

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



Transfer of Good Practices
& Reinforcement of
Internationalisation
Strategies in Kurdistan

KA2- Cooperation for innovation and the exchange of good practices – Capacity Building
in the Field of higher Education

Call for Proposals: EAC/A05/2016

Contract Number: 586290-EPP-1-2017-1-DE-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP

TIGRIS

PROJECT QUALITY PLAN

WP4: Quality Plan and Control

Coordinator: GII

ORGANIZATION NAME: UGOE	AUTHOR: Carlos Machado		
APPROVED: Uwe Brandenburg / TIGRIS Steering Committee			
DESCRIPTION: Quality Plan			
DOCUMENT CODE: TIGRIS QP	VERSION : 1.0	SUBMISSION DATE 07/05/2018	PAGE 1 of 22



Document Title **Quality Plan**

Date of Issue	24/04/2018		
Author(s)	Carlos Machado, Uwe Brandenburg		
Contributors	All Project Partners		
Contact name			
E-mail address			
Organisation			
Approval Status	Draft <input type="checkbox"/>		Final <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Number of Pages	28		
Keyword list	Quality Management, Quality Planning, Quality, Assurance, Quality Control		
Recipients	Only Partners <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Public <input type="checkbox"/>
Method of Distribution	Email <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Internet <input type="checkbox"/>
Confidentiality Status	Confidential <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Public <input type="checkbox"/>

History

Version No	Date	Revised by
1	30.04.2018	Uwe Brandenburg
2	20.05.2018	Carlos Machado
3	05.06.2018	Jakob Hedderich
Etc		

Summary

In the context of the current project, quality is described as the degree to which the project fulfils requirements. The elements of quality identified through this approach are quality planning, quality assurance and quality control.

ORGANIZATION NAME: UGOE		AUTHOR: Carlos Machado		
APPROVED: Uwe Brandenburg / TIGRIS Steering Committee				
DESCRIPTION: Quality Plan				
DOCUMENT CODE: TIGRIS QP		VERSION : 1.0	SUBMISSION DATE 07/05/2018	PAGE 2 of 22



Identifying standards is a major part of quality planning. Quality standards refer to the standards set for the assurance of the quality of project processes and project deliverables.

At the beginning of the project a Quality Plan (QP) will formalize the approach that will be followed by the partners of the project to ensure the highest possible quality of the project activities, outputs and outcomes and project management.

The deliverable itself is produced based on clear responsibilities: A Quality Leading Team (QLT) will be composed of UGOE, GII and UOS to assess the quality of the online courses. Activities of the QLT involve the Coordinator, members of the Project Steering Committee (PSC) of the project and external key stakeholders (ministries, association of students). The QP will be approved by the PSC and adopted by each Project Management Team (PMT). The QP will be made available on the project website. During the project implementation, staff involved in the project will also monitor the implementation and acceptance of the quality procedures along with the SPC and support the quality control of the project in its reinforcement. This QP will define the necessary procedures for:

- Internal monitoring, quality and risk management,
- External monitoring, and
- Technical and financial reporting.

Any conflict that might arise during the project will be resolved in a friendly manner through adequate institutional bodies. Any delays or misunderstandings regarding project activities will be discussed and resolved at consortium meetings through generally reached consensus. Since the partners in the consortium were selected on the basis of established mutual trust, the project is based on the premise of the continuation of the fruitful and successful collaboration.

The QP defines also the quality expectations regarding the project deliverables, i.e. reports and documents, events/workshops/meetings as well as procedures for internal and external monitoring. The structure of the deliverable is as follows:

- Definition of quality objectives and indicators related to its deliverables, trainings, meetings, events and other activities as well as the general guidelines to be followed.
- Internal monitoring strategy and responsibilities of the project partners with individual performance indicators. Among the potential indicators we can cite:
 - Monitoring the implementation of the different phases of development and the results of the surveys for key stakeholders. Feedback on implementation by Ministry and partners.
 - Number and quality of plans for internationalisation and sustainability developed
 - Perceived impact of the project in HEI development
- External monitoring. As external quality control, apart from the review of external stakeholders, the consortium has engaged the company “CM consulting” to provide an independent assessment on the quality, attainment of objectives, efficiency and sustainability of the project using both formative and summative assessment. The external evaluator was chosen according to certain criteria based on the CV, experience in internationalization, knowledge on cooperation and development programs, their methodology, management techniques and cost and familiarity with EACEA and Erasmus + procedures. A Terms of Reference will cover the scope, timespan and aim of the evaluation. The external evaluator will have access to all project documentation to obtain data via SWOT analysis, interviews, documentation from internal evaluations, etc. The external evaluator shall provide their monitoring

ORGANIZATION NAME: UGOE		AUTHOR: Carlos Machado		
APPROVED: Uwe Brandenburg / TIGRIS Steering Committee				
DESCRIPTION: Quality Plan				
DOCUMENT CODE: TIGRIS QP		VERSION : 1.0	SUBMISSION DATE 07/05/2018	PAGE 3 of 22



results before the intermediate progress report for the consortium members to take action on.

- Financial and technical reporting duties of the partners. There are two main purposes of the reporting. The formal reporting, by UGOE, provides the necessary information to the EACEA to assure them that this project is being implemented according to the Grant Agreement and that payments should therefore be released. The annual and mid-term reports by partner HEIs will provide information to the coordinator and QLT to allow them to verify the level of allocation and implementation of financial resources in progress.

Abbreviations of Project Partners in QMP

P1	Georg-August Universität Göttingen (UGOE)
P2	Katholique Universiteit Leuven (KUL)
P3	Masaryk University (MU)
P4	RijksUniversiteit Groningen (RUG)
P5	Global Impact Institute (GII)
P6	Kurdistan Institution for Strategic Studies and Scientific Research (KISSR)
P7	University of Sulaimani (UOS)
P8	Sulaimani Polytechnic University (SPU)
P9	University of Raparin (UOR)
P10	University of Halabja (UoH)
P11	Charmo University (CHU)
P12	Duhoc Polytechnic University (DPU)
P13	Erbil Polytechnic University (EPU)
P14	Salahaddin University (SU)
P15	Ministry of Higher Education and Science of Kurdistan (MHESR)

ORGANIZATION NAME: UGOE		AUTHOR: Carlos Machado		
APPROVED: Uwe Brandenburg / TIGRIS Steering Committee				
DESCRIPTION: Quality Plan				
DOCUMENT CODE: TIGRIS QP		VERSION : 1.0	SUBMISSION DATE 07/05/2018	PAGE 4 of 22



Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	6
1.1 Purpose of the Project Quality Plan	6
1.2 Quality Management Strategy	6
1.2.1 Quality Planning.....	6
1.2.2 Quality Assurance	7
1.2.3 Quality Control	7
2. ANALYSIS OF PROJECT'S PROCESSES QUALITY STANDARDS PER WORK PACKAGE.	8
3. QUALITY ASSURANCE AND QUALITY CONTROL TOOLS	17
4. QUALITY AND CONSISTENCY OF OUTPUTS WITH THE PROJECT'S IMAGE	18
BIBLIOGRAPHY	19
APPENDICES	20

ORGANIZATION NAME: UGOE		AUTHOR: Carlos Machado		
APPROVED: Uwe Brandenburg / TIGRIS Steering Committee				
DESCRIPTION: Quality Plan				
DOCUMENT CODE: TIGRIS QP		VERSION : 1.0	SUBMISSION DATE 07/05/2018	PAGE 5 of 22



1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of the Project Quality Plan

The Project Quality Plan documents the necessary information required to effectively manage project quality from project planning to delivery. It defines the project's quality policies, procedures, criteria for and areas of application, and roles, responsibilities and authorities.

More specifically, the goals for quality for the TIGRIS project are to ensure:

- Project management processes are appropriately followed
- Project deliverables meet their stated requirements

The above goals are to be assured through:

- A quality system that is implemented and maintained
- The identification of responsibilities of all involved partners regarding quality
- The compliance and alignment of all deliverables with the grant agreement
- The organization and monitoring of all processes relevant to the project at a high level of effectiveness and quality.

1.2 Quality Management Strategy

Quality management is performed throughout the project lifecycle through three main processes:

1. **Quality Planning** – primarily during the project planning process.
2. **Quality Assurance**– primarily during the project execution process.
3. **Quality Control**– primarily during the project monitoring and controlling processes.

1.2.1 Quality Planning

Quality planning is done during the development phase of the project life cycle. It determines quality policies and procedures relevant to the project for both project deliverables and project processes, defines who is responsible for what, and documents compliance. The QP focuses on the key components shown in Table 1, followed by an explanation of each of the key components:

Table 1 Key components of the Quality Plan

Objects of quality review	Quality Measure	Quality Evaluation Methods
Project Processes	Process Quality Standards Stakeholder Expectations Risk Identification	Quality Assurance Activities
Project Deliverables	Deliverable Quality Standards Stakeholders Satisfaction	Quality Control Activities

Project Processes and Project Deliverables: The key project processes and deliverables subject to quality review.

Process Quality Standards: The quality standards that are the “measures” used to determine if project work processes are being followed.

ORGANIZATION NAME: UGOE		AUTHOR: Carlos Machado		
APPROVED: Uwe Brandenburg / TIGRIS Steering Committee				
DESCRIPTION: Quality Plan				
DOCUMENT CODE: TIGRIS QP		VERSION : 1.0	SUBMISSION DATE 07/05/2018	PAGE 6 of 22



Stakeholder Expectations: Stakeholder expectations describe when a project process is effective as defined by the project stakeholders. An example is the review and approval of all high impact changes to the project.

Deliverable Quality Standards: The quality standards that are the “measures” used to determine a successful outcome for a deliverable. These standards may vary dependent on the type of the project.

Stakeholders Satisfaction: The Stakeholders satisfaction criteria describe when each deliverable is complete and acceptable. Deliverables are evaluated against these criteria.

Quality Assurance Activities: The quality assurance activities monitor and verify that the processes used to manage and create the deliverables are followed and are effective.

Quality Control Activities: The quality control activities that monitor and verify that the project deliverables meet defined quality standards.

1.2.2 Quality Assurance

Quality assurance consists of what must be done during the actual tasks to ensure that the standards identified during quality planning are met. It is therefore done during the implementation phase of the project life cycle. The focus of quality assurance is on the processes used in the project. Quality assurance ensures that project processes are used effectively to produce quality project deliverables. It involves following and meeting standards, continuously improving project work, and correcting project defects.

1.2.3 Quality Control

The focus of quality control is on the deliverables of the project. Quality control monitors project deliverables to verify that the deliverables are of acceptable quality. It also takes place during the implementation phase of the project life cycle.

ORGANIZATION NAME: UGOE		AUTHOR: Carlos Machado		
APPROVED: Uwe Brandenburg / TIGRIS Steering Committee				
DESCRIPTION: Quality Plan				
DOCUMENT CODE: TIGRIS QP		VERSION : 1.0	SUBMISSION DATE 07/05/2018	PAGE 7 of 22



2. ANALYSIS OF PROJECT'S PROCESSES QUALITY STANDARDS PER WORK PACKAGE

In the following tables an analysis of project's processes quality standards per work package is being performed by respective WP Leaders and GII. The quality assurance activities are being described and the responsible partner for each activities process is noted. The associated risks are also identified.

In the following tables an analysis of Project's deliverables quality standards per Work Package is being performed by respective WP Leaders, the as the leader for the Work Package and UGOE as the Project Leader. The quality control activities are being described and the responsible partner for each activity process is noted.

N.B. Editor's Note: It is important for the partners responsible for each work package to review the respective section and make any necessary changes. Each WP Leader is free to fill out the tables that correspond to their WP as they see fit.

ORGANIZATION NAME: UGOE		AUTHOR: Carlos Machado		
APPROVED: Uwe Brandenburg / TIGRIS Steering Committee				
DESCRIPTION: Quality Plan				
DOCUMENT CODE: TIGRIS QP		VERSION : 1.0	SUBMISSION DATE 07/05/2018	PAGE 8 of 22



Table 2 Analysis of WP1: Preparation – Processes & Deliverables, Quality Standards and Risks

WP 1: Preparation				
Leader: P2 KUL				
Participating: All partners HEIs				
Quality control level: internal & external				
No.	WP Process & Deliverables	Quality Standards	Quality Assurance Activity	Risks
1	Development of institutional strategies and establishment of infrastructure for improvement of Internationalization processes		Internal/External	Lack of commitment of partners and sense of ownership, especially the universities from Kurdistan.
1.1.	Analysis of existing national legislatives underpinning internationalisation in EU partners and Kurdistan	Meet deadlines	KUL review first draft and provide feedback to UGOE and TIGRIS Steering Committee.	Lack of commitment from partners
		Survey reflects all pertinent issues	After feedback KUL compiles revised draft to be considered by all the partners.	Missing a critical information that can distort results
		Accurate translations from and into English and local languages	Proof reading by professionals within HEIs	If done in English, participants should be able to be competent in English. If done in Arab, translations should be accurate.
1.2	Identification of standards for the accreditation of joint and double degrees in Kurdistan.	Response rate/ response representativeness	The Results are presented in annual partner meeting	Missing deadline
		Proper thorough analysis	KUL review first draft and provide feedback to UGOE and TIGRIS Steering Committee.	Not identifying accreditation procedures
		Accuracy of data submitted by Kurdish partners on existing accreditation procedures	After feedback KUL compiles revised draft to be considered by all the partners.	Failing to take into consideration all relevant parameters and having an incomplete analysis
1.3	Identification of criteria to formulate a quality plan for internationalisation	Adherence to Bologna standards and best practices in quality of internationalisation	The results and the recommended course contents will be reviewed by EU experts.	Failing to take into consideration all relevant parameters and having an incomplete analysis for a quality plan
		Participation rate/ representativeness	The Results are presented in annual partner meeting	Missing deadline

ORGANIZATION NAME: UGOE	AUTHOR: Carlos Machado		
APPROVED: Uwe Brandenburg / TIGRIS Steering Committee			
DESCRIPTION: Quality Plan			
DOCUMENT CODE: TIGRIS QP	VERSION : 1.0	SUBMISSION DATE 07/05/2018	PAGE 9 of 22



1.4	Identification of conditions for the recruitment of foreign students, PhD students, teachers and researchers at Kurdish HEIs	A comprehensive catalogue of existing procedures and conditions for recruitment.	The findings of the survey and the report will be reviewed and assessed by experts in internationalisation	Not identifying recruitment procedures
		Adherence to the Bologna process and best practices in all partner countries.	The results will be reviewed by EU experts.	Failing to take into consideration all relevant parameters and having an incomplete analysis for recruitment practices

Table 3 Analysis of WP2: Reinforcement of capacities – Processes & Deliverables Quality Standards and Risks

WP 2: Reinforcement of capacities				
Leader: UGOE				
Participating: All partners HEIs				
Quality control level: internal & external				
No.	WP Process & Deliverables	Quality Standards	Quality Assurance Activity	Risks
2	Enhancement of Human Resources and institutional capacities to facilitate the internationalization process	Completion of visits	Use of Internal quality assurance mechanism developed by GII	Lack of Motivation from authorities and participants towards the achievement of project goals Nepotism or cronyism in selection of participants.
2.1.	Study visits to EU and trainings for MHESR and HEI authorities	Visits correspond to participants and Kurdish needs.	Arrangement of satisfaction questionnaire for study visits	Lack of Management of differences in terms of terminology, understanding, socio-cultural, economic, political and financial conditions which may hinder the progress of implementation on the ground
2.2	Organisation of trainings for members of Kurdish partner HEI for strategic development of internationalization	RUG and UGOE will organise trainings according to Kurdish needs	Survey and questionnaire for participants to assess quality of trainings	Lack of satisfaction from participants.
		Kurdish institutions will provide adequate participants	Revision of selection procedures and selection of participants	Profile of selected participants do not correspond with trainings

ORGANIZATION NAME: UGOE		AUTHOR: Carlos Machado		
APPROVED: Uwe Brandenburg / TIGRIS Steering Committee				
DESCRIPTION: Quality Plan				
DOCUMENT CODE: TIGRIS QP		VERSION : 1.0	SUBMISSION DATE 07/05/2018	PAGE 10 of 22



2.3	Organisations of workshops and seminars to facilitate the scope and quality of international projects and strategic (research) partnerships	KUL and UGOE will organise workshops and seminars that enhance the quality of international projects and strategic (research) partnerships	Survey and questionnaire for participants to assess quality of seminars and workshops	Lack of satisfaction from participants.
		Kurdish institutions will provide adequate participants	Revision of selection procedures and selection of participants	Profile of selected participants do not correspond with trainings
2.4	Organisation of capacity building program for IRO manager and administrative staff and reinforcement of IRO structures.	MU will organise a capacity building program for IRO managers and administrative staff corresponding to Kurdish institutions needs	Survey and questionnaire for participants to assess quality of capacity building program	Lack of interest to maintain EU based management practices in Kurdistan
		Kurdish institutions will provide adequate participants	Revision of selection procedures and selection of participants	Profile of selected participants do not correspond with trainings

Table 4 *Analysis of WP3: Formulation of strategies – Processes & Deliverables Quality Standards and Risks*

WP 3: Formulation of Strategies				
Leader: UGOE				
Participating: All partners HEIs				
Quality control level: internal & external				
No.	WP Process & Deliverables	Quality Standards	Quality Assurance Activity	Risks
3	Formulation of strategies for internationalization	Completion of strategies for internationalisation	Internal monitoring on development of strategies for internationalisation External review on strategies delivered by Kurdish partners	Lack of commitment of partners and sense of ownership, especially the universities from Kurdistan.
3.1.	Development of national strategy on academic mobility and recognition of degrees and internationalization	Bologna standards introduced in mobility programs	RUG will develop a training program to develop updated and individualised strategies for academic mobility and recognition	Lack of commitment from Kurdish partners to respect recognition programs
		Accreditation and recognition procedures compatible with EU standards	Recognition of mobilities and diplomas from/to EU recognised by HEIs and MHES in Kurdistan	Lack of commitment from MHES to respect recognition procedures

ORGANIZATION NAME: UGOE		AUTHOR: Carlos Machado		
APPROVED: Uwe Brandenburg / TIGRIS Steering Committee				
DESCRIPTION: Quality Plan				
DOCUMENT CODE: TIGRIS QP		VERSION : 1.0	SUBMISSION DATE 07/05/2018	PAGE 11 of 22



3.2	Development of institutional strategy on internationalisation of Kurdish higher education and research.	Integration of internationalization strategies within HEIs in Kurdistan	KUL will develop a training program to develop updated and individualised strategies for internationalisation	Relevance of new strategies for Kurdish partners
		Endorsement of EU standards in strategies for internationalisation	Strategies approved internally and supervised by MHES	Lack of motivation from participants
3.3	Development of QA for internationalization	Use of EU recognized standards for QA for internationalization	GII will develop a training program for QA on internationalisation	Lack of interest to maintain QA for internationalisation practices in Kurdistan
		Participation rate/ representativeness	Training program approved and validated by steering committee	Lack of motivation from participants
3.4	Development of management practices at IROs	Learning objectives clearly identified for the training program	MU will develop a training program for the management of IROs	Lack of interest to maintain management practices in Kurdistan
		Use of well developed and tested training program on management of IROs	Training program approved and validated by steering committee	Lack of motivation from participants

Table 5 Analysis of WP4: Quality Plan – Processes & Deliverables Quality Standards and Risks

WP 4 TIGRIS Quality Assurance Leader: GII Participating: All Partner HEIs				
No.	WP Process& Deliverables	Quality Standards	Quality Assurance Activity	Risks
4	Quality Plan	Develop a comprehensive Quality Plan (QP) that will include both internal and external evaluation Internal Quality assurance – follow up and monitoring of activities (tools: roadmaps, Gantt charts, dashboards, etc). Assessing and measuring that the activities are in line with the project objectives (logical framework, SWOT analysis, etc); Internal peer review of the quality of the products	GII will monitor the quality assurance activity.	Lack of motivation to develop and maintain the QP.
			Draft QP reviewed by GII and then by all partners.	
			WP leaders will develop their own tables on their respective WPs	Partners ignoring the process as not critical.

ORGANIZATION NAME: UGOE	AUTHOR: Carlos Machado			
APPROVED: Uwe Brandenburg / TIGRIS Steering Committee				
DESCRIPTION: Quality Plan				
DOCUMENT CODE: TIGRIS QP	VERSION : 1.0	SUBMISSION DATE 07/05/2018	PAGE 12 of 22	



		External Evaluation – peer–review by academic/admin staff from non-partner HIEs, representatives from local authorities/private companies		
4.1	Internal monitoring of activities	Biannual report	The biannual reports will be provided by UOS, reviewed by GII and then submitted to all partners.	Failure to develop a comprehensive biannual report
4.2	Evaluation of national and institutional internationalisation strategies; standards, action plans and sets of recommendations	Use of recognised and tested models for evaluation of internationalization.	Draft framework on evaluation of internationalisation will be reviewed by GII and submitted to all partners.	Failure to develop an adequate reference frame. .
		Rich information provided by each partner in Kurdistan	UOS will collect information from all Kurdish partners	Failing to meet deadlines. Poor quality deliverables
4.3	Internal peer review and fine tuning of IRO practices and student services	High level of expertise in peer review members composition	Participation of EU experts in peer review through site visits	Visa issues, political instability to visit Kurdistan by EU experts
		Benchmarking with EU practices	TIGRIS will establish a group of internal and external to the project experts to review and assess the IRO practices and student services.	Failure to put together a good panel that will review the program and contents and provide constructive feedback.
4.4	External Evaluation	Formative and summative report provided by external expert in QA	The formative and summative report will reviewed by GII and UGOE and then by all partners.	Relevance to the project. Failure to develop proper formative and summative evaluation instruments.

ORGANIZATION NAME: UGOE	AUTHOR: Carlos Machado		
APPROVED: Uwe Brandenburg / TIGRIS Steering Committee			
DESCRIPTION: Quality Plan			
DOCUMENT CODE: TIGRIS QP	VERSION : 1.0	SUBMISSION DATE 07/05/2018	PAGE 13 of 22



Table 6 Analysis of WP5: Dissemination and exploitation - Processes & Deliverables Quality Standards and Risks

WP4: Dissemination & Exploitation of TIGRIS Leader: KISSR Participating: All Partner HEIs				
No.	WP Process& Deliverables	Quality Standards	Quality Assurance Activity	Risks
5	Dissemination and exploitation	Produce high quality outputs	Review, provide feedback and approve deliverables	Not meeting the sponsor's expectations
5.1	Development and maintenance of project website and social media	Produce high quality, website and social media presence	Review, provide feedback and approve deliverables	Not securing a good URL internet name. Delays in developing the website and social media Delays in publishing and distributing newsletters Poor quality and performance
5.2	Organisation of promotional activities to advertise Kurdish higher education and research in the country and abroad.	Plan ahead & have clear objectives in mind. Identify suitable venue. Prepare a meaningful, interesting agenda Identify and invite possible attendees	Review, provide feedback and approve deliverables	Lack of awareness and commitment from stakeholders and the intended audience
5.3	Organisation of annual dissemination conferences and regular conferences	Plan ahead & have clear objectives in mind. Identify suitable venue.	Review, provide feedback and approve deliverables	Lack of awareness and commitment from stakeholders to organize a successful event

ORGANIZATION NAME: UGOE		AUTHOR: Carlos Machado		
APPROVED: Uwe Brandenburg / TIGRIS Steering Committee				
DESCRIPTION: Quality Plan				
DOCUMENT CODE: TIGRIS QP		VERSION : 1.0	SUBMISSION DATE 07/05/2018	PAGE 14 of 22



		Prepare a meaningful, interesting agenda Identify and invite possible attendees		
5.4	Network to support internationalisation established at KISSR	Business plan in place Marketing strategies and advertising deployed	Impact analysis	Poor organizational effort Lack of interest on behalf of the targeted groups. Lack of resources to sustain the network

Table 7: Analysis of WP6: Management - Processes & Deliverables Quality Standards and Risks

WP 6: Management Leader: P1 UGOE Participating Partners: All Quality control level: external				
No.	WP Process & Deliverables	Quality Standards	Quality Assurance Activity	Risks
6	Management	Fluent and regular communication Risk management and assessment. Contingency Planning	Edit, regularly review and update the Quality Management Plan ,	Not meeting the sponsor's expectations
6.1	Preparation and approval project management plan and procedures	Use of internationally accepted management procedures	Edit, regularly review and update the Quality Plan, management plan and other management procedures.	Delays in implementation Poor quality deliverables.

ORGANIZATION NAME: UGOE		AUTHOR: Carlos Machado		
APPROVED: Uwe Brandenburg / TIGRIS Steering Committee				
DESCRIPTION: Quality Plan				
DOCUMENT CODE: TIGRIS QP		VERSION : 1.0	SUBMISSION DATE 07/05/2018	PAGE 15 of 22



	Conflict identification and resolution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Collaboration between partners -Efficiency -Partners' engagement -Fairness -Transparency 	-Monitoring Consistency with Project Management Plan	Problems in collaboration
6.2	Organisation of project management meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tools for concluding to a convenient date for meeting Agenda Clear travel and accommodation information to partners Appropriate meeting place & equipment Attendance list Logistics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Checking that partners are given the opportunity to send preferred dates and being able to travel in a cost efficient manner. Preparation, distribution and completion of attendance list Attendance by all consortium partners Providing early warning for booking of an appropriate meeting place and equipment Continuous contact with partners and preparation of an excel file with partners travelling details which will be completed by the partners before travelling and send to the LP organizer of the meeting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not finding a convenient date for all partners Poor organizational and logistics planning. Clear and detailed agenda and logistics information ahead of the project.
6.3	Financial and administrative management and reporting of project activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transparency Consistency Timeliness accurate transfer of requirements Consistency answer all partners' questions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring consistency with financial guidelines, templates and deadlines for submitting reports and financial data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delays in reporting / meeting deadlines Complaints from partners Requests for clarification

ORGANIZATION NAME: UGOE		AUTHOR: Carlos Machado		
APPROVED: Uwe Brandenburg / TIGRIS Steering Committee				
DESCRIPTION: Quality Plan				
DOCUMENT CODE: TIGRIS QP	VERSION : 1.0	SUBMISSION DATE 07/05/2018	PAGE 16 of 22	



3. QUALITY ASSURANCE AND QUALITY CONTROL TOOLS

Measuring deliverables and processes quality takes place through Quality Assurance and Quality Control.

Quality assurance and **quality control** will be performed through:

- **Processes Review (external QA):** Each process for each WP will be reviewed on a regular basis to check if they meet the set quality standards. This takes place to early identify if the process is successful or if it needs revision in order to result in quality deliverables.
- **Deliverables Review (external QA):** Each deliverable produced of each WP will be reviewed to check if they meet the quality standard set during their development stage.

The **quality control tools** used in the context of the TIGRIS project are listed below:

- **WPs' quality assurance mechanism** (internal QA, Appendix 1): For each WP and each of the WP's deliverables a table will be produced where the quality standards for each deliverable will be checked in terms if they have been met or not and whether the deliverables were produced in time. The quality assurance mechanism as an excel document will be continuously updated by the WP leaders and controlled by the QLT.
- **Partner project progress survey** (external QA, Appendix 2): Every 6 months, the external evaluator will run a short online survey collecting data on the general project development, as well as each individual WP. The survey is meant to be very short and measure for perception of development, efficiency and effectiveness. Every partner has to answer the survey. The external evaluator will provide the QLT with a short report both on the current survey and the results compared to the previous survey(s) with a month after closing of the survey.
- **Event evaluation surveys** (internal QA, Appendix 3 as example): for each training activity (study visits, trainings), an online survey will be produced that will be filled out after the event and serves to assess the output of the respective event. Once a sufficient number of participants (at least 60% for each individual event) have filled in the survey, a short report will be produced and sent to the coordinator.

ORGANIZATION NAME: UGOE		AUTHOR: Carlos Machado		
APPROVED: Uwe Brandenburg / TIGRIS Steering Committee				
DESCRIPTION: Quality Plan				
DOCUMENT CODE: TIGRIS QP		VERSION : 1.0	SUBMISSION DATE 07/05/2018	PAGE 17 of 22



4. QUALITY AND CONSISTENCY OF OUTPUTS WITH THE PROJECT'S IMAGE

All outputs of the project must be consistent with the image for the project in terms of uniformity. The Leaders for the WP5: Dissemination and Exploitation – KISSR is responsible for developing a dissemination plan and the creation of the project's image. Internal and external produced outputs must follow and use the instructions of the respective WP Leader and the logo and templates produced for the quality of the visibility of the project.

Communication Rules:

Communication rules as set by the Project Leader:

- Documents Control (Date, Person who Approved the Doc, Pages, Version number)
- Always refer the project acronym (TIGRIS)
- When somebody refers to the work of other partners they should cc the mail/doc to the partner concerned (unless confidential)
- Communication should always be carried out by the Partners contact points especially when distribution lists are concerned.
- Information flow within the network of Partners should always be notified to the Beneficiary
- Publication of results and dissemination activities: should always mention in the introduction that TIGRIS is an EU co-funded project as well as the names of all participating partners
- Travels should always be reported in short (e.g. field trip to health providing facility) to the different Partners to achieve optimum organization.
- Task/sub-action leaders should be recipients along with the coordinator
- Written communication, Minutes of the Committee meetings
- Communication Language: English
- Changes in documents sent :
 - Revisions: Always highlight what was revised in the document or in the text, e-mail (corrections)
 - New version should be clearly stated with a summary of the new main points
 - New versions of Doc, automatically imply that older version should be deleted or saved as back up doc
 - Internal communication between the partners through e-mails should be kept in logs and minutes to strengthen visibility and clarity.

Partners should start the subject with TIGRIS, then the work package that the communication concerns of and then a more specific brief description: **TIGRIS WP4 QP 1st Draft**

Reports (administrative or financial) will follow the guidelines that follow the relevant template sent by the project leader or the relevant WP leader.

Possible dissemination activities will be recorded by all partners in the dissemination template that will be prepared by the WP5 leader.

External communication with the Press or with identified stakeholders should always be done with reference to the project. The project logo, the Erasmus+ logo and the written mention of project funding should always be present in external communication.

ORGANIZATION NAME: UGOE		AUTHOR: Carlos Machado		
APPROVED: Uwe Brandenburg / TIGRIS Steering Committee				
DESCRIPTION: Quality Plan				
DOCUMENT CODE: TIGRIS QP	VERSION : 1.0	SUBMISSION DATE 07/05/2018	PAGE 18 of 22	



BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Rose, H. K. (2005) 'Project Quality Management: Why, what and how', J. Ross Publishing
2. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 2013, 'Project Quality Management Plan'. Available at: <http://www.itplanning.org.vt.edu/pm/qualitymgmtplan.html> [17/04/14]

ORGANIZATION NAME: UGOE		AUTHOR: Carlos Machado	
APPROVED: Uwe Brandenburg / TIGRIS Steering Committee			
DESCRIPTION: Quality Plan			
DOCUMENT CODE: TIGRIS QP	VERSION : 1.0	SUBMISSION DATE 07/05/2018	PAGE 19 of 22



APPENDICES

1. WPs' quality assurance mechanism

See attached excel document.

ORGANIZATION NAME: UGOE		AUTHOR: Carlos Machado		
APPROVED: Uwe Brandenburg / TIGRIS Steering Committee				
DESCRIPTION: Quality Plan				
DOCUMENT CODE: TIGRIS QP		VERSION : 1.0	SUBMISSION DATE 07/05/2018	PAGE 20 of 22



2. WP Survey DRAFT EXAMPLE (for online survey content)

WP PROGRESS SURVEY

Erasmus +: KA2- Cooperation for innovation and the exchange of good practices –
Capacity Building in the Field of higher Education

WP: _____

DATE: _____

PARTNER: _____

The questions will be asked separately for each WP.

Please rate to what extent you to the following statements:

1 (not at all) to 5 (totally)

	1	2	3	4	5
The WP is efficiently organised.					
I am confident that all deliverables will be produced in time.					
I am very satisfied with the quality of the deliverables produced so far (if any).					
Partners' engagement was adequate and efficient.					
The WP was professionally administered.					
The objectives of the WP were clearly and efficiently communicated to partners					
Sufficient guidelines are being provided for the accomplishment of the WP objectives					
Difficulties, problems, and issues were successfully resolved.					
If the WP is not finished yet: I am convinced that the WP is on a good track to be accomplished.					

Comments:

ORGANIZATION NAME: UGOE	AUTHOR: Carlos Machado		
APPROVED: Uwe Brandenburg / TIGRIS Steering Committee			
DESCRIPTION: Quality Plan			
DOCUMENT CODE: TIGRIS QP	VERSION : 1.0	SUBMISSION DATE 07/05/2018	PAGE 21 of 22

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



Transfer of Good Practices
& Reinforcement of
Internationalisation
Strategies in Kurdistan

1. Study visit - Evaluation Form (for online survey content)

See attached pdf document.



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

ORGANIZATION NAME: UGOE		AUTHOR: Carlos Machado	
APPROVED: Uwe Brandenburg / TIGRIS Steering Committee			
DESCRIPTION: Quality Plan			
DOCUMENT CODE: TIGRIS QP	VERSION : 1.0	SUBMISSION DATE 07/05/2018	PAGE 22 of 22