

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



RELEVANT ASSESSMENT AND PEDAGOGIES FOR INCLUSIVE DIGITAL EDUCATION



QUALITY MANAGEMENT REPORT

February, 2023

Title	RAPIDE Quality Management Report
Deliverable n°	/
Approval status	Approved
Date of issue	28/02/2023
Author	UNIRI and FOI
Contributor(s)	Partners
Distribution list	All partners
Abstract:	This document introduces the RAPIDE Quality Management Report. It includes the report of the activities and results achieved during the project by following the QM Plan.
Key words	quality management, evaluation, indicators, report

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Quality Management Plan (QM Plan) developed at the beginning of the project defined how to create a project environment that would ensure, qualitatively and quantitatively, that the intellectual outputs of the project would be completed and that the project objectives would be achieved with high quality and in accordance with the planned costs, available time and overall scope. QM Plan included a brief description of the methodology, implementing teams, monitoring, performance indicators, data collection, review process and reporting. The plan was structured to describe the processes, means and responsibilities of quality assurance at different levels: Project as a whole, Intellectual Outcomes and Project Events. This document is the report of the activities and results achieved during the project by following the QM Plan.

CONTENTS

Executive Summary	3
1. Introduction	5
2. Methodology	6
3. Quality of Delivering Teams	9
4. Monitoring	9
5. Performance indicators	9
6. Data Collection	10
7. Review processes	11
8. Reporting	15

1. INTRODUCTION

RELEVANT ASSESSMENT AND PEDAGOGIES FOR INCLUSIVE DIGITAL EDUCATION (RAPIDE) is a project focused on applying innovative pedagogy in accordance with inclusive digital education. Inspired by the COVID -19 pandemic and the circumstances in which higher education institutions and their administrations found themselves, many have adopted digital technologies as tools for delivering instruction. It is necessary to co-create, implement and share innovative pedagogies and aligned assessment for relevant and inclusive digital education in order to deal with the COVID-19 induced and similar crises and to support meaningful digital transformation of HEIs on the EU level.

RAPIDE quality assurance activities were directed towards the achievement of the set specific goals such as:

SO1: Implement and evaluate innovative and inclusive pedagogies that support student engagement, practical skills development, and deep access to learning in an online environment through digitally and pedagogically competent and confident teachers.

SO2: Support teachers in the use of relevant and inclusive assessment methods in the context of innovative pedagogies.

SO3: Support students and teachers in the meaningful implementation of innovative pedagogies in an online environment through the ethical use of learning analytics, with particular attention to at-risk students.

SO4: Build capacity of HEIs to monitor and evaluate the implementation of innovative pedagogies in online, blended, and distance education and conduct impact assessments of innovative pedagogies on their digital transformation goals.

The achievement of the objectives is visible through the achieved intellectual outputs of the project.

IO1: Open educational resources and e-course for Flipped Classroom (FC) and Work-Based Learning (WBL) for use in an online environment with the main aim of providing teachers and students with an original resource designed in the form of research-based practical guidelines for FC and WBL approaches in an online environment and as an open e-course. Following the guidelines will enable HE teachers to successfully implement innovative approaches in online teaching. Models for implementing WBL in online environments for critical professions, such as healthcare, are also presented.

IO2: Toolkit for student assessment in FC and WBL with the main objective of providing HE teachers with a unique and very practical toolkit (e-course chapter) containing assessment scenarios for the implementation of innovative approaches, mainly peer assessment and project assessment (both related to WBL and FC) in different learning environments and within different HEIs. In addition, an innovative tool (for an open source LMS) was developed to provide support for peer assessment and project assessment (as described in the toolkit). This chapter was added to the e-course developed in IO1.

IO3: Dashboard Model supporting inclusive FC and WBL was designed and developed with the aim of providing HE teachers and practitioners with the dashboard model for teachers and students supporting FC and WBL. This deliverable also include original and valuable tips and tricks for teachers on how to interpret the data provided on the dashboard, how to promote inclusion and help students at risk of failure, and input on how to ethically use student data.

IO4: Code of practice on impact analysis of innovative pedagogies with the main objective of using this unique opportunity to design, describe and test the methodology for impact analysis of innovative approaches in online education. This outcome is defined as a framework of impact analysis on the digital transformation plan and other strategic goals of HEI.

2. METHODOLOGY

Table 1: EFQM model of the RAPIDE project and performed actions.

QM Criteria Overview according to EFQM model			
	Who/What	Context	Performed action
Leadership	Project Steering Committee (PSC)	Responsibility for quality assurance, approval of reports and deliverables and monitoring of project progress to successfully achieve project objectives. The PSC is also responsible for approving Quality Assurance Plan.	PSC was elected during Kick off and included members: UNIZG FOI Prof. Blaženka Divjak, PhD UNIZG School of Medicine Prof. Mirza Žižak, PhD OPEN UNI Prof. Bart Rienties, PhD GOETHE UNI Prof. Alexander Tillmann, PhD Michael Eichhorn, Dipl.-Ing. M.A. TU DELFT Prof. Marcus Specht, PhD Sylvia Walsarie Wolff UNIRI Prof. Marta Žuvić, PhD
People	Project Coordinator (PC) Project Manager (PM)	PC - Responsible for the overall supervision of project activities, is also responsible for the revision of the quality assurance plan, monitors progress and status of planned deliverables.	Roles included the following: Project Coordinator (PC) - Blaženka Divjak (FOI) Project Manager (PM) - Josipa Bađari (FOI)

	Quality Assurance Manager (QAM) IO leader (IOL)	PM - the main responsibility of Project Manager is to ensure that the project produces the desired products within the specified tolerances in terms of time, cost, quality, scope, risk and benefits. Project Manager supports Project Coordinator. QAM - responsible for acting in accordance with the QA plan. IOL - responsible for producing specific intellectual deliverables.	Quality Assurance Manager (QAM) - Marta Žuvić (UNIRI) IO1 leader (IOL) - Bart Rienties (OU) IO2 leader (IOL) - Marcus Specht (TU DELFT) IO3 leader (IOL) - Blaženka Divjak (FOI) IO4 leader (IOL) - Alexander Tillmann (UNI GOETHE) Dissemination manager: Lana Škvorc, Josipa Bađari (FOI)
Strategy	Influencing education leaders and policymakers, including project stakeholders	The project gathers stakeholders' needs as input for the development and review of the strategy and supporting measures, anticipates the impact of changes at individual (teachers, administrators and students) and institutional level at national and international level (teacher training, introduction of good practises, international cooperation of education systems, promotion of Bologna principles).	Beyond project partners and teams working on the project results the project activities included the following activities that gathered educational leaders and policy makers: LTT events of the project and especially LTT3 that included the active work on IO4 designed to support the development of strategic approach to innovative methodology implementation.
Partnership & Resources	Project partners Project stakeholders	Manages the network of project partners to generate and use the support and resources needed to manage information, knowledge and technology to support effective delivery of results and decision-making. Works with partners to achieve mutual benefit and increase value for respective stakeholders by supporting each other with expertise, resources and knowledge,	Coordinator developed the Project handbook at the beginning of the project as a one-stop shop for smooth work and cooperation between partners. Partner members divided in teams and joined the development of different project results on a voluntary basis based on individual interest. Each result development was coordinated by one partner with participation of individual staff members from different institutions. To further maximise the benefits and impact the partners regularly published

		<p>developing an approach to engage relevant stakeholders and use their collective knowledge in generating ideas, providing and monitoring access to relevant information and knowledge for stakeholders while ensuring security and protection of intellectual property, building and managing learning and collaboration networks, involving relevant stakeholders in the development and deployment of new technologies to maximise benefits.</p>	<p>the development of their results, as presented in the Dissemination report.</p>
<p>Processes, Products & Services</p>	<p>Designing (learning) resources Training Dissemination</p>	<p>Processes are systematically designed, managed, reviewed and improved to increase value for project members and other stakeholders. The aim is to anticipate the diverse needs of project stakeholders and ensure that teachers have the necessary resources and skills to maximise the student experience, continuously monitor and review the experiences and perceptions of project users, and ensure that processes are aligned to respond appropriately to any feedback.</p>	<p>The quality assurance plan included the internal review by at least two partners. The review was implemented according to the agreed template.</p> <p>Under the coordination and technical support of the coordinator, partners developed MOOC with 4 modules resulting from the 4 IOs with the main aim to provide project stakeholders with guided training on the topics. The MOOC was piloted in 2022 which enabled project partners to receive valuable feedback from the participants and to make necessary improvements in order to include the diverse needs of its users and further inclusive principles.</p>
<p>People Results</p>	<p>Internal perception of the project Performance Indicators</p>	<p>Match teachers to the project, new technologies and key processes, and choose creative and innovative approaches. Use surveys and other forms of staff feedback to improve project outcomes for future organisational strategies, policies and plans.</p>	<p>Each RAPIDE activity was followed by feedback forms to measure the level of satisfaction of the users, especially the appropriateness in terms of content and format, as well as the transferability to other contexts.</p> <p>The survey results were stored on the project platform and analysed by project partners in order to enable further improvements of the project results.</p>

		<p>Measure perceptions of teacher satisfaction and engagement, motivation and competence.</p> <p>Measure performance indicators for teacher activities, leadership performance and internal communication, and developed skills of teachers, administrators and decision-makers.</p>	
Customer Results	<p>External perception of project</p> <p>Performance Indicators</p>	<p>People benefiting from the project activities and services perceive the project, using a set of perception measures and performance indicators to determine successful deployment of strategy, set clear targets for project users based on their needs and expectations in line with the project strategy. Measure perceptions of program reputation, value, and support and student engagement. Measure performance indicators of program delivery, support, and capacities for e-learning, opportunity to start joint study programs.</p>	<p>RAPIDE results were also developed having in mind the Project Impact Framework which included the list of indicators to be met, as well as the analysis of all developed results and performed actions and events. The results of this analysis are described and reported within the project Impact Framework Report.</p>
Society Results	<p>Teachers and students from project partner</p>	<p>Indicate the impact of the project on society, especially in the world of education, using the indicators to determine the success of the implementation based on stakeholders' needs and expectations, segment the results to understand stakeholders' experiences, needs and expectations, and demonstrate sustainability in terms of results for society. Measure perceptions of the</p>	<p>RAPIDE Project Impact Framework included the measurement of project results on different levels, including the geographical level. The results of this analysis are described and reported within the project Impact Framework Report.</p>

		programme's reputation and impact on jobs. At national level, improve teacher training. At international level, share good practice, cooperation between EU and non-EU education systems and promote the Bologna principles.	
Business Results	Key performance outcomes Key performance indicators	Set clear objectives for key project outcomes based on stakeholder needs and expectations, and continue development beyond the project lifetime. Measure stakeholder perceptions, performance against budget, volume programme delivered and key project outcomes. Measure project cost performance indicators, key project performance indicators (as stated in the project), partner performance, technology, information and knowledge.	RAPIDE Project Impact Framework included the list of indicators and in the report the performed values are listed.

3. QUALITY OF DELIVERING TEAMS

Each partner institution established the project team. Project team members were selected based on required expertise in the project with clearly defined roles and responsibilities.

Each project team formed a Delivery Team responsible for:

- The successful delivery of its element of the workstream in terms of time, quality, and budget
- Requiring the partner project team to provide feedback to Project Coordinator
- Identifying all risks to Project Coordinator as part of the project's risk management strategy
- Identify opportunities that can be exploited as part of the project's risk management strategy.

4. MONITORING

The monitoring phase was conducted in conjunction with project implementation to provide useful information about the project, and it helped Project Coordinator to track project performance and progress against key performance indicators (KPIs) established during project planning.

Monitoring of the project included:

- Adherence to deadlines and milestones
- Quality of activities and deliverables
- Indicators of success of the project, impact.

5. PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

During the implementation of the project, key performance indicators were monitored, resulting in activities/documents listed below:

- A Grant Agreement and a Partnership Agreement were signed, clearly defining the obligations and costs of each partner
- A project management plan was prepared, setting out clear rules and roles for effective project management, and a proposal for an internal report for the project partners.
- Activities for dissemination of project activities and results, preparation of publications and responsibilities for the activities were defined; channels and a project visibility package were created, as well as a logo and templates for use in the project
- A risk management plan was prepared to define the risks, severity, impact, scale, operational mitigation measures and responsibilities for capturing or mitigating potential threats, especially those arising from the pandemic COVID -19.
- A Gantt chart was created to monitor project activities, which was updated according to actual project achievements
- A project impact framework was created, defining headings for monitoring the impact of the project according to the defined levels and areas
- A work plan was prepared for each IO, defining the tasks for each IO, their duration, milestones and responsible persons
- A Quality Assurance Plan was created, appointing a Quality Assurance Manager responsible for proposing a Quality Management Plan and monitoring the progress and quality of the project activities.

The **key performance indicators** specified by types of project results and ways of monitoring are stated in the document RAPIDE Impact Framework Report prepared by Project Office at FOI in February, 2023.

6. DATA COLLECTION

The collection of data required for the monitoring was performed using online questionnaires, interviews, testimonials and internal project reviews. The analysis of data was performed using appropriate statistical data analysis software.

Online questionnaires were distributed to participants upon completion of consortium meetings, LTTs, workshops and multiplier events. Collected data were analysed and presented in QA reports for all events. The reports are stored on the project platform available to all partners.

The collection was performed via the following Google Forms:

CONSORTIUM MEETINGS

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSehy-nK2MCEPpXpiTMBrd6hgbEO-5HhYUpem-7P2jVXuKmzIA/viewform?usp=sf_link

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSdF-kjOT3P2c9KRcu6xkj51NEo18Lt9pOOS2WEhNZrIl9D9rQ/viewform?usp=sf_link

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSfDP9RiBaXTbLBAWIBX2cFVSTbpM_kJI8sgdNZOv821K6MKxQ/viewform?usp=sf_link

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSe-kxvgWCOTL7DI_eCwx76yaFFA68WsDbYEZl2TBsXSCXSY7w/viewform?usp=sf_link

LTTs

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSdvP1ocX2ZHRU-cikLa5eFy5clb4Ncc817cVH3aPdNAQRTrSg/viewform?usp=sf_link

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSeUREuleqXB7GAfCA-fS0ICV-J6QOm6wd2QVjD1ha56vmq8Ew/viewform?usp=sf_link

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSefDYbMzBvjV0OKFBj6jE6bXhSj4ce3RvguSo_-N_mhRjMdPQ/viewform?usp=sf_link

MULTIPLIERS

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLScpJ3On6bdIGDlzpMwzEHpGIWK4YdwyZ0yl5LtemrWoW7EmuA/viewform?usp=sf_link

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSfiZrMZOEQoORgCeAwaqrqZLgyJgo639cFZhiXvY4VavU2Og/viewform?usp=sf_link

FINAL CONFERENCE

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSdgsaTq0_3qgE8v_bUW4jNACoKJwpCihLWGCsZheBDwfFa6Sg/viewform?usp=sf_link

7. REVIEW PROCESSES

There were two types of reviews on the project, formative and summative:

Formative reviews: formative review was used to informally monitor activities developed during and between partner meetings and provided a basis for continuous improvement. It was realised through ongoing interaction with project partners, stakeholders and users - either online, synchronously or asynchronously, and face-to-face. A short oral formative report was provided to all project partners during the online and face-to-face meetings.

Summative reviews: Summative reviews were produced as formal documents - interim and final reports, and provide a basis for assessing the value created by the project.

Internal Processes Review

The review of internal processes was based on regular review of performance indicators and deadlines against collected data, review of meeting minutes, online questionnaires sent to project partners after project meetings and interviews (one to one) with a sample of partners during/after project meetings.

Based on the data collected, IO leader informed the project co-ordinator and the other partners of the need to revise the processes where a discrepancy has been identified.

IO peer reviews

IO's responsible partners were also responsible for the review of the corresponding IO, on a defined template and according to the established procedure where for each IO two (2) partners were nominated as peer reviewers.

The peer review of the deliverables was based on:

- Analysis of performance indicators - possible discrepancies, responsibility of the deliverable and how should it be corrected, or exploited if a strength has been identified.
- The review workflow internal to Google Drive (all working documents and final document uploaded to Google Drive) and in the proposed form (template)
- The informal feedback collected during interaction with partners and members transmitted to the relevant IO leaders.

The table with peer-reviewers and deliverables was uploaded to the projects' repository and is presented here.

IO No.	Responsible Partner	Review Partner 1	Review Partner 2	Review Performed
IO1	Open University	Goethe University	University of Zagreb	31.12.2021.
IO2	TU Delft	Open University	Goethe University	24.5.2022.
IO3	University of Zagreb (FOI-SoM)	Open University	TU Delft	1.2.2023.
IO4	Goethe University	University of Zagreb	TU Delft	1.2.2023.

Peer review process was performed in 3 steps, as follows:

- **First version of deliverable:** The IO leader prepared the deliverable according to template and sent it to assigned 2 reviewers (project coordinator, QA and Risk manager in Cc), 3 weeks prior the set deadline
- **External evaluation and peer review:** Peer reviewers reviewed the deliverable 7 days after received document using peer-review evaluation form. The peer reviewers sent the form to the IO leader who modified the work results if requested. In case that the deliverable was not accepted by the reviewer in the first iteration (major modifications were required), the deliverable leader sent the modified version to peer reviewer again (1 week prior the deadline)
- **Final version:** If the results of all peer reviews were positive (the paper was accepted), the project leader produced the final version. The IO leader uploaded the final version and informed the project coordinator and the QA partner (1 week prior the deadline).

Quality assurance for IOs

This section provides a description of the results of each IO, developed by the responsible partners, and the review partners used to check that they are present and of good quality in the final IO document.

IO1: Open educational resources and e-course for flipped classroom and work-based learning for use in online environment

	Result	Indicator(s)	Responsible partner	QA Tool	Achieved
R 1.1.	Open educational resources for FC and WBL for use in an online environment	2 educational resources on FC and WBL 4 showcases on implementation of FC and WBL in different subject areas available 1 open document passed internal QCC	Open University	Text file (document) exists in project documents repository and on Erasmus+ Project Results platform Open educational resources are reviewed as part of IO1 from 2 partners	31.12.2021
R 1.2.	E-course "Let's get flipped"	1 open e-course on innovative teaching methods Educational resources including 4 e-chapters (1. FC and WBL, 2. Students' assessment, 3. LA, 4. Impact)	University of Zagreb, FOI	E-Course is active on a platform/repository; e-Chapters and text file (document) exists in project repository and on Erasmus+ Project Results platform E-course is reviewed as part of IO1 from 2 partners	

IO2: Toolkit for assessment of students in flipped classroom and work-based learning

	Result	Indicator(s)	Responsible partner	QA Tool	Achieved
R 2.1.	Toolkit for assessment of students in FC and WBL	1 toolkit on students' assessment 4 showcases on implementation of	TU Delft	Toolkit exists on repository and on Erasmus+ Project Results platform in document form	31.5.2022.

		students' assessment available as 1 document passed internal QCC		Showcases text file (document) exists in project documents repository and on Erasmus+ Project Results platform Toolkit is reviewed as part of IO2 from 2 partners	
R 2.2.	Tool for students' assessment	1 developed tool for open source LMS according to functional specifications, implemented and available on FOI infrastructure, passed internal QC		Tool exists on a platform and as text file (document) in project repository and on Erasmus+ Project Results platform Tool is reviewed as part of IO2 from 2 partners	

IO3: Learning analytics for flipped classroom and work-based learning

	Result	Indicator(s)	Responsible partner	QA Tool	Achieved
R 3.1.	Dashboard model Analysis on LA	1 analysis on performed research on student and teacher perspective on LA use and 1 analysis on data obtained in LMS during piloting	UNIZG FOI	Dashboard model analysis exist as tool and as text file (document) in project document repository and on Erasmus+ Project Results platform Dashboard is reviewed as part of IO3 from 2 partners	30.9.2022.
R 3.2.	LA models	2 LA models (1 for students and 1 for teachers) including data sets and methods for reporting and prediction available as 1 open document passed internal QCC		LA models exist as tool and as text file (document) in project repository and on Erasmus+ Project Results platform LA models are reviewed as part of IO3 from 2 partners	
R 3.3.	Dashboards for students and teachers	2 dashboards (1 students' and 1 teachers') for open source LMS, according to functional specifications, implemented and available open on FOI infrastructure passed internal QCC		Dashboards for students and teachers exist in some tool and as text file (document) in project repository and on Erasmus+ Project Results platform Dashboards are reviewed as part of IO3 from 2 partners	
R 3.4.	Tips and tricks for teachers of dashboard data interpretation	1 tips and tricks for teachers on dashboard data interpretation available as 1 open document passed internal QCC		Tips and tricks exist as text file (document) in project repository and on Erasmus+ Project Results platform Tips and tricks document is reviewed as part of IO3 from 2 partners	
R 3.5.	Guidelines on ethical use of data	1 guideline on ethical use of data available as 1 open document passed internal QCC		Guidelines exist as text file (document) in project repository and on Erasmus+ Project Results platform Guidelines are reviewed as part of IO3 from 2 partners	

IO4: Code of practice for HEIs on impact analysis of innovative pedagogies

	Result	Indicator(s)	Responsible partner	QA Tool	Achieved
R 4.1.	Code of practice Interview designs	1 semi-structured interview design available as 1 open document including results on performed semi-structured interviews with decision makers	GOETHE UNI	Interview design templates exist as text file in project repository and on Erasmus+ Project Results platform Code of practice is reviewed as part of IO4 from 2 partners	31.1.2023.
R 4.2.	Semi-structured interviews	at least 8 participants in semi-structured interviews		At least 8 semi-structure fulfilled interview forms exist in project repository Interviews forms are reviewed as part of IO4 from 2 partners	
R 4.3.	Code of Practice	1 code of practice available as 1 open document on methodology for measuring impact of implementation of FC and WBL in an online environment on strategic goals 1 showcase based on the performed impact analysis on two partner institutions passed internal QCC		Code of practices exists as text file (document) in project repository and on Erasmus+ Project Results platform Code of practice is reviewed as part of IO4 from 2 partners	
R 4.4.	Focus group on impact analysis	1 focus group design for impact analysis results on performed focus group available as 1 open document		Results from focus group exist as text file (document) in project document repository and on Erasmus+ Project Results platform Focus group results document is reviewed as part of IO4 from 2 partners	
R 4.5.	Focus group participants' feedback	at least 5 participants with positive feedback on impact of innovative pedagogies on HEIs strategic goals		At least 5 positive feedback forms exist in project document repository and on Erasmus+ Project results platform 5 feedback forms are review as part of IO4 from 2 partners (form for review fulfilled and exists)	

8. REPORTING

There were summative reports (interim and final) and several short formative reports.

The **short formative reports** were based on the analysis of the relevant performance indicators and current progress of the project activities.

The **summative reports** were interim and final reports submitted to the European Commission. The Evaluation Reports were authored by the Quality Assurance IO leader with the support of the project coordinator, together with input from all project partners.

The Quality Assurance Report included chapters of Executive Summary, Introduction, Scope and Methodology of the Review (Evaluation Activities (if questionnaires, will contain results), Formative evaluation (measuring indicator in number and type, on time delivery, content, templates) and implemented improvements, Summative evaluation (interim/final report), Intellectual Output Review (for each IO), Conclusions and Recommendations and Appendix(s).