (Onsite and Online) • No. Participants • No. of Revisions Made 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work Package Progress Report • Reports generated from the Compass Tool • Materials developed for training • Evidences from Media (Articles, Video, Posts)
5.1a	Developing the UEC Compass Model and Tool	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Validity and Reliability of the Compass Model • Innovativeness of the Compass Tool 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No of experts who contributed to the development • Development Time • No. of Reviews conducted on existing models 	
5.1b	Adjusting the UEC Compass Tool	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback from partners, and extent of modifications accommodated • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. of Adjustments made according to requests 	
5.1c	Applying the UEC Compass Tool	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convenience, Accuracy, Consistency of the Model 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. of Adjustments made according to requests 	
5.2	Preparing Material and Running On-Site Training Sessions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of Content Prepared for onsite Training • Quality of Delivery 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. of Trainings Conducted • No. of Training Material Prepared • No. of Participants 	
5.3	Developing and Applying Sensitization Programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent of Customisation / Sensitization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. of Sensitisation Programs Carried out • No. of Adjustments made according to requests 	

Strengthening University-Enterprise Collaboration for Resilient Communities in Asia

Work Package / Deliverable	Description	Verifiable quality indicators		Means of Verification
		Qualitative Indicators	Quantitative Indicators	
5.4	Preparing Material and Running Online Training Sessions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality of Content Prepared for online Training Quality of Delivery 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No. of Trainings Conducted No. of Training Material Prepared No. of Participants 	
WP6	Dissemination and Exploitation			
WP6 Overall				
6.1	Developing a Dissemination and Exploitation Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presenting the draft Dissemination and Exploitation Strategy at the project meeting Comments from all partners Updating the project Dissemination and Exploitation Strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report- Dissemination and Exploitation Plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Soft copy of the Draft Dissemination and Exploitation Strategy Soft copy of the Final Dissemination and Exploitation Strategy Meeting minutes PowerPoint presentations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project website
6.2	Developing and Maintaining the Project Website	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coordinated by the Lead partner Contracting to an expert to developing the website 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project website Number of registered website users - at least 250 Time spent on web site: at least 15 minutes At least 20 frequent visitors from each partner institution Tweets liked a min of 50 times 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Website administrative data Website
6.3	Producing Quarterly Newsletters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On-time release of digital newsletters Inputs from partners with evidences to support the news items 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quarterly newsletters – 9 newsletters (Partner - M4, M12, M20, M32) (Programme -M8, M16, M24, M28, 35) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Soft copies of newsletters Project website Project interim report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project final report
6.4	Writing, Coordinating and Releasing Press Releases	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments from project partners before finalising Timely release of articles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimum of 5 press releases 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hard and/or soft copies of press releases Project website Newsletters

Strengthening University-Enterprise Collaboration for Resilient Communities in Asia

Work Package / Deliverable	Description	Verifiable quality indicators		Means of Verification
		Qualitative Indicators	Quantitative Indicators	
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutional websites
6.5	Producing Marketing Material	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of experts in designing the marketing materials • Comments from project partners before finalising 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Flyers, ○ Brochures, ○ Rollups, ○ Posters and ○ Leaflets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hard and/or soft copies of press releases • Hard and/or soft copies of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flyers, • Brochures, • Rollups, • Posters and • Leaflets • Project website <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project dropbox
6.6	Writing Articles in Local Trade Publications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence based articles • Conducting interviews or reliable data sources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum of 9 articles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hard or soft copies of articles published <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project website- output
6.7	Keeping an Active Online/Social Media Presence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of responsible social media • Present the status of the social media usage at the meetings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 500 followers in social media (combined) • Tweets liked a minimum of 50 times. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statistics from social media
6.8a	Drafting a Sustainability and Continuity Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment meetings between WP leading institutions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1- Sustainability and Continuity Plan (Draft) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soft copy of the Sustainability and Continuity Plan • Meeting minutes • Project website • Project interim report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project final report
6.8b	Revising the Sustainability and Continuity Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment meetings between WP leading institutions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 Sustainability and Continuity plan • Minimum of 2 assessment meetings between WP leading institutions per month 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting minutes • Soft copies of the Sustainability and Continuity plan • Project website • Project final report

Strengthening University-Enterprise Collaboration for Resilient Communities in Asia

Work Package / Deliverable	Description	Verifiable quality indicators		Means of Verification
		Qualitative Indicators	Quantitative Indicators	
6.9	Holding Final Event	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation of project final results to stakeholders and policymakers Participant evaluation survey 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Holding the final event Number of sessions and areas covered in the event Minimum of 150 participants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Photographs Meeting minutes Project website Participant lists <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participant evaluation survey
WP7	Quality Assurance			
WP7 Overall				
7.1	Establishing Quality Assurance Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> quality assurance plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acceptance by the entire consortium 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting minutes
7.2	Setting up Monitoring Mechanisms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring mechanisms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acceptance by the entire consortium 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting minutes
7.3	Conducting Ongoing Evaluations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ongoing evaluation reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 80% response rate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report of evaluations
7.4	Conducting Annual Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Self-assessment annual reviews 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 annual reviews 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report of annual reviews
WP8	Project Management			
WP8 Overall				
8.1	General Project Administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Achievement of planned (qualitative) outputs COVID-19 contingencies on collaboration format Quarterly status report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Achievement of planned (quantitative) outputs Activity progress (physical progress) in a timely fashion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interim and final reports External (annual) review Self assessment reports WP status monitoring tool SCM meeting minutes
8.2	Financial Administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial management according to European Commission requirements 		
8.3	Establishing a Project Management Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developed plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual adjustment if needed 	

Strengthening University-Enterprise Collaboration for Resilient Communities in Asia

Work Package / Deliverable	Description	Verifiable quality indicators		Means of Verification
		Qualitative Indicators	Quantitative Indicators	
8.4	Establishing a Risk Management Protocol	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developed plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual adjustment if needed 	
8.5	Preparing and Holding Kick-Off Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feedback from participants Timely kick-off 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of meeting attendees 	
8.6	Holding Management Meetings On-Site and Online	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feedback from participants Follow up on actions and issues arising from previous meeting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of steering committee meetings (SCM) held Number of meeting attendees 	
8.7	Compiling Interim and Final Reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reports produced on time Feedback from European Commission on interim report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project (interim and final) reports 	