AGRIENT – Enhancing Youth Entrepreneurship Skills, Careers Guidance and Competences in Agriculture Through a Game Based Virtual Reality Platform

2018-3-HR01-KA205-060151

QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLAN

August 2019

INDEX

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Quality Management Plan contains the description of quality management scope and objectives, methodology and tools for project AGRIENT, and aims to assist in project management.

Quality indicators are defined and monitoring and evaluation tools described for Quality Management on two levels: process and project deliverables.

The below does not replace any tasks or responsibilities described in the original and approved project application.

2. INTRODUCTION

According to the Survival Kit for European Project Management[1], evaluation should be seen as a process permeating project management. This process should be driven by questioning and by the desire for a high quality project. Quality is partly defined through the impact of the project, but should also extend to relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and long-term sustainability.

Measuring the impact and quality of projects is not easy, it is much more straightforward to assess if the outputs (publications, courses, websites) have been produced, and produced on time. Evaluation is a process that must not be left to the final stages of the project.

2.1 Scope

This Quality Management Plan is to be applied to the process of implementation of the AGRIENT project, funded by Erasmus+ / Key Action 2 - Cooperation for innovation and the exchange of good practices, Strategic Partnerships for Youth (European Commission, EACEA).

2.2. Objectives and general approach

The main goal of Quality Management Plan is to establish a support mechanism for project management in order to ensure smooth cooperation and high quality of project outputs.

The objectives of Quality Management in AGRIENT:

- Raising awareness about quality within the project and support of decision making processes,

- Provision of feedback to the coordinator and the project partners,

---

[1] Bienzle, H. (ed.): A Survival Kit for European Project Management. Advice for Coordinators of Centralised Socrates Projects; 3rd revised edition; 2004.

- Contribution to clear user orientation in the development of project outputs, and positive public relations,

- Outlining improvement potentials concerning processes and results. The Plan is developed aiming to facilitate

Quality Management on two levels:

1) Process – smooth and timely implementation of the project,

2) Project Deliverables – quality training programme, support materials, etc., based on the needs of the target groups and specifications described in project application and Grant Agreement.

The Plan is based on the basic cycle/ processes of quality management that include Quality Planning, Quality Assurance and Quality Control.

In Quality Planning, project goals and indicators that will be used to evaluate the quality of the project are defined; methods to achieve, control and verify success, as well as quality management tasks distribution among the partners are established.

Quality should be assured with a help of the tools set in quality planning, predicting and verifying the achievement of goals and need for corrective actions.

Quality Control includes identifying project risk factors, and uncovering, analyzing and correcting problems, should they occur.

The Project Management Coordinator – SIBENIK (P1) will assign a Quality Manager (QM) that will lead Quality planning, assurance and control will be responsible for the implementation of the Quality Management Plan.

3. QUALITY PLANNING AND ASSURANCE

3.1. Project goal, objectives, expected results

In order to set a Quality Management plan, it is important to establish what the project aims to achieve and what it should produce for the target group.

The AGRIENT project aims to develop an innovative and systematic approach to train and support young people to succeed in formulating, starting and running their own agribusinesses.

The project will produce **2 outputs** that are completely new and innovative in terms of learning methods, courses and youth training approaches in virtual reality environments. The general expected results are the following: Intellectual Outputs: O1: Design of Agro-Entepreneurship Curriculum, Formulation of Innovative Courses and Creation of Open Educational Resources O2: Game-based 3D Virtual Reality Educational Platform for Agro-Entepreneurship Education

- Quality Management Plan

- Dissemination and Exploitation

- Plan Needs analysis report – report Agro-Entrepreneurship training in Europe

- Content Repository with all educational materials erial (textbooks, presentations, exercises, videos

- User`s Handbook

- Project Handbook

- Pilot seminars based on the training programme

- Training programme

- Project website

- Press releases

- Promotional material

- Minutes of project meetings

- Project reports

- Needs analysis questionnaires

- Evaluation questionnaires

3.2. Quality indicators and methods of evaluation

A number of qualitative and quantitative indicators have been chosen in order to measure the project progress and degree of achievement of expected results.

Task or deliverable	Indicator(s)	Methods of measurement and control	Time plan
Process Quality:			

Overall project management	Clarity and flow of information Respect of project procedures, deadlines and budget Timely submission of reports	• Constant communication among project partners • Regular meetings of Management Team • Monthly Skype meetings • Discussions in project meetings, documented in Minutes • Partners' feedback in AGRIENT Project Evaluation Questionnaire – internal evaluation	Ongoing At least once a month Once a month After each project meeting Every 12 months
IO Management	Respect to WP deadlines and deliverables	• Feedback and discussions via email • IO Leaders' and Project Manager's feedback during project meetings, documented in Minutes	Ongoing After each project meeting
Project meetings	Meeting agenda and preparation Presentations and discussions Organisation (location, logistics, etc)	• AGRIENT Meeting Evaluation Questionnaire – internal evaluation	After each project meeting

Quality of Project Deliverables:

Quality Management Plan	Understandability, usability Compliance with description in the Grant Agreement	• Partners' feedback via email • Evaluation by Project Manager	1 week after the draft of R1 is sent to partners 1 week after the draft of R1 is sent for Quality evaluation
Dissemination and Exploitation Plan	Understandability, usability Compliance with description in the Grant Agreement	• Partners' feedback via email • Evaluation by Quality Manager	1 week after the draft of R2 is sent to partners 1 week after the draft of R2 is sent for Quality evaluation
Needs analysis report	Validity, understandability, usability Compliance with R3 description in the Grant Agreement Annex I	• Partners' feedback via email • Peer review • Evaluation by Quality Manager	1 week after the draft of R3 is sent to partners 1 week after the draft of R3 is presented for review 1 week after the QM receives the results of Peer review
Professional standards of AGRIENT	Validity, understandability, usability Compliance with R4 description in the Grant Agreement Annex I	• Partners' feedback via email • Peer review • Evaluation by Quality Manager	1 week after the draft of R4 is sent to partners 1 week after the draft of R4 is presented for review 1 week after the QM receives the results of Peer review
AGRIENT training programme	Adequacy for the target group (content, potential impact) Quality translations Compliance with	• Partners' feedback via email • Peer review	1 week after the draft of R5 is sent to partners 1 week after the draft of R5 is presented for review

		• Evaluation by Quality Manager	1 week after the QM receives the results of Peer review
		• Satisfaction of trainees - AGRIENT Training Programme Evaluation Questionnaire (20 questionnaires/ project country, 100 in total)	2 weeks after the pilot workshops
E-learning environment of AGRIENT	Accessibility Adequacy to the target group (visceral appeal, functionality, understandability) Compliance with description in the Grant Agreement	• Partners' feedback via email	1 week after R6 is presented to partners
		• Peer review	1 week after the draft of R6 is presented for review
		• Evaluation by Quality Manager	1 week after the QM receives the results of Peer review
		• Satisfaction of trainees – AGRIENT Training Programme Evaluation Questionnaire	2 weeks after the pilot workshops
User`s Handbook	Adequacy for the target group (understandability, usability) Compliance with description in the Grant Agreement	• Trainers' feedback via email	1 week after the draft of R7 is sent to partners
		• Peer review	1 week after the draft of R7 is presented for review
		• Evaluation by Quality Manager	1 week after the QM receives the results of Peer review
Project Handbook	Accessibility Adequacy for the target group (understandability, usability) Compliance with description in the Grant Agreement	• Partners' feedback via email	1 week after the draft of R8 is sent to partners
		• Peer review	1 week after the draft of R8 is presented for review
		• Evaluation by Quality Manager	1 week after the QM receives

		• Learners' feedback - AGRIENT Training Programme Evaluation Questionnaire	the results of Peer review 2 weeks after the pilot workshops
Pilot seminars based on the training programme	Adequacy for the target group (course content, workshop materials, potential impact) Quality of facilitation Workshop organisation Compliance with description in the Grant Agreement	• Participants satisfaction – AGRIENT Training Programme Evaluation Questionnaire • Number of participants (min 75) - Lists of participants	2 weeks after the pilot workshops
Training programme evaluation report	Validity, understandability Compliance with description in the Grant Agreement	• Partner's feedback via email • Evaluation by Quality Manager	1 week after R10 is presented to partners 1 week after R10 is presented for Quality evaluation
Project website	Visceral appeal Functionality Adequacy for the target group (contents, understandability, usability) Compliance with description in the Grant Agreement	• Partners' feedback via email and project meetings • Evaluation by Quality Manager • Number of visits to the website	1 week after the 1st version of R11 is developed 1 week after R11 is presented for Quality evaluation
Press releases	Visceral appeal Adequacy for the target group Compliance with description in the Grant Agreement	• Partners' feedback via email • Number of downloads from project website	1 week after the draft of each newsletter is developed To be discussed in project meetings
Promotional material –	Visceral appeal	• Partners' feedback via email	1 week after the draft leaflet

	Adequacy for the target group Compliance with R13 description in the Grant Agreement Annex I	• Number of promotional materials distributed • Feedback of the target group	is developed To be discussed in project meetings Ongoing
Minutes of project meetings	Validity, understandability	• Partners' feedback via email	1 week after the draft Minutes are sent to partners
R16: Project reports	Validity, understandability Respect to deadlines	• External evaluation by NA	At dates set in Grant Agreement
Needs analysis questionnaires	Validity; criteria defined in needs analysis methodology Compliance with description in the Grant Agreement	• Feedback of IO leader and partners involved • Number of questionnaires collected	By the deadline for collection of questionnaires as defined in WP workplan
Evaluation questionnaires	Validity; criteria defined in evaluation methodology	• Feedback of IO leader and partners involved • Number of questionnaires collected	By the deadline for collection of questionnaires as defined in WP workplan

3.3. Responsibilities

For the first Output, the first step will be to collect data and prepare a study report on the status of Agri-Entrepreneurship Training in the countries of Europe (Research). Based on this report, partners will design the content and methods of delivery of the Courses (Design) and then proceed with the implementation of the learning material (Implementation). Courses will be hosted on a Repository and used for piloting activities in order to collect valuable feedback (Evaluation) and plan the necessary adjustments (Finalization). For the second Output, the first step will be to prepare study reports about "State of the Art in 3D Virtual Worlds" and "Training in Virtual Worlds" (Research). Based on the reports, partners will prepare the Implementation plan for the 3D World, and start describing the learning scenarios that will take place in it (Design). The learning material of IO1 will be imported in the 3D World and partners will then start implementing the learning scenarios (Implementation) and finally the User's handbook. The final phases of the project concern the extensive testing of the 3D virtual world through various piloting activities, evaluating it (Evaluation) and using the results to improve and eventually finalize it (Finalization). SUA, Politehnic in Sibenik and ARI will be the main content providers with experts on Agriculture and youth Entrepreneurship Education and Agricultural Research and Innovation respectively. Primary technological partners include UPAT(experience in setting up and managing 3D virtual environments) CTI and CTE (experience in implementing educational infrastructure and training scenarios). All partners will also have the important task of local piloting activities in their country.

3.4. Evaluation tools

Several tools for evaluation will be used: discussions in project meetings and via emails, peer review to evaluate the main deliverables, evaluation questionnaires for internal evaluation - by project partners, and external evaluation – by the target group.

Peer review will be organised by the Quality Manager, who will assign the reviewers (each partner to provide 1 peer review) and will collect and analyse their feedback. Peer review will be applied for the following deliverables:

Needs analysis report

Agrient training programme

E-learning environment of Agrient

User` Handbook

Training programme evaluation report

The Quality Manager will develop the Peer review template to be used in the review process.

The results that do not require peer review will be evaluated by the partners and the Quality Manager. In the cases where Quality Manager is involved in the development of a result, the Project Manager will act as Quality Manager.

There will be 3 questionnaires:

1) AGRIENT Project Evaluation Questionnaire – to evaluate the general management and flow of the project, cooperation among the partners, partners' satisfaction with the achievements of the project and potential improvements;

2) AGRIENT Meeting Evaluation Questionnaire – to evaluate the quality of project meetings;

3) AGRIENT Training Programme Evaluation Questionnaire – to evaluate the quality of the developed Training Programme, e-learning environment, Learner's Guide and pilot workshops.

The Project Evaluation Questionnaire will be developed by -------in the 12th month of the project. The same questionnaire will be distributed to the partners and analysed by -------- twice – after 12 months and in the end of the project.

The Meeting Evaluation Questionnaire will be distributed to the partners and analysed by ---------- after every project meeting. The questionnaire is included in the Annex.

The Training Programme Evaluation Questionnaire will be developed by -------- in the 18th month of the project, based on the developed Training Programme. The partners will invite the participants of the pilot training to take part in this evaluation.

Whenever possible, the questionnaires will be administered as web surveys – to respect anonymity and simplify the analysis.

4. QUALITY CONTROL

Quality control deals with identification of project risk factors, and uncovering, analyzing and correcting problems, should they occur.

There are numerous risks in projects, which are at the same time challenges that can be highlighted by quality control. The outlined items include only some risks followed by short statement of how evaluation can help to find countermeasures or overcome these challenges:

1. Management challenges related to international collaboration and internal communication

Even though such problems are normal given the composition of the international partnership including a variety of different organisations, the activities foreseen by the project will contribute to the progressive strengthening of working bonds and communication channels between the partners. The work plan foresees the use of different tools aimed at guaranteeing a constant communication between the partners: face-to-face meetings, Skype meetings, document sharing, discussions, e-mailing etc. However, in case that the internal project evaluation processes show problems of communication between partners, the project management will have to intervene with specific ad hoc countermeasures.

2. Time plans are too ambitious or deadlines are not met

Most partners who are involved in the AGRIENT project have a long experience in planning and carrying out projects on national and/or European level. This experience will help partners to monitor the scheduling of the activities and to respect the intended deadlines. Internal evaluation reports will outline when deadlines are not met and appropriate measures have to be applied.

3. Methodological problems in

- training needs analysis,
- selection of relevant materials,
- adaptation of the training materials,

- testing and evaluation of the training materials,
- design and development of the foreseen outputs.

The methodological problems mentioned above will be discussed at the project meetings with all partners. The Project Manager and Quality Manager will be actively and constantly involved in this monitoring and evaluation and will guarantee the methodological coherence of all the project activities and results. Any possible problem emerging in this area will be discussed and solved in the framework of the foreseen evaluation and quality assurance sessions at the project meetings and in/after AGRIENT pilot workshops.

4. Mismatches of results vs. initial objectives

The project work plan and this specific Quality Management Plan foresee several moments of evaluation of the achieved results in comparison with the stated objectives: this evaluation will take place periodically during/ after partnership meetings, and in accordance to the piloting of the AGRIENT training programme/e-learning environment. This mechanism will allow the project management and the partners to refine activities and actions in case the obtained results do not correspond to the objectives of the project. The evaluation of the developed materials in the pilot training will provide the necessary feedback from the target group and will be analysed in order to improve the project results.

5. Problems related to the valorisation (dissemination and exploitation)

In order to prevent the emergence of such problems, dissemination and exploitation activities will be discussed in all AGRIENT project meetings. The work package leader RCDI (P6) will be in charge of monitoring the dissemination and exploitation activities and guaranteeing the achievement of the stated dissemination and exploitation objectives.

6. ANNEX

AGRIENT PROJECT MEETING EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Please evaluate the project meeting by ticking the appropriate answers and providing your opinion in open questions.

1. What were your main expectations for the project meeting?

2. To what extent were those expectations met?

☐ Very high   ☐ High   ☐ Moderate   ☐ Low   ☐ Very low

3. Please assess the different components of the meeting

	Very good	Good	Average	Fair	Poor	Not applicable
Meeting agenda and preparation						
Presentations						
Discussions						
Organisational aspects (venue, timing, meals, etc.)						
Interaction among participants						

Would you like to comment on some components of the meeting?

4. What did you learn during the meeting?

5. What did you like most during the meeting?

6. Was there any part of the meeting that you didn't enjoy?

7. Anything else you would like to share: