



kforce.uns.ac.rs

**Knowledge FOR Resilient soCiEty**



**K - FORCE**

573942-EPP-1-2016-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP



K-FORCE



## WP7

---

# External Quality Assurance Audit

## Part 1 – External Quality Assurance Methodology Deliverable 7.1

The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents which reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

AUGUST 2018

## *Authors:*

Prof Dr Sc. Meri Cvetkovska

Prof. Dr Sc. Miloš Knežević

Prof. Dr Sc. Mirjana Laban

Prof. Dr Sc. Mirjana Malešev

Report 7.1 explains methodology and time lines for external evaluation of K- FORCE project. According to the recommendations given in the Quality Assurance and Monitoring Manual, it is envisaged to engage an expert who will carry out the external evaluation of the project (QA audit of project implementation). The aim of the External evaluation of the K-FORCE project is to assure optimal quality and results of the project. The External quality control will include: keeping to the time plan, dissemination, horizontal & vertical coordination of WGs, peer-review of new learning material and efficiency of the whole process.

## PROJECT INFO

<b>Project Acronym:</b>	<b>K-FORCE</b>
<b>Project full title:</b>	Knowledge FOr Resilient soCiEty
<b>Project No:</b>	573942-EPP-1-2016-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP
<b>Funding Scheme:</b>	ERASMUS+
<b>Coordinator:</b>	University of Novi Sad
<b>Project start date:</b>	October 15, 2016
<b>Project duration:</b>	36 months

## DOCUMENT CONTROL SHEET

<b>Ref. No and Title of Activity</b>	<b>7.1 Develop Quality Assurance mechanisms and procedures</b>
<b>Title of Deliverable:</b>	<b>External Quality Evaluation Audit Report – Part 1</b>
<b>Institution:</b>	University of Novi Sad
<b>Author/s of the deliverable</b>	
<b>Status of the document:</b>	Draft
<b>Dissemination Level</b>	External

## VERSIONING AND CONTRIBUTION HISTORY

<b>Version</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Revision Description</b>	<b>Partner responsible</b>
<b>v.01</b>	15.08.2018.	First draft version	P1, P11



# TABLE OF CONTENT

---

PROJECT INFO .....	4
DOCUMENT CONTROL SHEET .....	4
VERSIONING AND CONTRIBUTION HISTORY.....	4
TABLE OF CONTENT .....	5
INTRODUCTION.....	6

## INTRODUCTION

---

According to the recommendations given in the Quality Assurance and Monitoring Manual, it is envisaged to engage an expert who will carry out the external evaluation of the project (QA audit of project implementation). The aim of the External evaluation of the K-FORCE project is to assure optimal quality and results of the project. The **External quality control** will include: keeping to the time plan, dissemination, horizontal & vertical coordination of WGs, peer-review of new learning material and efficiency of the whole process.

Based on the deliverable achievements, the external evaluation will facilitate a critical overview of the project progress twice during the project realisation period:

- after the second year of implementation, as **Advisory report**,
- two months before finishing the project, as **Final report**.

The external evaluator for QA audit of the project was proposed at the project meeting in Zilina. P11 has nominated Prof. Miloš Knežević as external evaluator, based on the following criteria:

- Compliance with, and understanding of the goals of the project;
- Understanding of the educational landscape and educational process in Balkan countries, and adequate background in educational process;
- Capacity for realization of the foreseen methodology;
- Ability to meet the required timetable for development of instruments, data collection, analysis and reporting;
- Relevant experience;
- Management of any existing or potential conflict of interest identified by the Project team;
- Brief CV of the person.

Prof. Miloš Knežević is a Full professor at the University of Montenegro, Faculty of Civil Engineering, Podgorica, Montenegro. His brief CV is part of this information. In period 2010-2016 he was Dean and in period 2005-2010 Vice dean for financial affairs. He is familiar with the Civil engineering study programs, especially in WB Countries, and he has an extensive experience in accreditation processes. He participated in a number of international projects. As Invited speaker at the 1st International Symposium “Knowledge For Resilient soCiEty KFORCE”, organized in the framework of the project, he presented his experience in the field of risk assessment in case of natural disasters and measures for reduction of consequences.

Prof, Dr. Sc. Miloš Knežević, from the University of Montenegro, Faculty of Civil Engineering, Podgorica, Montenegro, was nominated by Ss. Cyril and Methodius University-Skopje and appointed as the external evaluator for the K-FORCE Project at the Consortium meeting in Žilina, January 29<sup>th</sup> 2018.

The nomination document with candidate's Euro pass CV and Consortium decision with rationale published at project website.

## **1. EXTERNAL EVALUATION METHODOLOGY**

In order to carry out the External Evaluation, full access to all relevant external and internal documents, project consortium meetings, presentations, deliverables and on the contents of the projects' website will be given to the external evaluator.

Documentation comprises all relevant documents, including the original project proposal, the Logical Framework Matrix, Internal quality control and monitoring reports, Progress reports and Deliverables, intermediate report and feedback monitoring visit reports by EACEA.

Personal visits to the Project Consortium meetings and Workshops and will be enabled. Direct communications with the Project manager and the Team leader of WP7 will be obtained almost on daily bases, as well as face-to-face and online communication (e-mail,

Skype etc.) with contact persons from other project partner institutions in order to collect and

summarize the important information for reporting and evaluation findings.

The external evaluator has to give comments on:

- Appropriateness of sources and documentation used for internal evaluation;
- Quality and completeness of evidence provided and reviewed;
- The extent to which the objectives of the internal evaluation procedure have been met;
- Description and Analysis of the Self-Evaluation Procedure;
- Analysis of the positive elements and difficulties which arose during the self-evaluation procedure;
- Whether the self-evaluation procedure was comprehensive and interactive;
- Were the plans and timetables realistic and adequate for achieving the project goals;
- Were the measures taken to reach the project goals appropriate.

### **1.1 Quality control by incorporation of Project partners' comments (answers on questionnaires)**

Project partners are given the opportunity to comment on project realization quality, findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned by fulfilling the questionnaires prepared according to WP7. Quality control adhere to the principle of independence of the evaluator. The external evaluation report has to reflect these comments, acknowledges any essential disagreements and the External evaluator should investigate the reasons for these disagreements.

## **1.2 Quality control of learning materials**

The external evaluator has to make a brief control of the content of the learning material, as well as of the teaching methodology, and based on his teaching experience in Civil Engineering and experience in accreditation processes to give adequate suggestions for possible improvement.

## **2. RELEVANCE OF THE EVALUATION RESULTS**

### **2.1 Formulation of evaluation findings**

The evaluation findings have to be relevant to the Project aims and the purpose of the evaluation. The results should follow clearly from the evaluation questions and analysis of data, showing a clear line of evidence to support the conclusions. Any discrepancies between the planned and actual implementation of the Project have to be explained.

### **2.2 Evaluation implemented within the allotted time and budget**

The evaluation has to be conducted and results to be made available in a timely manner in relation to the purpose of the evaluation. Un envisaged changes to timeframe and budget to be explained in the report.

### **2.3 Recommendations and lessons learned**

Recommendations and lessons learned have to be relevant and targeted to the Project partners and future users of the project results. Recommendations are actionable proposals and lessons learned are generalizations of conclusions applicable for Project partners.

### **2.4 Distinction between conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned**

Evaluation report must distinguish clearly between findings, conclusions and recommendations. The evaluation presents conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned separately and with a clear logical distinction between them. Conclusions are substantiated by findings and analysis. Recommendations and lessons learned follow logically from the conclusions.

### **2.5 Clarity and representativeness of the summary**

The evaluation report contains an executive summary. The summary provides an overview of the report, highlighting the main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned.

### **2.6 Use of evaluation**

Evaluation requires an explicit acknowledgement and response from Project Management Committee regarding intended follow-up to the evaluation results. PMC will ensure the systematic dissemination and management of the output from the evaluation to ensure easy accessibility and to maximize the benefits of the evaluation's findings.

### **3. FORMAT FOR AN EXTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT**

The evaluation report should contain at most 30-50 pages without annexes.

#### **3.1 Title page**

Title of evaluation, date of completion of report, name of evaluator, name of contractor.

#### **3.2 Index, list of abbreviations**

#### **3.3 Executive summary**

The evaluation report starts with an executive summary of three to five pages. The summary contains a brief overview of the purpose, objectives, scope, methods of the evaluation and refers to the most important recommendations, results and lessons learnt. The executive summary must be written as an independent document so that it can be forwarded to all Project partners and even to third parties.

#### **3.4 Background**

In this chapter, the fundamental information on the project are summarised, i.e. project and programme context, project and programme title, project and programme number, duration, name of project partner, location, costs, objectives, expected results and planned changes with regard to the target group (outcome).

#### **3.5 Introduction**

Introduction contains a brief description of the purpose, objectives and scope of the evaluation and briefly explains whether there have been any restrictions during the evaluation.

#### **3.6 Methods**

This section offers an overview of the quantitative and qualitative methods applied. Techniques used during collection and processing of data and information should be mentioned as well. The evaluation report also mentions possible restrictions (e.g. the non-availability of key informants) by using the methods as well as possible resulting effects on the evaluation, particularly its independence.

#### **3.7 Evaluation findings**

In this chapter, the evaluation findings are presented in detail. The evaluation questions and the corresponding results also need to be attributed and additionally need to be described separately. Statements and conclusions must be comprehensible and be supported by data.

#### **3.8 Conclusions**

Conclusions contain a summary of the results of all evaluation questions and, furthermore, include all information issues which were mentioned under the scope of the evaluation. The conclusions are based on the results and the analysis, and are comprehensible on this basis. In case information is only presented partially, the reasons should be stated in the evaluation report.

#### **3.9 Recommendations**

In this chapter, recommendations are listed on the basis of the individual evaluation questions. It is important that the recommendations are feasible. It must also be clearly identifiable to who the recommendations are addressed to. It is recommended to present the recommendations in a matrix.

### 3.10 Annexes

The schedule of the evaluation, list of key informants, list of documents used, questionnaires or other instruments used in the evaluation have to be given as Annexes.

## 4. EVALUATION QUALITY CHECKLISTS

### 4.1 QUALITY CHECKLIST FOR PROJECT DELIVERABLES

The checklist below has to be used to determine whether the Project deliverables have met the standards required.

Question	Comment
1. Is the <b>language</b> of the Deliverable in line with the Project language?	
2. Is the Deliverable prepared according to the <b>suggested methodology</b> ?	
3. Is the <b>methodology</b> clearly described and adequate?	
4. Does the document comply with the <b>guidelines</b> in terms of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Structure and content</li> <li>• Length</li> <li>• Clarity</li> <li>• Format</li> </ul>	
5. Were all <b>planned participants</b> adequately involved in the Deliverable preparation?	
6. Is an <b>internal evaluation</b> conducted on the draft Deliverable and report prepared?	
7. Have <b>comments</b> received on the draft Deliverable been adequately taken into account?	

## 4.2 FOR INTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT

The checklist below has to be used to determine whether the Project Internal Evaluation Report (prepared by WP7) has met the standards required.

Question	Comment
1. Is the language of the Report in line with the Project language?	
2. Is the Report prepared according to the suggested methodology?	
3. Does the Report comply with the guidelines in terms of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Structure and content</li> <li>• Length</li> <li>• Clarity</li> <li>• Format</li> </ul>	
4. Does the Report contain a comprehensive and clear <b>executive summary</b> ?	
5. Have all the major documents been reviewed, and the contents adequately reflected in the report?	
6. Is the <b>methodology</b> clearly described and adequate?	
7. Were all <b>participants</b> involved in the project realization?	
8. Were all <b>participants</b> involved in the evaluation process?	
9. Are the <b>conclusions</b> clearly supported by the evidence presented?	
10. Are the <b>recommendations</b> relevant, feasible, useful and linked to conclusions?	
11. Does the report contain a <b>clear assessment</b> (incl. scores if appropriate) of the evaluation criteria?	
12. Have the following <b>cross-cutting issues</b> been adequately addressed in the evaluation process and the report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gender</li> <li>• Students and Youth</li> </ul>	