

Quality Assurance Management Plan

Raising the Quality of Teacher Education Programmes in Palestine through Technology Enhanced Learning (RQTEPP TELTA)

June 2016



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



PROJECT DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Project Acronym	RQTEPP TELTA
Project Full Title	Raising the Quality of Teacher Education Programmes in Palestine through technology Enhanced Learning
Grant Agreement	GA #3094-001 -001
Funding Scheme	Capacity Building in Higher Education
Project Duration	36 months (October 2016 - October 2018)
Project Officer	Roisin McCabe
Project Manager Project Administrator	Tony Mahon (UK) – Canterbury Christ Church University Emily Lau (UK) – Canterbury Christ Church University (2015-2016) Anne Stone (UK) – Canterbury Christ Church University (2016-2018)
Consortium partners	Canterbury Christ Church (UK) - CCCU Fontys University (Holland) - FU The University of Eastern Finland (Finland)-UEF Birzeit University (Palestine) - BZU Hebron University (Palestine) - HEB Al Azhar University (Palestine) – AZU
Website	http://www.tedpal.ps/

DELIVERABLE DOCUMENTATION SHEET

Number	Deliverable 8.1
Title	Quality Assurance Management Plan
Related WP	WP8
Author(s)	Emily Lau
Contributor(s)	Tony Mahon (CCCU)
Reviewer(s)	Tony Mahon (CCCU)
Nature	Report
Dissemination level	Internal
Due Date	29 th July, 2016
Submission date	29 th July, 2016

QUALITY CONTROL ASSESSMENT SHEET

Issue	Date	Comment	Author
V0.1	06/05/2016	First draft	Judy Durrant WP8 Leader
V0.2	09/07/2016	Review First draft	Tony Mahon Project leader
V0.3	18/07/2016	Final Version	Judy Durrant (CCCU) Tony Mahon (CCCU)
V0.4	30/06/2018	Revised version	Tony Mahon (CCCU)

DISCLAIMER

The opinion stated in this report reflects the opinion of the authors and not the opinion of the European Commission.

All intellectual property rights are owned by the RQTEPP TELTA consortium members and are protected by the applicable laws. Reproduction is not authorised without prior written agreement.

The commercial use of any information contained in this document may require a license from the owner of that information.

All RQTEPP TELTA consortium members are also committed to publish accurate and up to date information and take the greatest care to do so. However, RQTEPP TELTA consortium members cannot accept liability for any inaccuracies or omissions nor do they accept liability for any direct, indirect, special, consequential or other losses or damages of any kind arising out of the use of this information.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This document is a deliverable of the RQTEPP TELTA project, which has received funding from the European Union's Erasmus + Programme for Capacity Building in Higher Education (GA) Nb #3094-001 -001

CONTENTS

1. Introduction.....	8
2. Aims.....	8
3. Principles.....	8
4. Objectives.....	9
5. Milestones.....	9
6. Success Criteria	9
7. Data Capture.....	10
8. Key stages, timescales and responses.....	16
9. Quality Criteria.....	17
10. Ethics and Intellectual Property.....	18
11. Issues for Discussion and Management.....	19

1. Introduction

The Quality Assurance and Monitoring Plan is concerned with ensuring that the aims and success criteria of all aspects of the Project are fulfilled. It is organised around quality assurance and monitoring of the processes and outputs of the set of Work Packages, which involves collection of a rich variety of quantitative and qualitative data. Within the timescale of the project, each Work Package will contribute sets of baseline, interim, ongoing and summative data which will be collated into progress reports to determine extent and quality of development against project aims and objectives. Processes of data collection, recording, analysis and reporting will themselves be subjected to scrutiny to assure quality. Involvement of Steering Committee members and Work Package Leaders is crucial in successful implementation of this plan, involving different groups of participants as appropriate. Key features include:

- feedback to inform development based on the data analysis at each stage of the project
- acknowledgement of the function of data collection methods and activities in generating dialogue as part of the development process
- development of a quality assurance and monitoring toolkit that can continue to be used in participating universities and may be applicable elsewhere.

2. Aims

1. To implement a plan for the quality assurance of development and supporting Work Packages to ensure the aims of the project are fulfilled and the specified outputs, outcomes and impact are achieved.
2. To work with stakeholders to develop a toolkit of approaches and resources that can be used by colleagues in Palestine for quality assurance of teacher education programmes beyond the life of the project.

3. Principles

1. The quality plan will serve the overall aim of improving teacher education in Palestinian universities with the underpinning and longer-term aim of improving children's and young people's education.
2. New developments in quality assurance will draw upon effective existing evaluative processes in the Palestinian universities and good practice in European universities.
3. Developments will be underpinned by dialogue and collaborative working to recognise the expertise and experience of all stakeholders and ensure full ownership.
4. New processes that are introduced will align with and complement current processes, taking care not to duplicate evidence gathering or reporting.
5. Where possible, data capture will be combined for work packages so that for example one survey or focus group can cover several strands of the project.
6. A mixture of quantitative and qualitative evidence must be collected so as to be able to measure improvements in key factors related to the work packages, whilst also capturing rich details of people's experiences and perceptions during cultural change.
7. Quality assurance will take into account the voices of student teachers, teachers in post, teacher educators and programme leaders.

8. Flexibility of implementation will take into account changes in circumstance and new opportunities, ideas and evidence as they arise, by creating plenty of opportunities for dialogue around quality assurance processes.
9. Quality assurance processes will themselves be subject to on-going review and evaluation as the project progresses.

4. Objectives

1. To develop a quality assurance and monitoring strategy that is owned and implemented by teacher educators in Palestine, supported by European colleagues.
2. To provide quantitative and qualitative benchmarks against which progress for each work package can be measured and evaluated.
3. To monitor progress in delivering planned outputs, outcomes and impact to the specified timescales for each Work Package, against the benchmarks established.
4. To capture unforeseen outcomes and impact.
5. To develop approaches which align with and complement current quality requirements for each university in Palestine.
6. To build a sustainable legacy of quality assurance principles, tools and processes that can be used to enhance the comprehensive programme evaluation that is already taking place.
7. To ensure a balance of qualitative and quantitative evidence from a range of stakeholders including teacher educators and teachers in post (for example mentors of student teachers) as well as student teachers.
8. To maintain a critical dialogue about quality assurance strategies and processes as the project progresses, to inform continued implementation of the Quality Plan.
9. To disseminate our learning from the implementation of the Quality Plan, within appropriate ethical guidelines.

5. Milestones

1. Finalisation of quality assurance and monitoring strategy (*Month 10*)
2. Collaborative development of quality assurance toolkit (strategies, bespoke tools and processes). (*Initial draft: Month 12; Final version: Month 30*)
3. Checkpoint templates completed for each work package (*June / January each year*)
4. Full set of baseline data for each Work Package (*Month 12*)
5. Interim evaluation report (*Month 19*)
6. Presentation of evidence to dissemination conference demonstrating a) outputs, outcomes and impact of the project and b) what has been learnt about quality assurance (*Month 35*)
7. Final evaluation report (*Month 36*)
8. External evaluation report (*Month 36*)
9. Wider publications (*Month 35 – 36 and beyond*)

6. Success criteria

- Production of a quality plan document setting out aims, principles, objectives, frameworks, guidelines, key stages, responsibilities, milestones and success criteria.

- Internal publication of a quality assurance toolkit that is owned by Palestinian teacher educators, aligned with university processes and requirements and enhances sustained quality of teacher education programmes.
- Embedded processes for qualitative and quantitative data capture for each Work Package in the context of effective communication and management of quality processes.
- Completion of interim evaluation report to specified timescale.
- Dissemination of what has been learnt from the quality assurance of the project and about quality assurance itself, at the final project conference, on the website and beyond the life and immediate scope of the project.
- Final evaluation report demonstrating the extent to which the project Work Packages have fulfilled the project's aims and objectives.
- Positive external evaluation report
- Lasting legacy of a discourse of quality assurance, evidence and impact to enhance teacher education in Palestine as part of research and Higher Education capacity building.

The interim quality report will present evidence and evaluation of the progress towards milestones and success criteria.

The summative quality report will present evidence and evaluation of impact and the extent to which the milestones and success criteria for each Work Package and for the project as a whole have been fulfilled.

7. Data capture

This will draw upon a range of different methods, for example:

- Surveys (online and paper)
- Focus groups
- Q-sort¹ exploring teacher educators' pedagogical values and beliefs
- Interviews with teacher educators, project teams, Work Package leaders and project co-ordinators
- Action research data (such as reflective logs, evidence from classroom activities)
- Analysis of reports and publications arising from project development work
- Observations of teacher education classes and practicum
- Analysis of assignments by student teachers
- Teacher educator evaluations from Study Visits and Site Visits
- Student evaluations of teacher education programmes
- Minutes of student staff liaison meetings
- Analysis of statistical data from programmes
- Note taking from conversations, discussions and meetings
- Completed checkpoint templates from each Work Package

¹ Q-methodology involves individuals sorting statements about a particular theme according to their relative importance. Normally the statements are presented on small cards. The approach combines qualitative and quantitative analysis. It can be used to capture attitudes and values at a particular time and changes over time.

- Collection of tools and materials
- External evaluation.

Each Work Package will require data collection for the baseline report against which the interim evaluation and summative evaluation will track progress. Baseline data includes comprehensive notes taken on the first site visit in December 2015.

The data collection will be organised by Work Package leaders working with the Project Manager and Quality Plan Manager. Data capture and analysis is intended to involve all participants, not only Work Package leaders. The nature of the data will vary according to the Work Package, as in the table below. (This is intended to be illustrative only: Work Package leaders will adapt and augment it as the development work progresses.)

Work Package	Baseline data	Ongoing data collection	Interim evaluation	Summative evaluation
Implementation WP1: Development of BA Primary Education Degree Programme	Information from initial site visits; Current course documentation; Student evaluations; Observations of HE teaching; Notes from discussions with teacher educators.	Documentation from curriculum and course development and validation processes; Student evaluations; Staff evaluations; Minutes of meetings; Observations of practicum. Checkpoint summaries.	Ongoing data gathering supplemented by interviews and focus group meetings with staff and students during site visit; Mapping of programme outcomes against Professional Standards for New Teachers and Readiness to Teach Index.	Ongoing data gathering supplemented by interviews with staff during study visit to P1. Statistics of recruitment and retention for BA and pathways.
Implementation WP2: Diversity, Inclusion and SEN Pathway	Information from initial site visits; Survey completed by teacher educators; Interviews with teacher educators; Focus group meetings with student teachers	Documentation from course development and validation processes (DISEN Pathway courses); Student evaluations; Staff evaluations; Minutes of meetings; Observations of HE teaching and practicum. Checkpoint summaries.	Ongoing data gathering supplemented by interviews and focus group meetings with staff and students during Site Visits and Study Visits.	Ongoing data gathering supplemented by interviews with staff during Study Visits. Statistics of recruitment and retention for pathway.

Implementation WP3: TELTA Pathway	Information from initial Site Visits: visits to HE teaching rooms and school and HE teaching observations; discussions between teacher educators; focus group meetings with student teachers	Documentation from course development and validation processes (TELTA Pathway courses); Student evaluations; Staff evaluations; Minutes of meetings; Observations of HE teaching and practicum; Notes or images of changes to learning environments and how they are used. Checkpoint summaries.	Ongoing data gathering supplemented by interviews and focus group meetings with staff and students during Site Visits and Study Visits.	Ongoing data gathering supplemented by interviews with staff during Study Visits. Virtual tours of teaching environments. Statistics of recruitment and retention for pathway.
Implementation WP4: Capacity Building in Higher Education Pedagogy	Information from initial Site Visits: discussions with teacher educators, observations of HE teaching, focus group meetings with student teachers, visits to schools and classroom observations. Capture of additional data in study visit to P1; Interview with WP leader on reflections on study visit 1. Q-sort and/or survey completed by teacher educators.	Discussion and recording of progress during Site Visits and Study Visits. Correspondence between those who attended Study Visits to P1 and WP team. Documentation of any training for teacher educators. Checkpoint summaries.	On-going data gathering supplemented by interviews, observations and focus group meetings with teacher educators and students during Site Visits and Study Visits.	On-going data gathering supplemented by interviews, observations and focus group meetings with staff teacher educators and students during site visit and study visit. Q-sort and/or survey tool used again with same teacher educator participants to capture changes to values and beliefs.
Implementation WP5: Research	Information from initial Site Visit and Study Visit.	Documentation of progress and issues arising from	On-going data gathering supplemented	On-going data gathering supplemented by

<p>Capacity Building</p>	<p>Summary of research profile (e.g. publications, funding) for P4, P5, P6. Individual action plans for teacher educators' enquiries. Q-sort exploring pedagogic values will incorporate statements about research within teacher education.</p>	<p>individuals' enquiries. Evidence of wider participation in research activity or training in P4, P5, P6. Evidence in changes in research emphasis. Checkpoint summaries.</p>	<p>by interviews and focus group meetings with teacher educators including those involved in mentoring and coaching, to take place during site visits and study visits.</p>	<p>interviews, observations and focus group meetings with teacher educators during Site Visits and Study Visits. Peer reviewed research reports (usefulness/scientific quality). Academic publications and research reports arising from the research conducted in the course of the project. Q-sort and/or survey tool used again with same teacher educator participants to capture changes to values and beliefs.</p>
<p>Implementation WP6: Technology Enhanced Learning Environment: Smart Learning Rooms</p>	<p>Information from initial Site Visits: Visits to HE teaching rooms and school; Annotated photographs; HE teaching observations; Discussions between teacher educators; Discussions with student teachers. Information from Study Visit.</p>	<p>Documentation from TELE-Smart Learning Room development and issues arising; Student evaluations; Staff evaluations; Minutes of meetings; Observations of HE teaching and practicum; Annotated images of changes to learning environments and how they are used. Statistics on use of TELE-Smart learning rooms by students and staff in P4, P5, P6. Checkpoint summaries.</p>	<p>On-going data gathering supplemented by interviews and focus group meetings with staff and students during Site Visit and Study Visit.</p>	<p>On-going data gathering supplemented by interviews with staff during Study Visit to assess impact. Virtual tours of teaching environments.</p>

Support WP7: Management	Plans for Project Management, Communication and Financial Management / Budget. Roles and staffing for all partner institutions. Project schedule. Shared online communication tool (Google drive).	Minutes of meetings and documentation from Study Visits and Site Visits. Minutes from meetings within and between partner institutions. Steering Committee Minutes. Key documents such as financial summaries and timesheets. Checkpoint summaries.	Summary of progress against financial plan, schedule and milestones, evidenced by minutes of meetings and data from Implementation WPs. Evidence of use of online tool for communication.	Review of project outcomes and impact against WP criteria. Collaborative evaluation of project management process by partners.
Support WP9: Dissemination and Exploitation	Dissemination and exploitation plan Shared online communication tool (Google drive) in place.	Evidence of online communication by partners and participants. Promotional materials and strategies in place, such as website, social media. Checkpoint summaries.	Statistics and qualitative evidence on levels of engagement and participation for each HE partner. Reports, publications, presentations, videos, websites and social media trails.	Statistics and qualitative evidence of levels of engagement, breadth of participation and impact. Reports, publications, presentations, videos, websites and social media trails, documenting scope of dissemination and audience. Summary of potential / forthcoming events and publications.
Support: WP10 Preparation	Preparatory materials and documents. Notes from Site Visit 1 and initial Study Visits relating to setting up of Implementation WPs. Plans for Project Management,	Checkpoint Reports.		

	Communication, Finance / Budget, Dissemination and Exploitation, Quality Assurance and Monitoring. Project Schedule. Staffing for each partner university.			
--	--	--	--	--

Within the broad structure of initial, interim and summative evaluations, analysis will be used to support and inform ongoing development. Evaluation and feedback processes will be responsive to the requirements of the project as it evolves.

8. Key stages with timescales and responsibilities

Stage	When	Responsibility
Collaborative refinement of plans including articulation of a clear shared vision for the project and specification of processes and deliverables for each work package	Mainly Site Visit 1, followed up online and in initial study visits to CCCU, Fontys and UEF.	Project Manager and Steering Committee.
Identification of evidence required to benchmark current situation in relation to each work package, and how it is going to be collected.	Mainly Site Visit 1, followed up in initial study visits to CCCU, Fontys and UEF.	Project Manager and all WP leaders, along with those taking responsibility for each WP in Palestine.
Collection of baseline evidence for each WP.	Site Visit 1; online and through data collection in Palestinian Universities; initial study visits to CCCU, Fontys and UEF. Supplemented by online data collection in P3, P4, P5	WP leaders in European Universities working with those taking responsibility for WPs in Palestine, supported by Project Manager and Quality WP leader.
Development of draft Quality Toolkit	Tools, methods, guidance and evaluative commentary compiled and circulated to all participants via online communication tool. Draft by month 12, supplemented towards final toolkit by month 30.	Quality WP leader working with other WP leaders, supported by Project Administrators.
Collection of interim evidence for each WP	Around month 18, planned from month 17 assimilating evidence from on-going quality processes	WP leaders working with all stakeholders, supported by Project Manager and Quality WP leader. Administrators in Palestinian Universities to help co-ordinate collation of data.
Ensuring effective, embedded quality assurance during implementation of WPs	Throughout the project according to specified timescales. Checks to be made in month 9 to ensure communications and processes are working smoothly.	All participants led by WP leaders and supported by Project Manager and Quality WP leader.
Continued critical dialogue about quality assurance processes	Throughout the project with specific opportunities created during Site Visits and Study Visits.	All participants led by WP leaders and supported by Project Manager and Quality WP leader. Leaders of the Research Capacity WP will have a particular role in encouraging gathering and sharing of

		evidence.
Collection of final summative evaluative evidence for each WP	Around month 29, assimilating evidence from on-going quality processes during final Site Visit.	WP leaders working with all stakeholders, supported by Project Manager and Quality WP leader. Administrators in Palestinian Universities to help co-ordinate collation of data.
Report to dissemination conference presenting evaluation data identifying outputs, outcomes and impact for all WPs and for the quality WP.	Month 35	Quality WP leader working with Project Manager and those with responsibility for Quality WP in Palestinian Universities.
Refinement of Quality Assurance Toolkit for internal publication	Months 35-36	Quality WP leader involving all participants led by WP leaders and supported by Project Manager and Project Administrators, particularly involving those with responsibility for Quality WP in Palestinian Universities.
Final quality report	Month 36	Quality WP leader
External evaluation report and wider publication	Month 36 and beyond	External evaluator. All academic participants supported by Quality WP leader.

9. Quality Criteria

Quality criteria for each Work Package will be monitored by the Quality Assurance and Monitoring Work Package Leader and Project Manager at each Key Stage. In order to assess progress, Work Package Leaders will complete 'checkpoint' assessments every six months to assess each Work Package deliverable using a template with the following categories:

- Status of the deliverable
- Quality management activities carried out
- Lessons learned
- Issues Identified
- Possible risks

Work Package Leaders are then asked to identify recommendations for the next stage of the project in order to ensure outcomes are achieved. These will be collated to determine the progress of the project as a whole, identify any issues that need to be addressed and ensure appropriate support is in place across the programme.

Secondly, at each six-month checkpoint, Work Package Leaders will monitor quality according to the criteria for each Work Package specified in a separate 'Quality Criteria' document, as follows:

1. Deliverables are comprehensive, sufficiently detailed and match the specifications of the work package.
2. Deliverables have been produced according to agreed timelines.
3. Deliverables reflect recognised international good practice.
4. Deliverables are relevant to local context and needs.
5. Appropriate connections are made to other relevant work packages.
6. Work package teams have been involved in and committed to development of deliverables.
7. Work package development has provided opportunities for professional capacity building.

The Quality Assurance and Monitoring Toolkit includes a template for summarising the stage of development of each deliverable (Planning / Implementation / Development / Conclusion) and then evaluating deliverables against the generic quality criteria for the project.

10. Ethics and intellectual property

The project involves a wide range of data gathering, analysis and publication, as detailed above, for evaluation and quality assurance. In addition, academic colleagues from Palestinian and European universities may wish to use some of this data for research and publication, where there are likely to be opportunities for interesting and fruitful collaboration.

Canterbury Christ Church University has secured approval of the Faculty of Education's Research Ethics Committee *in principle* for building research and publication into the project with due respect for ethical conventions². This will include awareness of any or all of the following:

- Consent (which may have to be sought retrospectively),
- Confidentiality, with anonymity for individuals and institutions where appropriate,
- Power relationships in relation to the research,
- How the funded project may influence research outcomes,
- Cultural sensitivity in data collection, analysis and interpretation, including care with translation,
- Respect for intellectual property where many individual academics and a number of universities are involved,
- Adherence to statutory guidance for data collection, storage and access.

More detailed research proposals, as they arise throughout the duration of the project, will be subject to the ethical procedures and protocols of the universities involved, as appropriate.

² Canterbury Christ Church University, Faculty of Education Research Ethics Committee meeting, 31st May 2016

11. Issues for discussion and management

There are a number of issues that will need continued discussion and management in order to implement the quality plan effectively. There is expected to be interesting ongoing discussion about the ideas and questions arising from the data gathering process.

- *Co-ordination*: it is vital that all Work Package managers are involved in the development of tools and methods and lead the collection of data in their Work Package to inform baseline, interim and summative evaluations. This will be overseen by the Project Manager with the Leader of the Quality Work Package.
- *Translation*: in developing tools and methods it is important that they are carefully translated to take into account differences in meanings of words and concepts particularly where specialised vocabulary is used. Therefore, it would be helpful if academic colleagues in Palestine can help by checking translation before instruments are used.
- *Nature of data*: there needs to be an appropriate balance of quantitative data through which improvements can be measured, and qualitative data to capture the richness of experiences, ideas and perceptions relevant to each WP. It must be recognised that there is a range of opinions about what counts as evidence of improvement, not only in the wider academic and policy environments but also amongst project participants, which will be returned to in our continuing discussions.
- *Managing data collection*: named administrators in each setting will help to co-ordinate data collection and a system for managing this will be clarified in consultation with administrators and WP managers so that the data is sent efficiently to inform the baseline, interim and summative reports. Tools, methods and commentary on these also need to be collated efficiently to form the basis of the Quality Toolkit.
- *Writing of reports*: interpretations should be checked with all project partners and a mechanism for this will need to be developed.

