

# ON LIFE



## ***Quality Management Plan***

*This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication [communication] 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.*

#### **COPYRIGHT**

© Copyright ONLIFE Consortium

Consisting of:

- 

This document may not be copied, reproduced, or modified in whole or in part for any purpose without written permission from the ONLIFE Consortium. In addition, an acknowledgement of the authors of the document and all applicable portions of the copyright notice must be clearly referenced.

All rights reserved.

This document may change without notice.

#### **VERSION CONTROL**

<i><b>Version</b></i>	<i><b>Date</b></i>	<i><b>Comment</b></i>
01	16/06/2021	1st version

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1 INTRODUCTION</b>	21.1	FIEL
D OF APPLICATION - SCOPE	<b>22</b>	<b>QU</b>
<b>ALITY ASSURANCE</b>	33.1.	QU
ALITY ASSURANCE IN ONLIFE PROJECT	33.2. QUALITY MANAGER (QM)	<b>33</b>
<b>SUBJECTS OF THE QUALITY ASSURANCE</b>	43.1	EV
ALUATION OF MEETINGS	43.2	QU
ALITY CONTROL OF DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES	53.3	EV
ALUATION OF MULTIPLIER EVENTS	63.4	QU
ALITY CONTROL OF CONTRACTUAL RESULTS: PROCEDURE	63.5	EV
ALUATION OF WHOLE PROJECT	<b>94</b>	<b>DA</b>
<b>TA PROTECTION AND PRIVACY ISSUES</b>	105	<b>RIS</b>
<b>K AND CONTINGENCY PLAN</b>	126	<b>SU</b>
<b>MMARY OF THE MAIN INDICATORS</b>	157	<b>AN</b>
NEXES 1 6		

## 1 INTRODUCTION

This section will introduce the reader into the document contents and will serve as a guide to understand the field of application, the scope and the results expected by the present plan.

This document forms the Project Quality Plan for the implementation of the ONLIFE Project (hereinafter "Project").

The present document contains information regarding:

- Project Quality assurance
- Objects of evaluation

- Indicators for evaluation
- Tools for evaluation
- Risk and Contingency Plan

The purposes of the project Quality Management Plan (QMP) are the following:

- Create confidence in the quality of the work that the Project Team will perform by showing how the project will be carried out, measured, monitored, accounted for and safeguarded during and after development,
- Define roles and responsibilities and skills sets for each partner necessary to address the complexities and risks of the project,
- Show how changes and problems can be identified and reported,
- Clearly define the content, format, sign-off and review process, and responsibilities for each deliverable,
- Make visible all the means that are and will be applied to meet the technical and quality requirements,
- Define the strategy to put in place in case of risks and problems arising during the implementation of the project.

This manual covers the aforementioned aspects and addresses thus:

- Quality Assurance strategy in Chapter 2.
- Subjects of the quality assurance in Chapter 3.
- Data protection and privacy issues in Chapter 4.
- Risk and contingency plan in Chapter 5.
- Summary of the main quantitative and qualitative indicators in Chapter 6.

### **3.1. Field of application - Scope**

This section is meant to define the boundaries of the project: what ONLIFE will deliver and what it will not deliver.

All the details, aims, the workplan, the tasks and responsibilities and the expected outcomes are clearly described in the application form, as well as quantitative and qualitative standards that should be met along the project life cycle.

Quality assurance falls within the Project Management framework: Project quality control will aim to guarantee intellectual output realization and relevance. The following issues will be of key importance and will be strictly taken into consideration:

- Evaluation methods: which method is the most appropriate and suitable for data collection?
- Timing: how often and when data has to be collected?
- Responsibilities: who is responsible for the internal, external and self-evaluation?

Monitoring and evaluation will assess the processes and progress as well as project results, and all project partners will contribute to the process of quality assurance. Additionally, the project products and results will be evaluated during the pilot testing.

The leader of Quality assurance procedures is Eurocrea Merchant (P2), that appointed Giulia Zunino. P2 is responsible for drafting the present plan and delivering all the related documents (listed in the QMP).

## 2 QUALITY ASSURANCE

### 3.2. Quality assurance in ONLIFE project

#### - 3.2. Quality Manager (QM)

This section will shortly describe the definition and aims of quality assurance within a transnational project, providing detailed information about the provisions for quality assurance foreseen in the present project. Moreover, the role of the quality manager will be described, and its contact details will be included.

The quality assurance covers the whole lifespan of the project, from 01-11-2018 to 31-10-2020

#### Tasks:

Eurocrea Merchant (P2) will implement and lead the following tasks:

1. Development of Quality Management Plan.

The Plan aims to ensure the quality of project implementation process and project results.

2. Ongoing quality management and reporting.

The implementation of the Plan will be supervised by P2 and executed together by all partners.

P2 will collect and analyse partners' inputs and will develop evaluation reports regularly (after major results), as well as yearly evaluation reports that will cover both the quality of process (management and dissemination quality if something has been foreseen and produced) and Intellectual Outputs.

Quality control will be executed during the whole project and will contribute to the achievement of all project results.

**Objectives:** The objectives of the quality assurance are:

- to create **confidence** among partners;
- to define **roles and responsibilities**;
- to provide tools to **deal with any problem** that may arise;
- to show how **problems** can be **identified and reported**;
- to define the **review process** of tangible results;
- to inform about procedures and tools to meet technical and **quality requirements**.

**Methodology:** The first activity is to elaborate a detailed **Quality Management Plan** - evaluation framework outlining timing, responsibilities and methods. The plan also includes a contingency plan outlining possible challenges and discussing solutions.

The assessment methodology is based on the **peer to peer evaluation** a democratic and effective system as it allows an internal evaluation and peer-to-peer pressure, thanks to the definition of guidelines, indicators and sharing of best practice.

**Contingency plan.** There are numerous risks in projects that are at the same time challenges. Some of these challenges can be predicted and possible solutions can be proposed to allow a quicker targeted reaction. Types of risks followed by proposals of how evaluation can help to find countermeasures and overcome these challenges will be discussed in the contingency plan.

**Ongoing quality management:** communication and collaboration, project meetings, the timely production of outputs will be evaluated every six-month (progresses will be reported during each transnational meeting)

. Evaluation techniques will include both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. The internal quality manager will also provide feedback to the interim and final report which will be submitted to the funding authority.

**Reports:** In addition to the reporting about the different evaluation steps, an interim and final internal evaluation report will be drafted summarising all evaluation results. Specifically, the interim evaluation report in the end of the first year of the project will give practical advice for the second project half.

**Results:**

- Quality Management Plan;
- Project meetings evaluation reports;
- Internal project evaluation reports.

-

## - 2.2. Quality Manager (QM)

The main objective of quality assurance is to ensure that all the partners contribute with the necessary documents and information to the correct development of the project.

This will be under the responsibility of the Quality Manager, that follows the project day-by-day and is in charge for implementing and monitoring the quality procedures described in the present document. The QM also checks the quality indicators and measures the evolution of the project according to these.

The QM, then, reports to the Project manager and to the Management Committee in annual reports and in the occasion of each meeting, informing them of any significant deviation from the plans, according to the Risk and contingency Plan (included in the present document).

The object of the evaluation and the tools are described in the present document.

The QM of ONLIFE project is Mirna Fusaro (mirna.fusaro@dlearn.eu). The partners are invited to contact and inform the QM in any occasion they may retain relevant for quality assurance.

## 3 SUBJECTS OF THE QUALITY ASSURANCE

This section will list all items to be evaluated and the specific procedure put in place. Per each item, this section will describe performance indicators, tasks and responsibilities, timing of monitoring and evaluation activities. Moreover, specific evaluation tools (questionnaires/interview grid) will be provided as annexes to the present document)

### 3.1 EVALUATION OF MEETINGS

Through questionnaires distributed to the partners.

There are 5 project meetings planned, approximately every 6 months and the local partners will be responsible for their organisation:

- The KICK-OFF MEETING held in Poland at M1. Partners should meet and further explore the project objectives and overall strategy, setting the basis for the cooperation and beyond. During the kick off meeting partners have shared their views and strategies for the practical implementation of the project and especially about the first project activities, such as:
  - Management aspects
  - Quality assurance issues
  - Dissemination plan
  - Intellectual Output 1 – Methodology, tasks and responsibilities, as well as deadlines
  - Eventual Budget amendments and Financial reporting procedures
  - Formal obligations: Grant Agreement and Partnership Agreement

- The 2nd meeting will take place on line, organised by Dlearn, M10. During this meeting, the PC will provide all relevant information to deliver the interim report to the National Agency. Furthermore, during this meeting will finalize the IO2.A1 1st Draft of the online learning environment
- 3rd (transnational) project meeting will be held instead in Nicosia (Cyprus) hosted by P6 EACG at M14. Partners will review the results of the activities involved in O1 and O2 and take any necessary corrective actions and discuss the forthcoming activities related to O3. This meeting is strictly important as it will be focused on IO2 educational resources delivery and it will set the basis for the Pilot testing.
- 4th project meeting online organized by P8 – LSEM at M17 as it will be necessary for the project partners to finalize the IO2 (and collect pilot results) and set the basis for the IO3 through a co-creation methodology
- 5th (transnational) project meeting will be held in Brussels hosted by P3 and it will be done in coordination with the multiplier event in Brussels (organized by P2- Dlearn). During the final events the project partners will revise all the IOs and will appoint a project manager who will be in charge of the project sustainability and results exploitation.

The meetings are meant to be the occasion for partners to physically meet at key moments of the project life cycle to discuss about the attainment of relevant milestones.

The QM developed a specific questionnaire for meeting evaluation (Annex 1 of the present document). After each meeting the partners are asked to fill in the questionnaire and return it to the QM, that provides a report on meeting evaluation.

The meetings are meant to be the occasion for partners to meet at key moments of the project life cycle to discuss about the attainment of relevant milestones.

The QM will develop a specific questionnaire for the meetings evaluation. After each meeting the partners are asked to fill in the questionnaire and return it to the QM, that provides a short report.

### 3.2 QUALITY CONTROL OF DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES

Through monitoring and evaluation by Dissemination lead partner and quality manager every 6 months.

Dissemination activities are described in the application in related sections, which aims to:

- Disseminate information about the project to the target group in order to spread project results and information towards relevant target groups of beneficiaries, making them aware of the importance of the emotional and sexual education for people with disability among the different social collectives, to disseminate the advantages of this knowledge;
- Raise awareness about the existence of a specific training available for all those people who want to start using learning about the emotional and sexual education for people with special needs and become part of the ONLIFE network;
- To prepare for further exploitation of project results.

All partners will contribute actively to the dissemination and diffusion of the results, both in content creation and dissemination, as all contribute to the realization of an event for dissemination and demonstration in the respective countries.

Each partner will appoint one staff member as responsible for dissemination activities within the organization and contact person for the monitoring and progresses of visibility actions: P5 and P6 will conduct this monitoring every 6 months.

A dissemination plan will be developed and a report on dissemination activities at the end of the project will be provided.

The evaluation of dissemination activities will be conducted by the Quality Manager, according to the following indicators:

Performance Indicator	Object of evaluation
Completion of dissemination and exploitation activities, in respect to the plans	Percentage of activities remaining to be completed in respect to the plans (Dissemination and Exploitation plan). Threshold for this indicator is less than 20% at first year and at the end of the project
Participation level of stakeholders	Number of stakeholders reached and level of their engagement. Difference in % between expected numbers and actual numbers of stakeholder engaged. Threshold for this indicator is a difference of less than 30%
Perceived quality of the on-line dissemination activities and tools	Number of visitors **To be updated when the online tool is available

In case of results under threshold, the coordinator P1 will inform the Management Committee, which decides the type of correcting actions to be undertaken.

### 3.3 EVALUATION OF MULTIPLIER EVENTS

External evaluation conducted via anonymous questionnaires distributed to events participants (questionnaires to define together)

### 3.4 QUALITY CONTROL OF CONTRACTUAL RESULTS: PROCEDURE

Project results will be evaluated internally (through a peer review procedure involving project partners staff)

The Project has a total of 4 Intellectual Outputs, made of the following activities:

**IO1: GUIDEBOOK: Pattern for enhancing digital technologies in School Education**

- IO1: METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK;
  - o IO1-A1: Development of the Guidebook with focus groups and interviews both at national and international level
  - o IO1-A2: National reports to exchange good practices in COVID-19 era

**IO2: ONLIFE learning environment**

- IO2-A1: DEVELOPMENT– Online environment for online teachers' training
- IO2 – A2: Guidelines for training pilot and evaluation Training model development
- IO2 – A3: Action Learning Session- first internal pilot
- IO2 – A4 - IMPLEMENTATION - Training piloting for Online environment in SE Teachers engaged for testing will start their online training course by P5 leader of all the activities
- IO2 - A5 - Virtual Meeting
- IO3 – A6 - Comparative Report “Training pilot for online and blended teaching in SE” and final tunes of the learning environment

IO3 - A1 – CO-DESIGN

IO3 - A2 IMPLEMENTATION (3rd and 4th month of the 4months)



IO3 - A3 Virtual Meeting

IO4 - A1 - PREPARATION - Recommendation and guidelines for School System Bodies

IO4 - A2 - Virtual Meeting

IO4 - A3 - Report: Recommendation and guidelines for School System Bodies

A Peer Review Committee will be created, made of a representative from each partner that will be asked to review final outcomes of each activity to ensure that the quality of the results meet the required standards. Each result will be developed in two stages: a draft will be sent to the consortium in order to collect inputs and remarks from the partners within the number of days required and according the schedule set by the Project Coordinator. After that, the partner in charge of the result will have time to assess the draft and deliver it in a final version.

At this stage, the result will be evaluated taking into account formal aspects, comprehensiveness, clarity and completeness.

The names of Peer Reviewers are in Annex 4 to the present document while the template for the evaluation at Annex 1.

The procedure is described in the following table:

<b>Step 1: Checking the format and compliance with the template</b>	
<b>Who</b>	<b>Activity</b>
Quality Manager	<p>The QM checks the result for compliance with the agreed structure for results and the agreed issues with respect to version control and the more formal aspects of the result.</p> <p>In case the result is not approved, the partner in charge for the result is asked to improve it in 3 days.</p> <p>1.1. In case the result is approved: Step2</p>
<b>Step 2: Checking and adjusting the contents</b>	
<b>Who</b>	<b>Activity and timing</b>
QM, Peer reviewers and authors	<p>Each result will be evaluated by two peer reviewers representatives of two different partners, according to the division of tasks of Annex 4 to the present document.</p> <p>2.1. The QM asks the peer reviewers to fill in in the template for result evaluation (Annex 2 to the present document) and send it to the author of the result within 7 days. Communications should be sent via email, including all members of the consortium and the QM. Also comments and remarks on the text of the result are welcomed if relevant.</p> <p>2.2. The author is asked to improve the result taking into account the peer reviewers' inputs within 7 or 14 days, depending on the amount of improvements to be made. The number of days needs to be agreed between QM, PM and the partner involved.</p>
<b>Step 3: Final delivery of result</b>	
<b>Who</b>	<b>Activity</b>
The partner in charge of the result The whole consortium	<p>3.1. If the Consortium accepts the result, it is final.</p> <p>3.2. In case the verdict of the partners is negative on either one of the aspects emerged in step 2, the result is returned to the partner for improvements.</p> <p>3.3. The partner has an amount of days established by the PC to improve the result. In this case the Project Coordinator must check the compliance of the partner and inform the consortium.</p>

The Quality Manager will monitor that each step is implemented correctly, and the procedure respected.

All other results (different from the Intellectual outputs activities), will be however subject to internal quality control, although in a more informal way:

- The QM will check the format and compliance with the template (if relevant);
- The consortium will comment and send remarks and input via online communication tool to the author.

### 3.5 EVALUATION OF WHOLE PROJECT

Monitoring will be conducted every 6 months via questionnaire filled in by each partner covering the following evaluation areas: Project Management and Coordination, Project Consortium and Partnership Project Activities and Results, Self-assessment of each partner role in the project, risk management, dissemination activities and tools, Multiplier events, transnational meetings. The quality manager will process the results and provide short feedback reports every 6 months and comprehensive Quality evaluation reports every 12 months.

The quality control of the project as a whole is conducted via self-evaluation and focuses on the following aspects:

1. Project Management and Dissemination;
2. Project Consortium;
3. Project Activities and Intellectual Outputs;
4. Self-assessment of each partner role in the project.
5. Meetings
6. Multiplier events
7. Risk management

For each of the different aspects a set of performance indicators have been established, which can be measured on a scale of 1 to 4, where:

- 1 = Not sufficient,  
 2 = Sufficient,  
 3 = Good,  
 4 = Excellent

The Quality Manager is responsible for the evaluation, each partner will be asked to score the indicators, after which the Quality Manager will elaborate an aggregate report with the view of all partners. Monitoring of the indicators takes place on a 6-monthly basis. A specific questionnaire has been developed for this purpose (Annex 3).

Whenever the Quality Manager identifies an aggregate result below expectations, the Project Coordinator will be signalled and a strategy for improvement of problem-solving will be initiated.

The Quality Manager can additionally conduct informal dialogues with some of the coordinator, partners and/or team members to drill deeper into the issues which might not be uncovered by a structured questionnaire.

The threshold for internal evaluation is 2 out of 4. Any score below will require action.

Performance indicator	Object of the evaluation
<b>Project management and coordination</b>	
Quality of Project management arrangements:	Clear understanding of the division of tasks and responsibilities, the timing and the procedures
Effectiveness of coordination by the project coordinator	Capacity of the project coordinator as for leadership and professional competences
Effectiveness of the monitoring and evaluation processes	Extent of implementation of the procedures described in the management handbook and the quality
Effectiveness of quality arrangements	Relevance and usefulness of the Quality Plan and the Quality Manager

Communication/exchange of information with the NA	Level of communication between coordinator and NA and level of sharing of information between the coordinator and the consortium
<b>Project consortium and Partnership</b>	
Good flow of communication among the partners	Quality of the communication and ability to favour confidence, open debate and continuous information of the people involved
Quality of the meetings	If the team has enough time/occasions to meet (virtual & face to face) to discuss, take decisions and solve problems
Mutual exchange among partners	If there is an interesting exchange of skills and ideas among the Partners
Understanding of the project:	If the team has a clear and shared understanding of the project rational, short and long-term objectives
Strong commitment to the project by each partners	Willingness to solve emerging conflicts in a constructive way and engagement of the people in the implementation
Mutual trust among the partners	Development of positive attitudes towards to the consortium and the shared responsibilities
Peer Support:	Effectiveness of peer support within each partner organisation and the actors involved
<b>Project Activities and Results</b>	
Quality of the project	Clear objectives, realistic timescale, consistency of the involved set of skills
Implementation of the workplan	Adherence to the workplan by all partners
Fulfilment of tasks	The partners respect the division of tasks
Respect for timetable of activities	The extent to which deadlines are respected
Quality of the dissemination activities	The extent to which the activities planned and implemented are able to give visibility to the project and to favour multiplier effect
Quality of the outputs and results	If tangible and intangible outcomes are of good quality
Integration into ongoing activities	The extent to which project results/actions will be integrated into the partners activities
<b>Self-assessment of each partner role in the project</b>	
Self-assessment on time management	The extent to which the partner has been able to respect workplan, tasks and deadlines
Self-assessment on WP progress	The extent to which the partner is satisfied about the implemented tasks
Self-assessment on the difficulties encountered	The extent to which the partner is able to motivate and solve the problems

#### 4 DATA PROTECTION AND PRIVACY ISSUES

This section will provide clear guidance for the partners about protection of data within the project, in any case third parties are concerned (e.g. target group involved in the survey). The Data Protection Directive (95/46/EC) will form the basis for the definition of the treatment of data, and for each partner the national legis

lation and rules concerning the ethical issues, privacy aspects and data protection will define further the specific policy if needed.

During the execution of the project, some data privacy must be considered as different target groups representatives and other stakeholders will interact with the project in different phases, particularly in the needs analysis and pilot testing phases, but also during dissemination activities. Therefore, the publication and dissemination of private and confidential data is an important issue to be taken into account. Basic guidelines are developed in this section with the aim to promote openness by public entities and data privacy for individuals.

The Data Protection Directive ([95/46/EC](#)) will form the basis for the definition of the treatment of data, and for each partner the national legislation and rules concerning the ethical issues, privacy aspects and data protection will define further the specific policy if needed.

The Directive aims to protect the rights and freedoms of persons with respect to the processing of personal data by laying down guidelines determining when this processing is lawful. Some of the most relevant topics covered by the Directive are the followings:

- The quality of the data: personal data must be processed fairly and lawfully, and collected for specified, explicit and legitimate purposes. They must also be accurate and, where necessary, kept up to date;
- The legitimacy of data processing: personal data may be processed only if the data subject has unambiguously given his/her consent and only for a legitimate purposes;
- Special categories of processing: it is forbidden to process personal data revealing racial or ethnic origin, political opinions, religious or philosophical beliefs, trade-union membership, and the processing of data concerning health or sex life;
- Information to be given to the data subject: the controller must provide the data subject from whom data are collected with certain information relating to himself/herself (the identity of the controller, the purposes of the processing, recipients of the data etc.);
- The right to object to the processing of data: the data subject should have the right to object, on legitimate grounds, to the processing of data relating to him/her.
- Every person shall have the right to a judicial remedy for any breach of the rights guaranteed him by the national law applicable to the processing in question. In addition, any person who has suffered damage as a result of the unlawful processing of their personal data is entitled to receive compensation for the damage suffered.
- Transfers of personal data from a Member State to a third country with an adequate level of protection are authorised. However, they may not be made to a third country which does not ensure this level of protection, except in the cases of the derogations listed.

In summary, partners will respect the proportionality principle, which entails that personal data:

- may be processed only insofar as it is adequate, relevant and not excessive in relation to the purposes for which they are collected and/or further processed.
- must be kept secure and up to date;
- will be held only as much as they are needed for the purpose;
- will be held in a way to allow the subject of the information to see it on request.

Apart from the avoidance measures, the project will apply the following privacy principles:

- Only staff of the partner organisations involved in the project and the pilots will have access to user data.
- Participants will be treated with respect at all times and their anonymity will be protected.
- Pseudonyms or codes will be used to replace any identifiers within the data.
- Quotations may be included in reports and publications arising from the user interaction. Every quotation will be anonymised using e.g. a pseudonym.

Each time the partners will ask people to fill in questionnaire and/or to answer to questions related to personal data, the following sentence should be added on the document (questionnaire, interview text, email with questions, etc):

*In compliance with The Data Protection Directive (95/46/EC) and Law XXX (national law, if applicable) we inform you that your personal data will be used and processed only in relation to the purpose for which they are collected. The data will be kept secure, kept only as much as they are needed for the purpose and held in a way to allow the subject of the information to see it on request.*

*You will have the right to object, on legitimate grounds, to the processing of data relating to you.*

*If you agree with the processing of your data according to the above, please sign here/tick this box.*

## 5 RISK AND CONTINGENCY PLAN

This section presents the process for implementing proactive risk management, a project management tool to assess and mitigate events that might adversely impact the project, in order to increase the likelihood of success. To this purpose, this section deploys methods for identifying, analysing, prioritising, and tracking risk drivers, including also a table listing of possible risks, likely causes, a forecast of impacts and probability and a suggestion for remedial actions.

This section presents the process for implementing proactive risk management, a project management tool to assess and mitigate events that might adversely impact the project, in order to increase the likelihood of success. To this purpose, it is necessary to deploy methods for identifying, analysing, prioritising, and tracking risk drivers.

First it is necessary to define risk: risk is the effect of an event or series of events that take place in one or several stages of the project.

The risk, and its effects, may jeopardize the achievement of the overall project objectives, for this reason it is necessary to work on prevention and to have a clear risk and contingency plan.

The risk is computable from the *probability* of the event becoming an issue and the *impact* it would have. For this reason it is necessary to make a forecast of how likely is an event to happen and how bad the consequences will be for the project or parts of it. Also useful is to analyse the causes that brought that event to happen. The next step is to prevent a mitigation strategy and a contingency plan to reduce the negative impact. The following table include a list of possible risks, likely causes, a forecast of impacts and probability and a suggestion for remedial actions.

Risk	Possible causes	Probability	Impact	Remedial Actions
Slow synchronisation among the partners	- Insufficient communication within the consortium members	High	- Lack of coordination in the tasks implementation - Delay in the delivery of results and tasks fulfilment - Lack of coherence between deadlines	- Implementation of management procedures - Strong coordination - Regular communication among the partners
Imbalance of workload	- Wrong estimation of workload - Weak integration of project tasks within other daily activities	High	- Delay in results delivery - Overlap with other tasks	- Strong control of tasks and assigned resources - Re-definition of timeplan and deadlines, avoiding overall delay of the project

	ies of the partner organisations			
Intellectual Outputs planning not respected	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lack of engagement among the partners</li> <li>- Underestimation of the time and resources</li> </ul>	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Delay of project outputs</li> <li>- Delay of next steps</li> <li>- Overlap with other tasks</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strong coordination by Project coordinator and Activity leader</li> <li>- Realisation of a dynamic calendar that can be adapted according to the delays and changes</li> </ul>
Shortage of resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Wrong estimate of resources needed</li> <li>- Weak integration of project tasks within other daily activities of the partner organisations</li> </ul>	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Delay in results delivery</li> <li>- Lower quality of results</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Early warning of budget and personnel problems (it allows to take action in time)</li> <li>- Flexible management of resources dedicated to the project</li> <li>- Agreement within the consortium about remedial actions</li> </ul>
Inappropriate or insufficient development of dissemination materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Underestimation of the importance of dissemination materials and tools</li> <li>- Late development of tools and/or late execution of actions related to dissemination</li> </ul>	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Failure of the dissemination materials and tools to engage a high interest in stakeholders</li> <li>- Lack of multiplier effect</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Review of dissemination tools according to the quality procedure</li> <li>- Updating of materials as the project is developed</li> <li>- Strong coordination of dissemination activities by WP leader</li> <li>- Active engagement of external agents and multipliers</li> </ul>
Inappropriate collection and delivery of documents necessary for interim and final report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Wrong estimation of skills need for the project within partner organisations</li> <li>- Late study of guidelines, template and documents needed</li> <li>- Beginning of work for reports too close to deadlines</li> </ul>	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Incorrect or inconsistent interim and final report submitted by the coordinator</li> <li>- Overload of work for the coordinator</li> <li>- Financial problems with the NA</li> <li>- Cut of the budget by the NA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Early preparation for interim and final report</li> <li>- Good and continuous communication with the coordinator well before the deadline</li> <li>- Day-by-day financial management</li> </ul>
Insufficient involvement of target group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ineffective dissemination activities and tools</li> </ul>	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Weak participation of the target group in the evaluation phase</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strong and detailed dissemination strategy</li> <li>- Effective dissemination tools</li> </ul>

	- Late implementation of activities aimed to raise awareness and create understanding of the project objectives		- Low exploitation results	- Early involvement of the target: during the needs analysis and development of contents
Resistance to engagement by the target group	- Lack of involvement of the value representatives of the target - Low quality and effectiveness of results	Low	- Lack of exploitation of results by the end-beneficiaries	- Attention to the results of the needs analysis - Involvement of the target group in the development of contents phase - Effective testing and evaluation activities - Final release of the training system tailored to the results of the pilot test
Insufficient competences and effectiveness	- Wrong estimation of skills need for the project within partner organisations - Changes in the staff of the organisations	Low	- Low quality of deliverables - Increased need for subcontracting - Low quality of results	- Selection of project teams according to the need skills and complementarities - Quality assurance procedure put in place early in the project - Flexibility within partner organisations in the re-allocation of staff people to the project
Problems with translation within different languages	- Unclear text in the original language - Wrong selection of translators	Low	- Results do not provide the same information in all languages - Problems to understanding by end-users	- Create key words which can be common of every result and they have the same meaning in order to be translated correctly - Use easy concepts and not complex language- Be clear and concise.

By following the table, it is possible to reflect on the causes of likely emerging risks, so to work on the prevention and the avoidance of problems. Nevertheless, risks are always possible, so it is necessary to study solutions and remedies, working particularly on a re-organisation of tasks and responsibilities able to keep under control the processes and to guarantee results fulfilment. In this respect, key words are flexibility and collaboration: by working together and in a transparent way, the consortium can better manage problems and find solutions to inconsistencies.

In order to detect risks occurring, including risks not yet identified in the present plan, it is important to implement the following actions:

- Constantly monitor the possible causes of the risk as listed in the table – All partners



- Respect and correct implementation of procedures described in the Management and Quality Plans – All Partners
- Coordination and monitoring of Intellectual outputs activities – Activity leaders
- Day-by-day coordination and monitoring of project implementation – PM (P1)
- Coordination and monitoring of Quality assurance procedures – QM (P2)

In case any of the partners of ONLIFE project would detect an occurring risk, he/she should immediately inform the PM – P1, that will in turn inform the Steering Committee.

The SC will organise an extraordinary meeting (virtual meeting) to inform the consortium of the problem and to select the most appropriate mitigation strategy and remedial action.

## 6 SUMMARY OF THE MAIN INDICATORS

This section will describe the indicators for evaluation of Intellectual outputs, dissemination activities, management and performance.

### 6.1 Quantitative indicators

- at least 20 attendees to the event and 15000 stakeholders reached through newsletter and publicity materials.
- Guidelines for training pilot and evaluation. P2 will a tutorial and guideline for training testing which will involve around 100 people totally 20 for each case
- At least 5 experts' attending online events: in total about 10 experts will be involved plus the ones involved into face-to-face meeting.
- At least 20 people p/country into the multiplier event
- Clarity of the certification and recognition tools at least 80% of positive results in the overall evaluation of the training experience.
- Quality of the training platform, accessibility, adequate guidance tools and supporting material at least 80% of positive results in the overall evaluation of the platform.
- Overall at least 90% of positive results regarding the entire experience and commitment in applying the project model.

-

### 6.2 Qualitative indicators

- Overall satisfaction of project partners about project implementation, progress and results (monitoring every 6 months through quality procedures, in depth evaluation every 12 months);
- Overall satisfaction of partners staff after project meetings (monitoring through questionnaire after each meeting);
- Overall satisfaction of participants in the multiplier events (to be measured distributing anonymous questionnaires);
- Overall success of the local contests, in terms of interest raised, level of participation, quality of the products developed;

### 6.3 Performance indicators

Based on EFQM standards, several quality indicators will be combined in the overall project evaluation:

- Fulfilment indicators, related to a task conclusion. They are related to ratios that indicate the achievement degree of task and/or duties, e.g. number and quality of duties fulfilled, minimum number of participants, etc.;

- Evaluation indicators, related to the ratios and/or methods that help in performance identification and improvement opportunities for tasks, process or work packages. Some examples include the qualitative and quantitative results obtained in the validation phase, or the internal communication indicators;
- Efficiency indicators, related to the ratios that indicate the invested time for the fulfilment of tasks/duties and the costs of it. Some example: the use of resources in different work packages, the incurred costs in management, etc.;
- Efficacy indicators: related to ratios that indicate the capacity or success in the fulfilment of task and duties, such as the percentage of task accomplished at any moment or evaluation of IO products quality.
- Management indicators, related to management and/or establishment of concrete actions to realize the planned activities. They are related to the ratios that allow the real management of a project, like project management tools use, the quality of the communications between the general coordinator and other partners, accuracy of the procedures, etc.

## 7 ANNEXES

This section will provide the analysis tools (questionnaire and interview grid to be used for monitoring and evaluation of quality, according to the procedures described in previous sections. It will include in particular: questionnaire for evaluation of meetings, quality assessment of contractual results, 6 months whole project evaluation, list of peer reviewers, survey for external evaluation of events etc.

### Annex 1: Template for Quality Assessment of IO results

**To be filled in by the designated peer reviewer.**

Intellectual Output: (please insert I.O. number)

Activity: (please insert name and number)

Reviewer: (please insert name of the person and of the organisation, including Partner number)

Completeness	Are the contents complete and cover the objectives of the result?	Yes / no Comments: .....
Clarity	Is the document clear in its meaning, language and organisation of contents?	Yes / no Comments: .....

	Also, is the content adapt to the end users/beneficiaries of the result?	
Comprehensiveness	Does it addresses all the issues described in the project plan?	Yes / no Comments: .....

Suggestions for improvement

--

Any other comment

--

## Annex 2: 6 month-project evaluation questionnaire

Dear Partner,

For the purpose of the evaluation of the ONLIFE project, I would appreciate if you could kindly provide me with your opinions on the project management and implementation so far. At the same time you are kindly asked to put down your expectation, wishes and concerns in connection with the next phases of the project. Your opinion is very valuable for the project coordinator and the whole consortium for continuing successfully with this project. Answering a questionnaire is not always a pure pleasure, nevertheless it is necessary for improving the quality of this project and its products. As such, this evaluation is an integrated part of the project workplan.

Please do consider the following instructions when answering the questionnaire:

- Please cast your vote per each question, bearing in mind that:  
**1 = Not sufficient**  
**2 = Sufficient**  
**3 = Good**  
**4 = Excellent**
- Please provide also some written text in the boxes foreseen, especially in the case of negative opinions and judgments: the explanation important to understand weaknesses and rooms for improvements
- Please only fill one questionnaire per partner organization. If you wish, you can internally collect opinions from your colleagues and respond to the question for all staff people involved in the project.
- Please return the filled questionnaire by the indicate deadline to:

Please feel free to contact me in case you have any question.

Thank you very much for your understanding, your co-operation and your support!

Mirna Fusaro  
ONLIFE Quality Manager

QUESTIONS/CRITERIA	1	2	3	4	Observations
<b>Project Management and Coordination</b>					
1. <u>Quality of Project management arrangements</u> : the partners have a clear understanding of the division of tasks and responsibilities, the timing and the procedures					
2. <u>Effectiveness of coordination by the project coordinator</u> as for leadership and professional competences					
3. <u>Effectiveness of the monitoring and evaluation processes</u> : the procedures described in the quality plan are put into practice					
4. <u>Effectiveness of quality arrangements</u> described in the Quality Plan and satisfaction about Quality Manager activity					
5. <u>Good communication/exchange of information with the NA</u> : between coordinator and NA and between the coordinator and the consortium					
<b>Project Consortium and Partnership</b>					
6. <u>Good flow of communication</u> among the partners: it allows confidence, open debate and continuous information of the people involved					
7. <u>Quality of the meetings</u> : the team has enough time/opportunities to meet (virtual & face to face) to discuss, take decisions and solve problems					
8. <u>Mutual exchange</u> : there is an interesting exchange of skills and ideas among the Partners					
9. <u>Understanding of the project</u> : the team has a clear and shared under					

standing of the project rationale, short and long-term objectives					
10. <u>Strong commitment to the project</u> by each partners: willingness to solve emerging conflicts in a constructive way and engagement of the people in the implementation					
11. <u>Mutual trust among the partners</u> : development of positive attitudes towards to the consortium and the shared responsibilities					
12. <u>Peer Support</u> : effective peer support within each partner organisation and the actors involved					
<b>Project Activities and Results</b>					
13. <u>Quality of the project</u> : clear objectives, realistic timescale, consistency of the involved set of skills with the activities					
14. <u>Implementation of the workplan</u> : adherence to the workplan by all partners					
15. <u>Fulfilment of tasks</u> : the partners respect the division of tasks					
16. <u>Respect for timetable of activities</u> : the deadlines are respected					
17. <u>Quality of the dissemination activities</u> : the activities planned and implemented are able to give visibility to the project and to favour multiplier effect					
18. <u>Quality of the outputs and results</u> : tangible and intangible outcomes are of good quality					
19. <u>Integration into ongoing activities</u> : the extent to which project results /actions will be integrated into the partners activities					
<b>Self-assessment of each partner role in the project</b>					
<b>Time management</b>					
20. Until now, your activities have taken place according to your workplan and timing					

21.Until now, you have respected the deadlines for delivering products					
22.The workload has reflected your estimation					
<b>Workplan progress</b>					
23.Until now, you have undertaken all activities you were supposed to and delivered all the products you were in charge of					
24.Until now, you are satisfied with the quality of your activities or products					
<p>25.If you have encountered difficulties in implementing your tasks, it was due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Time difficulties ?</li> <li>○ Language difficulties ?</li> <li>○ IT skills difficulties ?</li> <li>○ Incompatible resources?</li> <li>○ Communication problem?</li> <li>○ Intercultural sensitivity ?</li> <li>○ Coordination ?</li> </ul> <p>How do you plan to face and solve those difficulties in the future?</p> <p>Please explain</p>					

**Further comments**

--

**Annex 4: Results peer review**

<b>Partner</b>	<b>Name of peer reviewer</b>	<b>Intellectual outputs assigned to be reviewed</b>	<b>Other tasks</b>
P1: EUROGEO VZW (E10182031, BE)			
P2: UNIWERSYTET PEDAGOGICZNY IM KOMISJI EDUKACJI NARODOWEJ W KRAKOWIE (E10160065, PL)			
P3: European Digital Learning Network (E10096531, IT)			
P4: DOUKA EKPAIDEFTIRIA AE - PALLADION LYKEION EKPAIDEUTHRIA DOUKA (E10148866, GR)			
P5: UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA (E10209447, ES)			
P6: EUROPAIKOS SYNDESMOS PROSANTOLISMOU STADIODROMIAS (E10047415, CY)			
P7: Liceul Teoretic "Tudor Arghezi" (E10017270, RO)			
P8: LICEO STATALE ETTORE MAJORANA (E10192559, IT)			

**The peer review procedure per each output will be detailed on a later stage by the QM.**