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The role of the UM in the IN2IT project

WP 7 leader: the Quality Assurance of the project

Tasks status

- T 7.1 Quality Policy Document + Quality Work Plan
- T 7.2 WP quality evaluation
- T 7.3 Product quality measurement reports
- T 7.4 Project progress assessments reports

Lessons learnt

Next year activities
The role of the UM in the IN2IT project

WP1: Development of the framework for internationalization capability maturity assessment of Israeli Colleges
- WP1 Workshop 1 in Warsaw (20-22/1/2016)
- WP1 Workshop 2 in Montpellier (8-10/3/2016)

WP2: Formation of international multidisciplinary team partnerships
- WP2 Workshop 1 in Tel Hai (17-19/5/2016)
- WP2 Workshop 2 in Ludwigsburg (11-13/7/2016)

WP3, WP4, WP5: Development of the academic programs, communities of practice collaboration and academy-industry cooperation

WP6: Development of the technological platform to support the varied online international academic activities

WP8: Dissemination efforts in France and in Europe

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union
The role of the UM in the IN2IT project

WP 7: the Quality Assurance of the project

Goal: to ensure that the project is executed following the project plan

4 tasks:

- T 7.1 Quality Policy Document + Quality Work Plan
- T 7.2 WP quality evaluation reports
- T 7.3 Product quality measurement reports
- T 7.4 Project progress assessments reports
IN2IT quality assurance methodology follow the PLAN-DO-CHECK-ACT iterative four step management method.

1A) Satisfaction: How satisfied are you with the WP1 Workshop in Warsaw preparation/execution?

BEFORE:
- 15% Very Dissatisfied
- 54% Dissatisfied
- 31% Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
- 2% Satisfied
- 8% Very Satisfied

AFTER:
- 12% Very Dissatisfied
- 18% Dissatisfied
- 53% Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
- 18% Satisfied
- 12% Very Satisfied

1A) Satisfaction: How satisfied are you with the WP1 Workshop in Montpellier preparation/execution?

BEFORE:
- 15% Very Dissatisfied
- 15% Dissatisfied
- 46% Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
- 23% Satisfied
- 8% Very Satisfied

AFTER:
- 26% Very Dissatisfied
- 47% Dissatisfied
- 26% Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
- 26% Satisfied
- 26% Very Satisfied
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Task 7.1: Quality Policy Document + Quality Work Plan

Two objectives:

- Common guidelines all partner adhere to => Quality Policy Document
- Plan the Quality tasks and resources => Quality Work Plan

2 objectives met:

- The quality policy document – signed in early 2016 ✔
- The quality Work Plan – established in March 2016 ✔

However:

- Quality policy document: to adapt in case of consortium change
- Quality Work Plan: need to be updated (schedule and organization change)
  - T2.2 – Study visits in June 2016 => September-Dec 2016
  - T5.1 – 12-15 Sept 2016: possible delay (UK)
  - T4.1 – possible additional meeting in Milan (IT)
Task 7.2: Workshop and Meeting quality evaluation reports

Two objectives:

- BEFORE / AFTER surveys
- Analysis and report

Objectives met:

1st Consortium Meeting in Karmiel => Report “1ST CONSORTIUM MEETING EVALUATION - NOVEMBER 2015”
- WS in Warsaw => Report “WP1 WORKSHOP IN WARSAW EVALUATION - JANUARY 2016”
- WS in Montpellier => Report “WP1 WORKSHOP IN MONTPELLIER EVALUATION - MARCH 2016”
- WS in Tel-Hai => Report “WP2 WORKSHOP IN TEAL HAI EVALUATION - MAY 2016”

Conclusion:

- More time for informal discussion
- It would be good to briefly present the goals at the beginning of the meeting
- It could be interesting to remind briefly the document and the technical instructions attendees need to read before the workshop
- In addition, it appears that it would be better to specify to speakers and moderators what is expected from them
- The project coordinator should send the attendee list before the workshop
1A) Satisfaction: How satisfied are you with the 1st consortium meeting in Karmiel preparation/execution?

- BEFORE:
  - Very Dissatisfied: 6%
  - Dissatisfied: 6%
  - Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied: 29%
  - Satisfied: 59%

- AFTER:
  - Very Dissatisfied: 17%
  - Dissatisfied: 6%
  - Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied: 6%
  - Satisfied: 44%
  - Very Satisfied: 28%

=> Introduction session too long
1A) **Satisfaction:** How satisfied are you with the WP1 Workshop in Warsaw preparation/execution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>BEFORE</th>
<th>AFTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

=> *More time for informal interaction*
1A) **Satisfaction:** How satisfied are you with the WP1 Workshop in Montpellier preparation/execution?

- **Before:**
  - 15% Very Dissatisfied
  - 15% Dissatisfied
  - 46% Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
  - 23% Satisfied
- **After:**
  - 26% Very Dissatisfied
  - 47% Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
  - 26% Satisfied

=> Enough time for informal interaction
1A) Satisfaction: How satisfied are you with the WP2 Workshop in Tel-Hai preparation/execution?

Before:
- Very Dissatisfied: 5%
- Dissatisfied: 11%
- Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied: 37%
- Satisfied: 47%

After:
- Very Dissatisfied: 11%
- Dissatisfied: 6%
- Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied: 39%
- Satisfied: 44%

=> Time distribution: more work should have been done in advance by partners
T 7.2 Planning Workshop Evaluation
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Task 7.3

Product Quality Evaluation

Two objectives:
- Expectation / Satisfaction surveys
- Analysis and report

Objectives not yet met:
- Expectation surveys in progress

Task will start: Year 3
T 7.3 Planning

Product Quality Evaluation

Task in line with product delivery => Year 3
Task 7.4

Project progress assessment

Two objectives:

- Completion of task – punctuality of deliverable
- Achievement of project objectives

Objectives not yet met:

- Project assessment survey in progress (1/4)

- Sept 2016
- Sept 2017
- Sept 2018 x 2
T 7.4 Planning

1. International Capability Maturity Framework
2. International Team Building
3. International Virtual Curriculum
4. International CoP for knowledge-sharing
5. Academy-Industry/community cooperation
6. Innovative technological platform
7. Quality assurance
   - Preparation of quality policy document and quality work plan
   - Development and delivery of IN2IT WPs quality evaluation reports
   - Development and delivery of IN2IT products quality measurement reports
8. Development and delivery of IN2IT project progress assessment reports
   - 1st evaluation report
   - 2nd evaluation report
   - 3rd evaluation report
   - 4th evaluation report
9. Sustainability and Exploitation
10. Project Management
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Lesson learnt

For WP leaders:
- Help everybody to know their role in the WP; docs need to prepare before the WP, to know what is expected from them and they are ready to participate
- Objectives and methodology to be clearly defined and understood

For WP participant:
- Prepare you participation at the WP
- Read all related docs before the WP

- More time requested form informal exchange
- Need to clarify goals and objectives before
- Nice to have attendee list before
- City sightseeing requested
# Next year activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WBS</th>
<th>Task Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>International Capability Maturity Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>International Team Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>International Virtual Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>International CoP for knowledge-sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Academy-Industry/community cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Innovative technological platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Quality assurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Preparation of quality policy document and quality work plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Development and delivery of IN2IT WPs quality evaluation reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2.1</td>
<td>WP1 WS Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2.2</td>
<td>WP2 WS Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2.3</td>
<td>WP3 WS Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2.3.1</td>
<td>WP3 WS1 Evaluation Report - Milan (IT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2.3.2</td>
<td>WP3 WS2 Evaluation Report - Baqa Al-Gharbiyye (IS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2.3.3</td>
<td>WP3 WS3 Evaluation Report - Warsaw (PL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2.4</td>
<td>WP5 WS Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2.4.1</td>
<td>WP5 WS1 Evaluation Report - London (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2.4.2</td>
<td>WP5 WS2 Evaluation Report - London (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2.5</td>
<td>WP10 Consortium Meeting Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Development and delivery of IN2IT products quality measurement reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>Development and delivery of IN2IT project progress assessment reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4.1</td>
<td>1st evaluation report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4.2</td>
<td>2nd evaluation report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4.3</td>
<td>3rd evaluation report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4.4</td>
<td>4th evaluation report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sustainability and Exploitation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Conclusion

- The role of the UM in the IN2IT project:
  - WP1: work facilitator
  - WP2: the UM team is actively involved
    - WP 3, 4, 5, 6 and 8: next steps

- Leading WP 7: the Quality assurance of the project
  Tasks
  - T 7.1 Quality Policy Document + Quality Work Plan
  - T 7.2 WP quality evaluation
  - T 7.3 Products quality measurement reports
  - T 7.4 Project progress assessments reports