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Introduction

This document outlines the quality assurance processes applied to the ERASMUS PLUS Methods Project: Modernization of Teaching Methodologies in Higher Education: Eu Experience For Jordan and Palestinian Territory.

The quality assurance plan uses an Agile approach to quality assurance related to providing acceptance criteria and specifications for all project outputs. These are devised by the WP6 leads but also subject to co-production through the auspices of the quality committee.

Quality process

Responsibility for the quality of outputs is delegated to a quality assurance committee (QAC) comprising all work package leads. Each specific output is then subject to quality assurance through the use of a specific tool which is assessed by a quality assurance subcommittee (QASC) selected by the QAC against the expertise required for the specific output.

In summary the key end user outputs for each work package in the project are assessed through the production of a quality checklist of suitable acceptance criteria overseen and verified by WP6. Results are reviewed by the relevant (QASC) and then accepted/verified by the QAC as acceptable. If outputs fail to meet those requirements, then revisions are made. The purpose of this is twofold; firstly, to ensure the overall quality of the project with regard to generally held academic standards and secondly, to provide a supportive and collaborative environment for learning and improvement.

As such, quality in the methods project is a live process where quality control is regulated by WP6 but quality assurance is a collective responsibility.

WP 6 is run through agile methodology using a Kanban system which is totally transparent and documents the quality backlog, work in progress (wip) and work done.
This allows Agile concepts such as the inspection and adaption of work in progress and the concept of definition of done, where work is verified by others is applied to all outputs and is essentially peer reviewed.

Values: Co-construction and collaboration, devolved responsibility for quality to work package teams and establishment of definitions of done. 

Quality Assurance Measures are a separate part of WP 6 related to the impact evaluation of all training outputs. As such these are subject to the same quality assurance measures as other outputs but are reviewed by the QAC without the direct involvement of WP6.
Quality Process Diagram

Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) and Quality Assurance Sub Committee comprising WP1 Lead, Specific WP Lead and UoW Quality Lead.

**METHODS Project Quality Assurance Committee**

**Terms of Reference**

**Aims**
To provide guidance, standards and procedures that will ensure that the METHODS project produces relevant, trustworthy, rigorous and useful outputs and outcomes for partners, beneficiaries and the wider community, for external scrutiny and review.
Objectives
To meet online or face-to-face as required relating to project outputs.
To record and distribute any discussion, decisions and recommendations as efficiently as possible.
To comprise a representative from each partner institution, to be chaired and convened by Professor Traxler, University of Wolverhampton
To review and accept the quality assurance and evaluation plan
To review and accept/agree the quality assurance tools that are used within the project by all partners for specific purposes within the evaluation plan as they are developed/required
To review and accept/agree the evaluation tools including baselining that are used within the project by all partners for specific purposes within the evaluation plan as they are developed/required
To agree a minimum turnaround time for review of key tools/documents etc.
To work as sub-committees, with additional or specialist input as necessary, on specific concrete tasks, reporting back to the main Quality Committee, in the first instance about, Reporting and documentation, version control, internal review, document standards and templates
Scientific activities such as surveys, interviews, focus groups, technical monitoring; data gathering, data analysis, theory-building, scientific publication; triangulation, corroboration, pilots; specifically, for surveys, interviews and focus groups, face-to-face or online,

Principles

General Quality Principles
· Responsibility – each Work Package, each output, each activity and each deliverable is the legal and ethical responsibility of a named Partner,
  o which may nominate a specific individual
· Collegiality - everyone helps when and where they are able
  o within the limits of their experience and competence
· Visibility - tracing and recording the progress and evolution of deliverables and outputs
  o For open and transparent scholarship and research
· Reflection - learning from our mistakes
  o Using quality procedures to show the process of reflection and improvement

Generic Quality Checklist
· Did you use recognised and validated sources and models?
· Did you undertake a peer review? Did you undertake piloting?
In looking at examples, projects, findings, papers and technologies from elsewhere, did you consider differences in
- Resources
- Language, culture, customs, traditions
- Pedagogy
- Organisation
- Demographics?

Did you identify a clearly intended and cost-effective purpose and impact?
Did you consider any ethical issues?
- Social, emotional, cultural, psychological harm?

Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Ahmed</td>
<td>Salaymeh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Wasel</td>
<td>Ghanem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Bashar</td>
<td>Hammad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Imad</td>
<td>Ibrik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Nabil</td>
<td>Al-Joulani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Karl</td>
<td>Royle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. John</td>
<td>Traxler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Klaus</td>
<td>Haenssgen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pablo</td>
<td>Beneitone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Nevena</td>
<td>Mileva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Maria</td>
<td>Lluisa Perez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Rikke</td>
<td>Magnussen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA Denisa</td>
<td>Gibovic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Fahmi</td>
<td>Abu Al-Rub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Suhail</td>
<td>Odeh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Mohammad</td>
<td>Hamdan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[DISCLAIMER: 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.]
Quality Criteria Checklists (QCC).
These are used by WP leads to review all outputs before delivery. The checklists are available via Gdocs and follow a file naming convention which is as follows. METHODS_Social_Research_Data_Gathering_and_Analysis_Quality_GuidelinesV2. Please contact k.royle@wlv.ac.uk for your relevant checklist.

Usage: These are used to self-evaluate outputs. When an output is ready to submit to the quality committee the output will also be checked against the same criteria and either sent back for review or sent back with no changes required.

Examples

Dissemination WP Checklist:
Social Science Checklist: Various WPs (extract)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Explanations</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comments, Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data-Gathering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were the questionnaires, surveys, interviews piloted?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This ensures that questions are not phrased hazy, that the questions were understood as intended, that answering them did not take too long, that the analysis gave useful findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How was the development of the questionnaire documented and modified?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This means that external reviewers can inspect the development process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the questionnaire peer-reviewed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This enhances the quality by ensuring different relevant perspectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were standard, recognized and documented procedures and instruments used?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using standard procedures and instruments makes findings more credible because it shows other researchers have used them before and have published and evaluated the procedures and instruments being proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data-Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the analysis of the data planned in advance? What was the proposed method of analysis?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning the analysis at the same time as planning the data gathering means that there are no unexpected problems with the...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Training events evaluation checklist (extract). This will be live trialled at the train the trainers event in March.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>C (Required)</th>
<th>R (Not Required)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>Timetable for the day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>Technologies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
Smart Classroom Design Checklist (Extract):

Evaluation/Checklist Criteria for the Review of SMART CLASSROOM DESIGN. Dianna Bannister
This criteria has been developed for the Methods Project.
Each area should be reviewed against the criteria.
If the criteria have been completed satisfactorily, this will be checked by the evaluator. If the criteria require review, this will be checked and actions will be noted as necessary.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Is there effective wireless access within the room/space?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Have you identified particular “zones” in the room for specific types of activities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>What presentation technologies will need to be available?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>What technology needs to be made available to students?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Can students bring their own devices?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Can students use the technology to collaborate within the teaching time?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Development of Quality Assurance Measures (QAM) that are used to evaluate impact of programme.

The impact evaluation of the programme is concerned with the impact of the training courses and other activities on trainers, trainees and as far as possible to ascertain the impact on organisations.
To this end we have developed a digital habits survey and training impact survey which is described in the plan below.
Quality Assurance and Evaluation:

Survey Justification and Data Capture Plans
We propose that two short surveys will be implemented as per WP 6 to look at:
1. The Digital Habits of all training participants prior to and post training and;
2. The effectiveness of the training courses by way of a quality assurance and impact evaluation process.

Digital Habits Surveys (Teachers and Students)
This survey will gather evidence from the teachers who engage with the METHODS training and their students about how they use and engage with information and communication technologies (ICT) and digital technologies at work and home. They will also consider teaching and learning preferences and professional learning practices within their work context. This will form an overview of current digital habits and preferences of training participants.

The teachers’ version of the survey consists of five sections, and will be distributed before engagement with the METHODS training. The students’ version of the survey consists of four sections (as it does not ask about professional learning), and will be distributed once their teachers have completed the METHODS training, as well as during the 12 month follow up after the training. Data will be analysed to provide trends and changes in digital habits during the timeframe of the METHODS project, which will provide an indication regarding the effect in this area of the METHODS training.

The sections for both questionnaires are as follows:
About you
In this section users are asked to respond to a series of questions to enable the research team to gather evidence about the personal characteristics of the participant.
Confidence and competence using ICT for work/university
In this section users are asked to respond to a series of statements which indicate their confidence and competence in using ICT. The statements which constitute question 7 were formed based upon the digital competency framework (Ferrari, 2013) which covers 5 main areas of digital competencies; information, communication, content-creation, safety, and problem-solving. These are reflected within the statements participants must reflect upon for question 7, which will indicate levels of digital competency amongst the cohort.
Using ICT at home
In this section users will respond to questions and statements about the use of technology at home, for both leisure and work/study purposes. This includes the frequency of use of various digital tools and the reliability of connectivity to the internet, with the aim of gaining...
insight into the prominent and popular methods of digital connectivity amongst the participants in their daily lives.

Attitudes to ICT use

In this section users will respond to questions which refer to their relationship with digital technologies and desire to include them within their practice. The results of this section will provide an indication of an individual’s disposition towards participation with online resources and communities. Identifying how individuals are disposed towards working digital technologies is key to the sustainable use of ICT in education practice, and will highlight developmental needs in relation to the METHODS training within different contexts and work communities. (Angeletou et al, 2011; Rowe et al, 2013).

Professional development and training (teacher’s version of the survey only)

In this final section users are asked to respond to a series of statements regarding the frequency and type of personal development and training they might engage with. The questions in this section are based upon Gusky’s (1999; 2002) 5 levels of critical evaluation for professional training and development programmes, with particular emphasis placed upon Gusky’s first level, “participants’ reactions”. Responses to these questions will inform the research team about the current availability of personal development and training opportunities for participants, and how often they have engaged with any training in the last 12 months, which can inform future decisions regarding the frequency and type of training made available to individuals.

On the final page of the questionnaire participants are also given the opportunity to add any further comments, and provide their contact information if they are willing to participate in potential further METHODS studies.

The analysis plan for the questionnaires will initially focus on the descriptive variables of participants’ responses, i.e. personal characteristic data from section 1 will be used to identify any correlations and relationships between age, gender, role etc. and other aspects of each section of the questionnaire. The results will help the project to identify key trends in digital habits, ICT behaviours and technological uses within teaching and learning.

Impact Evaluation Surveys (Stage 1 and Stage 2)

The purpose of these questionnaires is to gather evidence from participants of the METHODS training and evaluate its effectiveness on their teaching practices.

Kirkpatrick’s (1994) four-level model of evaluation was originally developed for the evaluation of training and development in business organisations. The four levels were designed to provide training directors with a simple and practical process for evaluating training programmes. The aim is to begin evaluation at level one and move sequentially through each level, each of which progresses into a more specific, rigorous, time consuming and expensive level of evaluation. This model is chosen due to its prominence within the
evaluation literature, as well as the sufficient scope it provides in allowing discussions of individuals’ satisfaction levels and development of their digital skills. The four levels are as follows:

Level 1: Reactions – What the participants feel about the various aspects of the programme, for example the topics covered, the tutors, the schedule etc. This could also be interpreted as ‘satisfaction levels’ of the participants.

Level 2: Learning – What the participants learn as a result of the programme, such as knowledge acquired, skills improved, or changes in attitude. This will mostly centre on teaching skills and pedagogy, but could also include wider life skills and identity development.

Level 3: Behaviour – How do the participants apply what has been learnt to the everyday environment of the programme? This level specifically draws attention to the participants’ professional identity development, as well as the wider impacts of the programme experience on their identity.

Level 4: Results – The final results of the programme for the organisation and individuals involved. This level considers the extent to which the programme can be considered a success and the reasons why.

The stage 1 survey incorporates levels 1 and 2 of the Kirkpatrick model, and the stage 2 survey utilises levels 3 and 4. Both surveys also include an “about you” section to enable individuals to be identified and subsequently followed up 12 months after the training has taken place.

The analysis plan for these questionnaires involves identifying descriptive statistics of individuals who have taken part with METHODS training (e.g. age, gender, position). Following the stage 2 survey, individual results will be able to be compared and contrasted with each other to enable potential changes in pedagogy and practices to be identified and measured. Thus, the effectiveness of the METHODS training will be able to be critiqued using the results from these questionnaires.

Data Capture Plan
All of the questionnaires are located on Survey Monkey (www.surveymonkey.net), which is where all the data will be collected. The links to the surveys will be sent via email to the individuals responsible for communicating with each participant group, with a timeframe of 1 week being allowed for completion. The data will be analysed by researchers at the University of Wolverhampton.

References

Research Plan for Digital Habits and Evaluation Surveys

Before any Training Takes Place
- Digital Habits (Teachers) Survey

Upon Completion Of Training
- Evaluation Survey Stage 1 (Teachers) + Digital Habits (Students) Survey

Follow up 6,12 Months After Training Completion Date
- Evaluation Survey Stage 2 (Teachers) + Digital Habits (Students) Survey

DISCLAIMER: 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.
Ethics: Ethical clearance has been obtained for the methods Impact/QA approach through the University’s ethics committee.

Appendix A : Single response: University Ethics Form (SAMPLE)

1. Please enter your surname and first name below. (SURNAME, FIRST NAME)
   Scott, David

2. Please enter your University e mail address (e.g. M.Name@wlv.ac.uk)
   d.s.scott@wlv.ac.uk

3. Please enter the name of your Project Supervisor, Director of Studies, or Principal Investigator.

4. Please enter date by which a decision is required below. (Note that decisions can take up to 4 working weeks from date of submission)
   01/12/16

5. Which subject area is your research / project located?
   1. Science (including Pharmacy)
   2. Engineering & the Built Environment
   3. Computing
   4. Health and Wellbeing (including Psychology)
   5. Education
   6. Business
   7. Social Sciences & Humanities
   8. Art
   9. Sport

6. Please select your Faculty, Department or Research Centre
   1. Faculty of Social Science
   2. Faculty of the Arts
   3. Faculty of Science and Engineering
   4. Faculty of Education Health and Wellbeing
5. CADRE
6. CEDARE
7. Centre for Discourse and Cultural Studies
8. Engineering and Computer Science Research Centre
9. CHSCI
10. RIHS
11. Centre for Historical Research
12. RILLP
13. Centre for Research in Law
14. Centre for Transnational and Transcultural Research
15. Management Research Centre
16. RCSEP
17. Centre for Academic Practice
18. IT Services
19. Human Resources
20. Learning Information Services
21. Registry
22. Don't know
23. Other (please specify below)

7. Does your research fit into any of the following security-sensitive categories? (For definition of security sensitive categories see RPU webpages (www.wlv.ac.uk/rpu) follow links to Ethical Guidance).

1. commissioned by the military
2. commissioned under an EU security call
3. involve the acquisition of security clearances
4. concerns terrorist or extreme groups
5. not applicable

8. Does your research involve the storage on a computer of any records, statements or other documents that can be interpreted as promoting or endorsing terrorist acts?

1. YES
2. NO
9. Might your research involve the electronic transmission (e.g. as an email attachment) of any records or statements that can be interpreted as promoting or endorsing terrorist acts?

1. YES
2. NO

10. Do you agree to store electronically on a secure University file store any records or statements that can be interpreted as promoting or endorsing terrorist acts. Do you also agree to scan and upload any paper documents with the same sort of content. Access to this file store will be protected by a password unique to you. Please confirm you understand and agree to these conditions?

1. YES I understand and agree to the conditions
2. NO (please explain below)
3. I do not understand the conditions

11. You agree NOT to transmit electronically to any third party documents in the University secure document store?

1. YES I agree
2. NO I don't agree

12. Will your research involve visits to websites that might be associated with extreme, or terrorist, organisations? (for definition of extreme or terrorist organisations see RPU webpages (www.wlv.ac.uk/ru) and follow links to Ethical Guidance.

1. YES (Please outline which websites and why you consider this necessary)
2. NO

13. You are advised that visits to websites that might be associated with extreme or terrorist organisations may be subject to surveillance by the police. Accessing those sites from university IP addresses might lead to police enquiries. Do you understand this risk?

1. YES I understand
2. NO I don't understand

14. What is the title of your project?

Modernization of Teaching Methodologies in Higher Education: EU Experience for Jordan
15. Briefly outline your project, stating the rationale, aims, research question / hypothesis, and expected outcomes. Max 300 words.

This is a 3-year project co-funded by the Erasmus+ programme of the European Union, and involves 14 partners from Jordan, Palestine, and European Universities. The project aims to improve the quality of teaching and learning at the partner universities by incorporating technological tools into pedagogical best practices through capacity-building of each university in terms of evaluating, developing and designing e-curricula. In practical terms, this involves establishing national centres in both Jordan and Palestine which will be concerned with modernising higher education and to serve as a hub for utilising best practices in ICT education. The centres will also host a portal for sharing these experiences. Smart classrooms will be implemented in partners’ universities, and staffs’ capacities will be developed to be responsible for developing learning objectives by utilising best practices in ICT in education. These will be achieved through mutual visits between partner universities, which will also develop sustainable strategies for moving from teaching to learning. The research questions are as follows:

What are participants’ digital habits prior to engaging with the training?
How do these digital habits change as a result of the training?
What impact does the training have on participants’ teaching and learning practices?
16. How will your research be conducted?
Describe the methods so that it can be easily understood by the ethics committee. Please ensure you clearly explain any acronyms and subject specific terminology. Max 300 words

The research involving University of Wolverhampton staff is mainly desk-based, with the university providing consultancy regarding smart classrooms, educational portals and technologies, and evaluation strategies. The university will also be designing questionnaires to assist in evaluating digital habits, training events, and quality assurance for partner institutions. University staff may also participate in online training events and will attend consortium meetings.

17. Is ethical approval required by an external agency? (e.g. NHS, company, other university, etc)

1. NO
2. YES - but ethical approval has not yet been obtained
3. YES - see contact details below of person who can verify that ethical approval has been obtained

18. What in your view are the ethical considerations involved in this project? (e.g. confidentiality, consent, risk, physical or psychological harm, etc.) Please explain in full sentences. Do not simply list the issues. (Maximum 100) words

The main ethical considerations for this project concern confidentiality of participants, as they are being asked to engage with the project over a long period of time and so their full names and place of work are required by the researchers. Through careful data protection and anonymity measures by University of Wolverhampton staff this potential dilemma will be minimised. Additionally, the wide international involvement means that there may also be ethical issues around cultural differences and translation between languages, which the researchers will be made aware of during interactions with participants.

19. Have participants been/will participants be, fully informed of the risks and benefits of participating and of their right to refuse participation or withdraw from the research at any time?

1. YES (Outline your procedures for informing participants in the space below.
2. NO (Use the space below to explain why)
3. Not applicable - There are no participants in this study
Any contact with participants will be preceded with information about the project and information regarding their withdrawal from the research project. For instance, on the questionnaires recently constructed to evaluate training events pertaining to the project, the first page of the questionnaire outlines the project aims, the purpose of the questionnaire, anonymity measures taken by the researchers, how the data from the questionnaire will be used by the researchers, and details of the ownership of the data collected, along with contact information if the participants have any questions or wish to withdraw (a copy of this is available on request).

20. Are participants in your study going to be recruited from a potentially vulnerable group? (See RPU website (www.wlv.ac.uk/rpu) and follow link to Ethical Guidance pages for definition of vulnerable groups)

1. YES (Describe below which groups and what measures you will take to respect their rights and safeguard them)

2. NO

   It is possible that some participants may be considered potentially vulnerable in terms of learning, physical or mental disabilities (definition B of the Police Act 1997), although these groups will not be directly targeted. In the instance that individuals who do fall into this category are recruited for the project, then further measures will be implemented to ensure understanding of the project, what is required of the individual, and withdrawal procedures are fully explained.

21. How will you ensure that the identity of your participants is protected (See RPU website (www.wlv.ac.uk/rpu) and follow link to Ethical Guidance pages for guidance on anonymity)

   Although the university researchers will have access to participant names in order to enable follow up data collection, all reporting of data will ensure that participants are anonymised, with pseudonyms assigned to each individual.

22. How will you ensure that data remains confidential (See RPU website (www.wlv.ac.uk/rpu) and follow link to Ethical Guidance pages for definition of confidentiality)

   Again, pseudonyms will be assigned to each participant in order to assist with confidentiality. Additionally, any personal or sensitive information which might compromise individuals’ position within the faculty will be discussed with the individuals involved.
23. How will you store your data during and after the project? (See RPU website (www.wlv.ac.uk/rpu) and follow link to Ethical Guidance pages for definition of and guidance on data protection and storage).

All information will be stored on a password protected computer, with data being saved on the University of Wolverhampton servers. The questionnaire data will also be stored on the Survey Monkey website, which has additional protection software. Any printed information will be kept in a locked filing cabinet to which only the PI has access to. Any identifying information (e.g. names, phone numbers) will be kept separately from the data.
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Erasmus+ logo:
All material produced for project activities, training material, projects websites, special events, posters, leaflets, press releases, CD ROMs, etc. must carry the Erasmus+ logo and mention: "Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union"

Methods logo:
All material produced for project activities, training material, projects websites, special events, posters, leaflets, press releases, CD ROMs, etc. must carry METHODS logo.

Formatting:
Font
Use the Times New Roman, as the report font; select 12-point as the recommended size.

Report and other types of documents pages
Allow one-inch margins on all sides
Use 1.15- for spacing the report body
Justify the text
Begin each chapter on its own page; include the chapter’s title at the top of the Page
Start page numbering with the introduction; leave the acknowledgements, table of contents, list of tables, list of figures, and executive summary unnumbered
place page numbers at the right-bottom of the page
Graphics
Place graphics either immediately after they appear in the text or in the appendix section
When using color, keep in mind that users may be printing the report in black and white; if you choose color in graphs or photos, check to make sure the photos and graphics are legible when printed in black and white (if applicable)
Include brief captions to describe the graphic. Keep the type size to 10-points or larger to ensure legibility of the figure or table description
Number tables and figures separately and consecutively as they appear and use a two-number format to indicate the chapter number (for example, Figure 1.1 is the first figure in Chapter One)

Abbreviations
Define abbreviations, acronyms, and symbols the first time they appear, and then use the abbreviation in additional uses.

Contents of reports:

Title Page
Use the sample title page as provided and type over the appropriate information. For consistency, the sample includes the logos, project information and disclaimer statements.

Acknowledgments (optional)
The acknowledgment page recognizes the individuals who and organizations that significantly contributed to the research project. Keep acknowledgments to one page. The acknowledgment page comes before the table of contents and the executive summary. You can add the logo of contributors.

Table of contents
List titles of chapters in the table of contents as they appear in the report body.

List of tables and list of figures, if the report includes tables and figures
Sequentially list each table/figure number and title, as well as the page number on which the table/figure appears. The list of tables and/or list of figures follow the table of contents on a separate page.

Executive summary

DISCLAIMER: 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.
The executive summary provides a concise synopsis of the report, the main findings or results, conclusions, the significance of the research, and recommendations. Limit the length of the executive summary to no more than four pages. The executive summary will be used as a stand-alone summary of the report. This section should be set up with a brief description of the problem that was addressed, the objectives of the project, a description of the effort and a summary of the outcome and findings with an emphasis on the research impact.

Introduction
The introduction serves as the report’s first chapter and should be no more than one page. The introduction addresses the report issue, the background of the report, report goals, the basic approach to the project, and the report organization. Unlike the executive summary, it does not include research results, conclusions, or recommendations.

Report body
The report body’s organization and content vary depending on the nature of the research project, but usually follow the direction that the work plan outlines. Most reports include the background of the research problem, the research approach and methods, an analysis of research results, conclusions, and recommendations for implementation and further testing. Organize the report body in chapters; each chapter starts on its own page, with the introduction as the report’s first chapter.

References
Include only those references in the reference section that you cite in the report; include other references as part of a bibliography
Attribute unpublished material, telephone conversations, and other personal communication in the body of the report and not in the reference section
You may use any acceptable style recommended by your discipline, as long as it is followed consistently throughout the report

Appendices (if needed)
Appendices consist of material that supports the report but isn’t critical in understanding project results. Appendices follow the report body.
When writing original material for an appendix, use the typeface Times, or a variation of Times, as the font; select at least 11-point type for body copy, with 12-point as the recommended size
Label appendices by letter (Appendix A, Appendix B, Appendix C. etc.)
Include a title page for each appendix, which includes the Appendix letter (for example, Appendix A) and the appendix title
Meetings evaluation
All face to face meetings are evaluated using the following survey: View here: https://www.surveymonkey.net/r/?sm=wfDg6mV1QtS_2F_2BxCVvIxF7lfYbcLDLtkP6oe1_2B0weZe4_3D

Schedule of quality meetings
Meetings of the Quality Committee are scheduled as part of the regular monthly meetings and sub committees as required
By the demands of the project.

Status update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Acceptance criteria</th>
<th>Due date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Roles and responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(GOV) Convene and schedule quality</td>
<td>All relevant work package leads are members</td>
<td>March 16</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>All work package leads will attend quality committee meetings required for their area of work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assurance committee</td>
<td>All QA and Evaluation tools are reviewed and agreed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All other issues re ethics/scientific outputs/culture and language are monitored</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(GOV) Create QA</td>
<td>Plan is Dynamic</td>
<td>March 16</td>
<td>UoW (WP6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>Plan is agreed by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation plan</td>
<td>QA committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan includes the development of Quality Criteria for all activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan includes development of quality assurance tool for all scheduled activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Criteria (QCC) developed for baseline study.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QAM baseline study: develop study in partnership with Palestinian technical UNI WP2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Criteria (QC) &amp; Quality Assurance (QA) baseline study: develop study in partnership with Palestinian technical UNI WP2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey complies with ethical requirements. Survey includes an agreed set of foci/themes. Survey sample and demographic is agreed. Survey is designed to show change over the period of the project against established descriptors of organisational development in ICT. Survey is accessible. Survey is triangulated by other tools/focus groups/structured interviews.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(QCC): Social science checklist is developed for all enquiry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Checklist is accepted by quality committee. Checklist is</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>March 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PTU/UOW/QAC/WP2 Lead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>April 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP2 lead and QAC and UOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QCC: Develop quality criteria/template for training programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QAM: Peer review QA system is established and moderation/sign off to agreed criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QAM: Quality assurance of training events. Review of training events. Development of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation tool(s).

Analysis of results.

Digital habits survey is incorporated into initial pre course and post course evaluation tools so that data collection is derived from actual events.

Consider self efficacy too?

about the project/programme, normally measured by the use of reaction questionnaires based upon their perceptions.

Level two: Learning – this moves the evaluation on to assessing the changes in knowledge, skills or attitude with respect to the programme/project objectives.

Level three: Behaviour – evaluation at this level attempts to answer the question: are the newly acquired skills, knowledge or attitude being used in the everyday environment of the programme?

Level four: Results – this level seeks to evaluate the success of the programme in terms of results.

survey is implemented with all training dates and then followed up with participants at 3 and 6 months after this.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QCC. Develop criteria for evaluation of learning objects</th>
<th>Broad quality criteria for learning object design developed. Evaluation tool is based on criteria for design.</th>
<th>Before commencement of production</th>
<th>LO WP5/3 design leads / UOW/QASC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QAM. Evaluation of learning objects</td>
<td>QA system is developed that allows peer review and moderation/sign off to agreed criteria.</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>LO WP5 /3design leads / UOW/QASC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QCC: Educational portal review/Is this currently</td>
<td>Educational portal is reviewed by expert group from consortia.</td>
<td>Expert panel needed Before commencement of production</td>
<td>Expert panel required/Review criteria developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>being planned</td>
<td>Review criteria developed. Educational portal design is evaluated/reviewed before implementation by users. Educational portal reviews inform design and functionality of portal iteratively.</td>
<td>Plan for portal production needed November 16</td>
<td>QACS/ WP3/4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QCC. Smart Classroom design checklist</td>
<td>Smart classroom design is informed by current practice. Plans are approved by QAC subcommittee.</td>
<td>Before purchase November 16</td>
<td>QASC WP4 Diana.. Webinar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting Year 3</td>
<td>Impact evaluation tool developed to add to Existing data collection through digital habits tool.</td>
<td>March 17</td>
<td>QASC WP 6. This is about all parts of impact evaluation across the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting Year 3</td>
<td>Reports written as per schedule</td>
<td>June 17 – Sept 17</td>
<td>QASC WP6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External evaluation.</td>
<td>Contract external evaluator</td>
<td>Feb 17</td>
<td>QASC WP6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External evaluation carried out.</td>
<td>External evaluation reporting period</td>
<td>Oct 17</td>
<td>QASC WP6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
External Evaluation Specification

**Project Title:** Modernization of Teaching Methodologies in Higher Education: Eu Experience For Jordan and Palestinian Territory

**Project acronym:** METHODS

**Project Number:** 561940-EPP-1-2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

**Funding scheme:** Erasmus+ Programme (Capacity-Building projects in the field of Higher Education (E+CBHE))

**Start date of the project:** 15/10/2015  
**Duration:** 36 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable title</th>
<th>External Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Author(s)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization name(s)</strong></td>
<td>The University of Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deliverable No.</strong></td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deliverable Type</strong></td>
<td>Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WP Number</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WP Leader</strong></td>
<td>UOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Due date of delivery</strong></td>
<td>1/9/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prepared on</strong></td>
<td>6/1/2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project month**

DISCLAIMER: 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.
External Evaluator Appointment

Main role of evaluator:
The external evaluator role is mainly to assess the project as a whole in its progress toward agreed objectives and contribution to support the EU standard for the project implementation. It is expected that the external evaluator will be in regular contact with the coordinator via electronic means (i.e. email, Skype, etc.) and will be invited to participate remotely in the project meetings with all partners at least once a year.

Selection criteria
Past experience in evaluation of complex multinational educational projects or similar
Evidence of the ability to work with partners to formulate an appropriate robust evaluation framework
Evidence of ability to undertake appropriate quantitative and qualitative methodologies and case studies for evaluation
Evidence of the ability to analyse and present evaluation data in an appropriate and professional way
Evidence of good communications skills (both verbal and written) in English

Cost
Qualifications of Evaluator
Minimum of a Master’s degree (with a research or evaluation component) or other appropriate qualifications.

Maximum price of the contract
The maximum price is €3000 inclusive of VAT if applicable (depending on if VAT registered and country based in).

Needed tasks from the evaluator:
The subcontractor will provide an evaluation report in English on the quality of the project performance within the whole project period from 15/10/2015 to 14/10/2018 or 14/10/2019 (if the project period could be extended) and summaries, as well as some suggestions on improving the overall performance of the project. The subcontractor will, therefore, deliver two reports:
Intermediate report: From 15/10/2015 until 15/4/2017. This is expected to be a retrospective evaluation report based on a review of existing reports from the project inception.
Final Report: From 15/4/2017 until the end of the project. This will be either 14/10/2018 or 14/10/2019, depending on the approval of the EU to extend the project. It is expected that the final report will be completed 1 month prior to the project’s termination (i.e. either 14/09/2018 or 14/09/2019, depending on the approval of the EU to extend the project).
The contractor will provide the monitoring reports for the subcontractor. These reports have been prepared for 6 month periods.

Dates on which the agreement begins and ends:
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Start date: 01/09/2017
End date: 15/10/18 (depending on approval of extension of the project)

Delivery of the agreed work
The subcontractor will start the project evaluation as soon as they have received the total number of produced outcomes that have been agreed above, and will deliver his report within 15 working days.

Amount to be paid:
€3000 EUR inclusive of VAT if applicable (depending on if VAT registered and country based in). This will be paid in two rates. The first rate (50%) will be paid after delivering the intermediate report and the second rate (50%) will be paid after delivering the final Report.

Detailed description of the costs on which this figure is based:
The work to be performed is considered to take place remotely via electronic communication means such as email, web conference, etc. No mission or travel expenses have been considered on the above amount. In the case of the contractor requesting the subcontractor to be present in face-to-face meeting(s), then this will be covered by the project.

Furthermore, the evaluation work to be performed by the subcontractor concerns only the given period. If further evaluations are requested by the contractor then this is out of the scope of this agreement, and another agreement will be established.

Necessary background information
The contractor shall provide the subcontractor with background information on the project, such as the website, the technical annex of the project, and any other material that is considered important to be taken into account.
Email to be send for potential subcontractor:

Dear>>

We have received a good recommendation regarding your external evaluation work. As such, we are writing to offer you an external evaluator position for an Erasmus + project, entitled "Modernization of Teaching Methodologies in Higher Education: Eu Experience For Jordan and Palestinian Territory-METHODS". This is a 3-year project which started on the 15th October, 2015 and is co-funded by the Erasmus+ programme of the European Union. It is coordinated by The University of Jordan (UJ) with 14 partners from Jordan, Palestine and European countries.

The project aims at improving the quality of teaching and learning at the partner universities, with cooperation of EU-experience, through incorporating technological tools in consistence with pedagogical best practices and by building the capacity of the universities to evaluate, develop and design e-curricula.

If you are interested in the project and in the role of external evaluator, kindly please send us your CV.

Please let me know if you have any questions or would like to discuss the offer in more detail, so we could arrange an online meeting to discuss the needed tasks and the amount to be paid.

We would be excited to welcome you to the project!