Co-funded by the European Union

This Project has received funding from the European Commission ERASMUS+ Programme under grant agreement no. 101082928.

WP 6-Deliverable 6.1

‘Quality Assurance Plan’

Project Name: Students’ Personalised Learning Model, Based on the Virtual Learning Environment of Intellectual Tutoring "Learning with No Limits" – SMART-PL

Grant Agreement No.: 101082928

Call: ERASMUS-EDU-2022-CBHE

Topic: ERASMUS-EDU-2022-CBHE-STRAND-2

Type of action: ERASMUS Lump Sum Grants

Start date of the project: 1 January 2023

Duration of the project: 36 months

Disclaimer

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

The SMART-PL consortium consists of the following partners:

Document Information

Project short name and number	SMART-PL (101082928)
Work package	6 Quality Assurance
Number	6.1
Title	QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN
Type[1]	R
Dissemination level[2]	SEN
Contractual date of delivery	31.08.2023

Document History

Version	Date	Status	Authors, Reviewers	Description
v 0.01	22.08.2023	Report	A: Geert De Lepeleer	Project deliverable
v 0.02	25.08.2023	Report	R: Artem Boyarchuk	Minor updates
v 0.03	05.07.2024	Report	R: Artem Boyarchuk	Post-review corrections

[1]**Types.R:** Document, report (excluding the periodic and final reports); **DEM:** Demonstrator, pilot, prototype, plan designs; **DEC:** Websites, patents filing, press & media actions, videos, etc.; **OTHER:** Software, technical diagram, etc.
[2]**Dissemination levels:** Public — fully open (e.g. web); Sensitive — limited under the conditions of the Grant Agreement; EU classified — RESTREINT-UE/EU-RESTRICTED, CONFIDENTIEL-UE/EU-CONFIDENTIAL, SECRET-UE/EU-SECRET under Decision 2015/444.

This Project has received funding from the European Commission ERASMUS+ Programme under grant agreement no. 101082928.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

This Project has received funding from the European Commission ERASMUS+ Programme under grant agreement no. 101082928.

1 Executive Summary

This Quality Assurance Plan was prepared in the scope of the SMART-PL project, and particularly according to what is foreseen in WP6 and D6.2: Quality assurance plan with Milestones

The objective of this Quality Assurance Plan Manual is to ensure the production of concrete and high–quality results in line with the project plans.

The aim is to facilitate the project's management and guide all partners on the evaluation and quality issues, by establishing a coherent set of guidelines by which all aspects of the project are managed and measured. It will be the use of these guidelines that will ensure a better collaboration among the consortium members, individuals and groups, and this will also ensure that the entire consortium is responsible for and engaged in the work that is produced by the project.

In this context, the main purpose of the plan is to define the methodology to adopt in order to ensure a proper assessment and control of project activities, results deliverables and impact. It describes the principles/mechanisms for quality and performance control; the main indicators to be used in the project lifecycle; the data gathering process; tools and role of partners. A timetable (Overview of Project Deliverables-Annex 1) is included, so partners are aware of the moments and activities in which the indicators and instruments should be applied.

Three areas will be evaluated:
A) Quality of core deliverables
B) Quality of process - Process of transnational cooperation
C) Sustainability of project results

2 Introduction

The main purpose of this QAP is to describe the Quality Assurance Management procedures that the project team will follow in order to ensure, monitor and control the quality of all processes and deliverables produced during the SMART-PL project lifecycle. In particular:

To clearly define the content, format, review and approval process of the project deliverables;

- To define the responsibilities of the project partners regarding those deliverables;

- To identify all the different tools and means for monitoring and evaluation to be applied throughout the project duration;
- To provide guidelines for adequate implementation and thereby assure that certain quality standards in the performance of all the tasks are fulfilled;
- To define the quality requirements that must be obtained throughout the project lifecycle. The deliverables, actions and results must be in line with these requirements.

3 Project Summary

SMART-PL is a 3-year project, focused on introducing a model of personalised learning, based on the virtual learning environment of Intellectual Tutoring "Learning with No Limits". Intellectual tutoring is a set of learning tools: SMART online platform for virtual personalised learning and formative student assessment; co-working centre with equipment for organising hybrid learning, which increases the educational process's efficiency and gives both teachers and students more opportunities. "Learning with No Limits" means that all students are welcomed - regardless of age, personality, socioeconomic status, or educational needs, regardless of the opportunity to be present in the audience or not. The project is divided into 7 WPs which are linked to promoting the cooperation of partners to implement the European experience of personalised learning; improving educational programs of universities; increasing transparency and comprehensibility of education and assessment for students (including the results of non-formal education), reducing students' anxiety as for their professional expertise and forming their confidence to achieve efficient results; to improve the quality of teaching materials; to facilitate students' mobility, including in virtual mode, on a university/country scale, inter-university/country levels); to create extra opportunities to get higher education for people with disabilities and specific academic needs through inclusive education and the implemented model of personalised learning and hybrid technologies.

The fundamental principle of the project is a personalised approach aimed at forming a highly qualified competitive specialist who can conduct innovative activities and has the skills of continuous professional development. The personalised approach is characterised by innovative teaching methods, designed to encourage collaboration between students and teachers, emphasising the central role of students in controlling their learning.

4 Project partners

	Role	Short Name	Legal Name	Country
1	COO	TalTech	TALLINNA TEHNIKAÜLIKOOL	EE
2	BEN	KU Leuven	KATHOLIEKE UNIVERSITEIT LEUVEN	BE
3	BEN	PWR	POLITECHNIKA WROCLAWSKA	PL
4	BEN	IFNUL	IVAN FRANKO NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF LVIV	UA
5	BEN	KRNU	KRYVORIZKYJ NATIONALNYJ UNIVERSYTET	UA
6	BEN	KKNU	V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University	UA
7	BEN	KHNU	KHMELNITSKY NATIONAL UNIVERSITY	UA
8	BEN	ONPU	ODESSA NATIONAL POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY	UA
9	BEN	IHE OF NAESU	INSTITUTE OF HIGHER EDUCATION OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES OF UKRAINE	UA
10	BEN	KSU	KHERSON STATE UNIVERSITY	UA
11	BEN	NAHEQA	NATIONAL AGENCY FOR HIGHER EDUCATION QUALITY ASSURANCE	UA
12	BEN	UKRSEITSOC	PUBLIC ORGANIZATION "UKRAINIAN SCIENTIFIC AND EDUCATIONAL IT SOCIETY"	UA
13	BEN	FFUTURE	Kryvyi Rih Foundation of the Future	UA

This Project has received funding from the European Commission ERASMUS+ Programme under grant agreement no. 101082928.

5 Project aim, objectives and WPs.

The project aim is to:
- Implement the European experience of student-centered learning;
- Increase the role of students in ensuring the quality of higher education in Partner Countries, by introducing a model of personalized learning based on the virtual learning environment of Intellectual Tutoring "Learning with No Limits" and hybrid technologies.

The project specific objectives are to:

- Enhance student's motivation to learning through applying the by-the-learner approach and create conditions to meet students' individual needs associated with differentiation and personalization of academic trajectories.
- Increase transparency and comprehensibility of education and assessment for students (including the results of non-formal education), reducing students' anxiety as for their own professional expertise and forming their confidence to achieve efficient results.
- Create extra opportunities to get a higher education for people with disabilities and specific academic needs through inclusive education and the implemented model of personalized learning and hybrid technologies.
- Improve educational programs of universities by updating the process of formation of competencies and the distribution of program results of student learning between educational components; to improve the quality of teaching materials.
- Facilitate students' mobility, including in virtual mode, on a university/country scale, inter-university/country levels, between academic sectors and forms of education formal/informal/correspondence) by acknowledging and swapping grades/credits.
- Ensure a feedback on students', teachers' and administration's efficiency

The project contains 7 WPS and for each WP a WP leader has been indicated:

WP1: Project Management (TalTech);
WP2: Development a methodological support for a model of personalized learning (IHE NAESU);
WP3: Development of the information-diagnostic online SMART platform based on the adaptation of an open-source virtual learning environment (KhNU);
WP4: Organization of University Co-working Centres «Learning with No Limits» at the each partner university (Karazin NU);
WP5: Practical approbation of the model of personalized learning and intellectual tutoring (PWR);
WP6: Quality Assurance (Katholieke Universiteit Leuven);
WP7: Dissemination (IFNUL).

6 Project Management Structure

The project will be managed in such a way as to promote a sense of ownership and motivation for each of the partners. The structure of the project management consists of:

- The Project Coordinator (PC);
- The Steering Committee (SC);
- The Project Quality Committee (PQC);
- The Work Package Leader (WPL).

6.1 The Project coordinator (PC)

TalTech is the Project Coordinator and is responsible for the overall operation of the project and its smooth running, financial and administrative management including the preparation of budget and reports, the in-time deliverance of the project deliverables. The PC will supervise and coordinate all activities, ensuring that all partners are working towards the same objectives and deliverables. The PC will ensure that all partners' contributions meet the Work Plan expectations.

The PC will be responsible for:

- representing the consortium towards the EC;
- ensuring effective flow of information between partners;
- ensuring the implementation of the agreed action plan to the agreed standards and deadlines;
- ongoing evaluation of project activities and reporting on project progress to the EC;
- Introducing in the EC portal the promised deliverables at due date.
-

Within TalTech the project coordination tasks have been divided between:

- Archil Chochia – head of management team, financial management;
- Artem Boyarchuk – communication with Ukrainian team members, verification of deliverables, reporting;
- Madli Krispin – internal communications, signature processes.

6.2 The Steering Committee (SC)

The SC, chaired by the PC, is composed by one member of each partner and will supervise the implementation of the whole programme. It will meet on the occasion of every Transnational Project Meeting (TPM). SC was formed during the kick-off meeting (KOM), and is composed of the following persons:

No.	Short Name	Name + e-mail	Country
1	TalTech	Archil Chochia (archil.chochia@taltech.ee)	EE
2	KU Leuven	Geert De Lepeleer (geert.delepeleer @kuleuven.be)	BE
3	PWR	Mariusz Mazurkevich (mariusz.mazurkiewicz@pwr.edu.pl)	PL
4	IFNUL	Olha Oseredchuk (oseredchuk.ola@gmail.com)	UA
5	KRNU	Natalia Morkun (nmorkun@gmail.com)	UA
6	KKNU	Olena Muradyan(o.s.muradyan@karazin.ua)	UA
7	KHNU	Tetiana Hovorushchenko (hovorushchenko@khmnu.edu.ua)	UA
8	ONPU	MAKSYM MAKSYMOV (prof.maksimov@gmail.com) and TAIA PETIK (taiapetik@gmail.com)	UA
9	IHE OF NAESU	Svitlana Kalashnikova (s.kalashnikova@ihed.org.ua)	UA
10	KSU	Oleksandr Spivakovskiy (spivakovsky@ksu.ks.ua)	UA
11	NAHEQA	Albina Tsiatkovska (atsiatkovska@naqa.gov.ua)	UA
12	UKRSEITSOC	Vyacheslav Kharchenko (v.kharchenko@csn.khai.edu)	UA
13	FFUTURE	Yuriy Korkach (yuriy.korkach@gmail.com)	UA

The SC is the project operational decision-making and arbitration body, which will implement the provisions of the Grant Agreement and shall decide on the following matters:

- strategic orientation of the project;
- on time completion of activities and deliverables ;
- take all decisions required for the successful progress of the project;

- implement the scientific decisions and orientations, taken by the coordinator, by redefining the work plan and schedule and/or re-defining partner roles, contributions and budgets;
- monitor any significant difference between planned and actual advancement of participants' work, particularly with respect of project results and deliverables.

6.3 The Project Quality Committee (PQC)

The Project Quality Committee will be chaired by KU Leuven as Work Package Leader. The PQC will monitor the project at different points using different types of evaluation practices and tools (see Annexes to this Quality Assurance Plan) aiming at assessing on an ongoing basis project relevance, efficiency and impact, to measure progress throughout its life cycle, to determine if the project responds to main target groups' needs, to measure the level of satisfaction of beneficiaries of project activities, and to evaluate unexpected results and control all processes.

The Project Quality Committee (PQC), was established during the kick-off meeting, and is composed of one representative per partner. More particularly, the following persons are part of it:

No.	Short Name	Name + e-mail	Country
1	TalTech	Archil Chochia (archil.chochia@taltech.ee)	EE
2	KU Leuven	Geert De Lepeleer (geert.delepeleer @kuleuven.be)	BE
3	PWR	Mariusz Mazurkevich (mariusz.mazurkiewicz@pwr.edu.pl)	PL
4	IFNUL	Vitaliy Kukharskyy (vitaliy.kukharskyy@gmail.com)	UA
5	KRNU	Musyka Ivan (musicvano@knu.edu.ua)	UA
6	KKNU	Iryna Soldatenko (irinasoldatenko@karazin.ua)	UA
7	KHNU	Sergii Lysenko (sirogyk@ukr.net)	UA
8	ONPU	ANNA LYSYUK (lysyukann@gmail.com)	UA

This Project has received funding from the European Commission ERASMUS+ Programme under grant agreement no. 101082928.

9	IHE OF NAESU	Natalia Shofolova (n.shofolova@ihed.org.ua)	UA
10	KSU	Volodymyr Peschanenko (vladim@ksu.ks.ua)	UA
11	NAHEQA	Olena Loban (oloban@naqa.gov.ua)	UA
12	UKRSEITSOC	Vyacheslav Kharchenko (v.kharchenko@csn.khai.edu)	UA
13	FFUTURE	Yuriy Korkach (yuriy.korkach@gmail.com)	UA

The duty of the PQC is to support the SC in the monitoring and evaluation of the progress of the project and to ensure that all its activities are carried out properly according to European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance and ensuring proper execution of the project to achieve its objective. The PQC will hold regular web meetings and will meet in person during the f2f coordination meetings. The PCQ will report to the SC.

The monitoring and evaluation procedures will monitor the project execution through three (3) yearly monitoring reports.

6.4 The Work Package Leader (WPL)

For each deliverable, one partner is defined as Work Package Leader (WPL). Each Work Package Leader will be responsible for the detailed co-ordination and reporting of a specific WP. Depending on the nature of the WP, in multi-task WPs, the beneficiaries will be assigned specific task and receive responsibilities for leading them, while in transversal WPs they will assist the WPL in its duties. If needed, meetings of the partners involved in the WP will be organized and chaired by the WPL. For each deliverable, within the WP, the Leader will assign direct responsibility either to himself or to another beneficiary. The Work Package Leader is, in the first instance, the person who will be contacted by the PC as part of the monitoring of progress towards completion of the promised WP deliverables.

This Project has received funding from the European Commission ERASMUS+ Programme under grant agreement no. 101082928.

7 Project Quality Assurance

Certain indicators of effectiveness are determined in order to guarantee the reaching of the project goals and objectives, each of which is related to a certain standard (requirement or metric), a measure of the success in producing the project results with the desirable level of quality.

These indicators and respective objectives are described in the Logical Framework Matrix (LFM) of the project application. The indicators mentioned in the LFM of the project application are the main instrument of quality assurance. Additional indicators can also be defined by the WPL or the SC, if deemed necessary. The PQC will use these indicators to measure the rate of success of foreseen results on a regular basis. Indicators are described from a qualitative and quantitative point of view in view of the overall implementation of the project and particular project objectives.

Quality will be measured by using tools such as the monitoring and evaluation questionnaires issued regularly by the PQC and answered by all relevant partners or stakeholders, as well as evidence collected during project activities. In particular, during project execution, the quality of the project and its deliverables are measured against selected quality standards regarding:

- Project Processes, to ensure the involvement and alignment of all partners according to the topics and tools to measure effectiveness.
- Project Deliverables, to measure the degree of achievement of the expected results, both in qualitative and quantitative form.

7.1 Quality of the Project Processes

The quality of the project processes will be done by using the Project Quality Assessment Forms that have been included in the annexes. For the evaluation a set of indicators has been established, which can be measured on a scale from 1 to 5, where 5 is very positive and 1 is very negative. The indicators are generally relevant to the quality of the project management, coordination, structure, support mechanisms, content, and resources. The forms can also contain statements to which the respondent can answer with I agree/I disagree.

The PQC will collect all the answers from the concerned stakeholders and integrate them into a small summary report, which will reflect the views of the consortium on its progress. In case the PQC, upon processing the results finds that one or more are below the expected performance, the PQC notifies the PC in order to start up the improvement procedures.

The evaluation of the project processes will be performed at the end of year one, two and three and the results of the analysis will be incorporated in the yearly reports.

The quality process will also be used to provide valuable feedback from the users of courses, attendants of trainings, in order to increase the quality of the developed deliverables.

7.1.1 Quality of Deliverables

The deliverables consist of the results of the 7 Work Packages, as described in the work plan of the project, and have been included in Annex 1 of this document.

In order to assure a high level of quality regarding the results of the project, each deliverable - activity is evaluated for its completion in due time as well as for its completeness, its effectiveness and its impact. In view of this, a general evaluation document for each deliverable has been created (Annex 3)

Depending on the nature of the activity implemented, for each WP and its subtask(s), the evaluation can be of two kinds: a. Internal or b. external. “Internal” means that responsible for the review of the document or activity are related to members of the consortium, while “external” means that persons other than the partners of the project (e.g. the public, participants, trainees, beneficiaries, etc.) evaluate the results. The evaluation is made with the aid of specific forms that are included as annexes to this plan. Besides these documents, additional evaluation forms may be produced during the lifetime of the project. The forms are suggested to be mainly set up as google forms.

7.1.2 Internal Evaluation

Regarding the internal evaluation of a deliverable (document, report) the following procedure is followed. When a deliverable is finished, the WPL sends the “first draft version” of the relevant document to Project Coordinator who checks it for its completeness, clarity and comprehensiveness. The PC asks the PQC to send out the appropriate evaluation documents, if applicable.

The results of the evaluations are elaborated by the PQC who sends them to the WPL, the PC and the other members of the consortium. The WPL is responsible for amending the document according to the review results, if needed. The time for this amendment is agreed between the WPL and the PC.

In case the WPL considers the suggested improvements (by the reviewer(s)) as not relevant he has to present his reasons to the PC.

The approved document/report/deliverable is included by the PC in the formal progress report/s of the project. It is also uploaded in due time on the website of the project and, if applicable, on the EU portal.

Apart from the project deliverable evaluation form (Annex 3) there is also the peer evaluation form (Annex 4) that has been developed in order to evaluate internally newly developed learning material. It is up to the Project Coordinator to ask the PQM to send out these evaluation forms, if applicable.

7.1.3 External Independent Audit

The SMART-PL project should have the external independent audit of the quality of the project development. As stated in the application (Task T.6.4.), two experts from the non-participating EU institutions will be subcontracted by the project and carry out external quality control activities. The specific contents of the external evaluation include, as regards to the tools used, the reviewer, the dates of review, the indicator(s) etc, are indicated in Annex 5 (Course/Training Evaluation Form). The external independent audit of the project will be prepared by the independent auditor (experts) after the project end. The results of the audit will be submitted together with the Final report.

List of indicators is attached to the QA plan (see Annex 8).

Terms of reference for the external experts are attached to the QA plan (See Annex 9).

7.1.4 Development of Questionnaires

When questionnaires are used for the evaluation of project results, events etc, they will consist mostly of questions that can be answered with the aid of five points rating scale (1: poor and 5: very good). Additionally, they may also include open-ended and/or YES/NO questions. The elaboration of the answers to the questionnaires is made by the PQC and has been distributed to the other project partners.

In order to measure the quality of events (with mainly external participants) the Event Evaluation form has been developed (Annex 6) and to measure the quality of the internal (international) project meetings we developed the Meeting Evaluation form as Annex 7.

This Project has received funding from the European Commission ERASMUS+ Programme under grant agreement no. 101082928.

7.2 General Quality Issues

7.2.1 Document Control

This section describes the control system for preparing, reviewing, approving, distributing, revising and updating documents that are required for the Quality Plan of the SMART-PL project. These documents include but are not limited to the following:

- Quality assurance plan;
- Quality forms (as annexed to the Quality Assurance Plan);
- Minutes of the meetings;
- Deliverables of WPs;
- Progress reports.
-

External documents like the Erasmus plus program guide or other instructions by the EACEA or the European Commission, the grant agreement, the partnership agreements (PA) between the PC and the partners etc.

All the internal documents (except quality forms) are drafted using the DT (document template-Annex 2). The first draft version is numbered with 1. For the description of the different versions the version control table in the beginning of each document is completed. The version nr is also inserted in the bottom of each page of the document. Responsible for the revision of the different documents are the respective WPLs who are also responsible for distributing the documents.

The first draft version of the documents (v1) is sent to the PC and the WP involved partners who have 7 days to submit their comments. The WPL makes the necessary amendments and issues the second draft version (2) which is also distributed to all involved partners. If no comments are received in a period of 7 days maximum, this second draft version is considered to be the final one. Further amendments to the documents, during the lifecycle of the project can be made given a new version nr.

The last approved version (controlled copy) is sent to the Project Coordinator who will also upload the document/deliverable to the website of the project. In case the document concerns a project deliverable, the PC uploads the document also on the EC portal by due time.

External documents that are not available on the website shall be properly collected and maintained by the PC and made available to the partnership if deemed necessary or requested by partner(s)

7.2.2 Documents' Format

All the documents are elaborated in MS Word™ format (or equivalent) for documents, MS Excel™ format (or equivalent) for spreadsheets and MS Power Point™ (or equivalent) format for presentations. For questionnaires that are circulated a google doc document is strongly advised.

The final deliverables are also made available in pdf format in order to avoid not desired changes.

7.2.3 Documents for Public Use

Documents or other material that is addressed to the public (informative material, brochures, leaflets, posters, presentations, DVDs etc.) must bear:

- The logo of SMART-PL project;
- The logo of ERASMUS PLUS;
- The title and reference number of the project;
- The following disclaimer: Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them".
-

Important: the same logos and disclaimer shall be also mentioned at the web-site of the project as well as at any other social network page (Facebook, twitter etc.).

7.2.4 Master List of Quality Plan Documents & Forms

The Quality documents and forms are described in the following table and annexed to this Quality plan:

Full name of document	
Quality Assurance Plan	
Overview of deliverables including timeline and WP leaders	Annex 1
Document Template	Annex 2
Deliverable Evaluation Form	Annex 3
Peer Review Evaluation Form	Annex 4
Training/Course Evaluation Form	Annex 5
Event Evaluation Form	Annex 6
Meeting Evaluation Form	Annex 7

This Project has received funding from the European Commission ERASMUS+ Programme under grant agreement no. 101082928.

7.2.5 Communication

Communication between the members of the consortium, between the PC and the project officer and between the PC and the EACEA is very crucial for the successful implementation of the SMART-PL project.

Day by day communication of the partnership is conducted by e-mail, telephone conversations and online platform meetings when deemed necessary. Each partner appoints a representative for the list of recipients for communications. For the avoidance of any confusion, special attention is paid to the clear drafting of the subject of the e-mail. Periodic online conferences/meetings will be organized to complement face to face meetings in order to facilitate follow upon decision taken, monitor on project implementation and trouble shooting.

In general, all information relevant to the project is sent to all partners, except in cases of specific action(s) that involve only some of the partners. Each WPL shall communicate the WP results to all partners during transnational meetings.

External communication with the Project Officer and with the EACEA is the responsibility of the PC. This communication takes place mainly by the EC Portal, by e-mail, telephone conversations, online meetings or face-to-face discussions when it is needed, and its results are communicated to the partnership.

7.2.6 Meetings

Timely project meetings are important to ensure the progress of the project and to maintain the technical and social relationships among the partners in the project. Due to the ongoing war in Ukraine some of the meetings will be reorganized internally by the partners and held online, as the case for the Kick-off meeting.

During project meetings, the work already done will be presented, jointly reviewed, and - when necessary - possible steps for improvements agreed. Having the necessary information in time on possible delays/obstacles in the planning, it allows to decide suitable corrective/preventive actions when detecting lacks or gaps related to the project scheduling and/or planning. These measures decided after analysing the associated risks (in delays, additional costs, overall implications), are to assure that the project meets the declared project objectives, deliverables and targets according to the project planning.

Each meeting should be attended by preferably the same team of project participants in order to assure a smooth project execution. The host of the meeting and the PC are jointly responsible for preparation of agenda for each transnational meeting. During the meeting a list of participants has to be signed. After each meeting, the minutes will be written down. The minutes have to be accepted by all project partners. Decisions in partner meetings will be made based on simple majority. If the distribution of votes is even, the PC vote decides. But it is advisable to reach consensus in all decisions.

To measure the quality of the internal (international) project meetings the Meeting Evaluation form has been developed as Annex 7.

7.2.7 Reporting

A project interim report will give a detailed overview of the activities and outcomes of the project to date. The elaboration will be led by the PC and the SC.

At the end of each project year there will be a quality report that will be prepared for the SC by the PQC. A Project Final Report will also be produced during the last month of the project. It will give a detailed overview of all deliverables realised. The final report will be assessed and approved by the PSC by month 36.

7.2.8 Conflict Resolution

During the project, partners will have to agree on and develop specific outputs. Usually, agreement is first reached through regular contact, followed by official confirmation via electronic mail, letter or minutes. For important issues, agreement may be a report to be signed by those responsible for decisions. Non-technical factors such as resource allocation and contractual terms also need to be agreed and documented in writing. The Project Coordinator should immediately act if potential conflict situations arise. Technical issues/conflicts within contractual commitments that do not involve a change of contract, a change of budget and/or a change of resources/overall focus will be discussed/solved by the Project Coordinator. Decisions will be normally taken through consensus. However, after a reasonable amount of time has passed for illustration and defence of conflicting positions, to avoid deadlock in project operational progress, the approval by a two-third majority of partners will be sufficient. If the decision being taken is unacceptable to partners found in the minority positions, then the problem is elevated to a higher managerial level at the partners in conflict. If again the problem cannot be resolved, the Project Coordinator has to call a management meeting to solve the issue. The Project Coordinator has to inform the partners in writing of any decisions to enforce a final solution by majority vote at least one week in advance. In addition, the PC will inform the Executive Agency in writing and discuss the topics with the Agency before a final decision is made. Any changes regarding budget/contractual issues will be reported to the Agency and occur upon approval only, in accordance with the Grant Agreement.

This Project has received funding from the European Commission ERASMUS+ Programme under grant agreement no. 101082928.

8 List of Annexes

Annex 1: Overview of deliverables including timeline and WP leaders.

Annex 2: Document Template.

Annex 3: Deliverable Evaluation Form.

Annex 4: Peer Review Evaluation Form.

Annex 5: Training/Course Evaluation Form.

Annex 6: Event Evaluation Form.

Annex 7: Meeting Evaluation Form.

Annex 8: List of indicators

Annex 9: Terms of reference

Co-funded by the European Union

This Project has received funding from the European Commission ERASMUS+ Programme under grant agreement no. 101082928.

QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN: ANNEX 1: OVERVIEW OF DELIVERABLES INCLUDING TIMELINE AND WP LEADERS

WP1 PROJECT MANAGEMENT

Deliverable No	Deliverable Name	Lead Beneficiary	Due Date
D1.1	Kick-off meeting	TalTech	01.2023
D1.2	Consortium agreement	TalTech	06.2023

WP 2: DEVELOPMENT OF METHODOLOGICAL SUPPORT FOR A MODEL OF PERSONALIZED LEARNING

Deliverable No	Deliverable Name	Lead Beneficiary	Due Date
D2.1	Benchmarking of the European and Ukrainian practice of applying a personalized approach to learning	IHE NAESU	05.2023
D2.2	Training in KU Leuven	KU Leuven	07.2023
D2.3	The internal regulations on the use of personalized learning	NAQA	03.2024
D2.4	"Competency-based personalized learning and formative assessment in the system of higher education quality assurance" – training program	IHE NAESU	02.2024
D2.5	Training in Politechnika Wroclawska	PWR	07.2023

This Project has received funding from the European Commission ERASMUS+ Programme under grant agreement no. 101082928.

WP 3: DEVELOPMENT OF THE INFORMATION-DIAGNOSTIC ONLINE SMART PLATFORM BASED ON THE ADAPTATION OF AN OPEN-SOURCE VIRTUAL LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

Deliverable No	Deliverable Name	Lead Beneficiary	Due Date
D3.1	SMART-PL online platform	KhNU	08.2024
D3.2	"Opportunities of open educational platforms for students and teacher. Using of the information-diagnostic online platform SMART for teachers and students" – training program	KhNU	11.2024

WP 4: ORGANIZATION OF UNIVERSITY CO-WORKING CENTRES «LEARNING WITH NO LIMITS» AT EACH PARTNER UNIVERSITY

Deliverable No	Deliverable Name	Lead Beneficiary	Due Date
D4.1	Co-working Centers «Learning with No Limits"	IFNUL	06.2024
D4.2	Recommendations "Inclusion in the educational process of people with special educational needs"	IHE NASU	03.2024
D4.3	Consultations on inclusive education	NAQA	09.2024
D4.4	Cooperation agreements	KRNU	12.2025

Co-funded by the European Union

This Project has received funding from the European Commission ERASMUS+ Programme under grant agreement no. 101082928.

WP 5: PRACTICAL APPROBATION OF THE MODEL OF PERSONALIZED LEARNING AND INTELLECTUAL TUTORING

Deliverable No	Deliverable Name	Lead Beneficiary	Due Date
D5.1	Internal trainings for Teachers on personalized learning and the use of the SMART platform	IFNUL	05.2024
D5.2	Adaptation of pilot disciplines for learning in a personalised approach and using the SMART online platform	PWR	06.2025

WP6: QUALITY ASSURANCE

Deliverable No	Deliverable Name	Lead Beneficiary	Due date
D6.1	Quality Assurance Plan	KuLeuven	03.2023
D6.2	Project Manual	TalTech	07.2023

WP 7: DISSEMINATION

Deliverable No	Deliverable Name	Lead Beneficiary	Due Date
D7.1	Project logo and promotional documentation templates	KKNU	03.2023
D7.2	Set of online PR resources	TalTech	03.2023

This Project has received funding from the European Commission ERASMUS+ Programme under grant agreement no. 101082928.

D7.3	Electronic book «Manuals on competence-related personalized education»	NAQA	01.2025
D7.4	Joint scientific papers	KSU	10.2025
D7.5	Final conference	IFNUL	11.2025
D7.6	Electronic book «Opportunities of open educational platforms for students and teachers»	ONPU	01.2025

This Project has received funding from the European Commission ERASMUS+ Programme under grant agreement no. 101082928.

QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN: ANNEX 2: DOCUMENT TEMPLATE

Project Name: Students' Personalised Learning Model, Based on the Virtual Learning Environment of Intellectual Tutoring "Learning with No Limits" – SMART-PL

Grant Agreement No.: 101082928

Call: ERASMUS-EDU-2022-CBHE

Topic: ERASMUS-EDU-2022-CBHE-STRAND-2

Type of action: ERASMUS Lump Sum Grants

Start date of the project: 1 January 2023

Duration of the project: 36 months

Co-funded by the European Union

This Project has received funding from the European Commission ERASMUS+ Programme under grant agreement no. 101082928.

Disclaimer

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

The SMART-PL consortium consists of the following partners:

No.	Role	Short Name	Legal Name	Country
1	COO	TalTech	TALLINNA TEHNIKAÜLIKOOL	EE
2	BEN	KU Leuven	KATHOLIEKE UNIVERSITEIT LEUVEN	BE
3	BEN	PWR	POLITECHNIKA WROCLAWSKA	PL
4	BEN	IFNUL	IVAN FRANKO NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF LVIV	UA
5	BEN	KRNU	KRYVORIZKYJ NATIONALNYJ UNIVERSYTET	UA
6	BEN	KKNU	V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University	UA
7	BEN	KHNU	KHMELNITSKY NATIONAL UNIVERSITY	UA
8	BEN	ONPU	ODESSA NATIONAL POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY	UA
9	BEN	IHE OF NAESU	INSTITUTE OF HIGHER EDUCATION OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES OF UKRAINE	UA
10	BEN	KSU	KHERSON STATE UNIVERSITY	UA
11	BEN	NAHEQA	NATIONAL AGENCY FOR HIGHER EDUCATION QUALITY ASSURANCE	UA
12	BEN	UKRSEITSOC	PUBLIC ORGANIZATION "UKRAINIAN SCIENTIFIC AND EDUCATIONAL IT SOCIETY"	UA
13	BEN	FFUTURE	Kryvyi Rih Foundation of the Future	UA

This Project has received funding from the European Commission ERASMUS+ Programme under grant agreement no. 101082928.

Document Information

Project short name and number	SMART-PL (101082928)
Work package	
Number	
Title	
Type[1]	
Dissemination level[2]	
Contractual date of delivery	

Document History

Version	Date	Status	Authors, Reviewers	Description

[1]**Types.R:** Document, report (excluding the periodic and final reports); **DEM:** Demonstrator, pilot, prototype, plan designs; **DEC:** Websites, patents filing, press & media actions, videos, etc.; **OTHER:** Software, technical diagram, etc.

[2]**Dissemination levels:** Public — fully open (e.g. web); Sensitive — limited under the conditions of the Grant Agreement; EU classified — RESTREINT-UE/EU-RESTRICTED, CONFIDENTIEL-UE/EU-CONFIDENTIAL, SECRET-UE/EU-SECRET under Decision 2015/444.

Co-funded by
the European Union

This Project has received funding from the European Commission ERASMUS+ Programme under grant agreement no. 101082928.

Co-funded by the European Union

This Project has received funding from the European Commission ERASMUS+ Programme under grant agreement no. 101082928.

QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN: ANNEX 3: DELIVERABLE EVALUATION FORM

Reviewer’s Name & Organization (optional but helpful):

Date of Review:

Contents:

Agree
Disagree
N/A

The contents of the Deliverable is adequately clear and understandable.
The contents is according to the Project Technical description.
The contents is according to the project objectives.
All aspects are thoroughly and in depth analyzed
The deliverable is complete.
The deliverable includes the right amount of information and there are not any sections that should be removed.
The contents of the Deliverable is adequately clear and understandable.

Format (for documents)

Agree
Disagree
N/A

The Deliverable contains: Deliverable name and number, Version, Author Name and Date
The Deliverable properly uses the official template provided (formatting, fonts, logos, EU funding disclaimer)
Other aspects concerning the format of the Deliverable such as spelling, grammar, etc are considered correct.

Suggested improvements

Important changes that should be implemented - Missing information - Further improvements

1.Page No. & Section / Suggested Improvement:

2. Page No. & Section / Suggested Improvement:

3. Page No. & Section / Suggested Improvement:

Other observations

Minor corrections that need attention:

1.Page No. & Section / Observation

2.Page No. & Section / Observation

3.Page No. & Section / Observation

4.Page No. & Section / Observation

Conclusion

Mark with X the appropriate line:

No changes required

Minor changes required

Major changes required, it must be reviewed after the changes are implemented

Co-funded by the European Union

This Project has received funding from the European Commission ERASMUS+ Programme under grant agreement no. 101082928.

QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN: ANNEX 4: PEER REVIEW EVALUATION FORM

Form for Courses/Trainings Peer Review

Please give us your evaluation by answering this questionnaire.

Your feedback is very valuable in view of the further project progress and performance.

Rate each question on a 1 (Poor) to 5 (Excellent) scale. Mark only one per row.

If you give 1-Poor or 2-Fair, please explain why and if it is possible give some advice, using the Comment lines.

Thank you for your valuable time.

Course/Training Title: …….

HEI offering the course:……..

1. Course/Training Overview

Poor Fair Average Good Excellent N/A

Description of the course is clear and comprehensive

Expectations for prerequisite knowledge in the discipline and/or any required competencies are clearly stated.

Course credits that have been assigned correspond to the actual workload of the course.

If you have answered “Poor”, "Fair" or "Not Applicable", please give your comments or suggestions for improvement:

This Project has received funding from the European Commission ERASMUS+ Programme under grant agreement no. 101082928.

2. Learning Objectives & Outcomes

Poor Fair Average Good Excellent N/A

The learning objectives and outcomes stated correspond to the level of the course.

The learning outcomes are measurable and consistent with the program-level objectives.

The learning objectives and outcomes are clearly articulated and use specific action verbs.

If you have answered “Poor”, "Fair" or "Not Applicable", please give your comments or suggestions for improvement:

3. Teaching & Learning Methods

Poor Fair Average Good Excellent N/A

The teaching and learning methods are clearly defined and appropriate for this level of course.

The teaching and learning methods promote the achievement of the stated learning objectives and outcomes.

The teaching and learning methods promote the active engagement of the participant.

If you have answered “Poor”, "Fair" or "Not Applicable", please give your comments or suggestions for improvement:

4. Resources & Materials

Poor Fair Average Good Excellent N/A

The resources and materials are appropriate for this level of the course.

The resources and materials contribute to the achievement of the stated learning objectives and outcomes.

The resources and materials represent up-to-date theory and practice in the discipline.

If you have answered “Poor”, "Fair" or "Not Applicable", please give your comments or suggestions for improvement:

5. Course Schedule

Poor Fair Average Good Excellent N/A

The course schedule is clearly defined and logically sequenced.

The amount of time needed to complete this course is appropriate for this content.

The course schedule is in line with the Intended Learning Outcome (ILO).

If you have answered “Poor”, "Fair" or "Not Applicable", please give your comments or suggestions for improvement:

6. Learning Assessments

Poor Fair Average Good Excellent N/A

The learning outcomes and assessments are aligned.

Major summative assessment activities are clearly defined.

Assessments are implemented according to plan.

The course grading policy is clearly stated.

Weighting of exams and projects is clearly defined.

The learning outcomes and assessments are aligned.

If you have answered “Poor”, "Fair" or "Not Applicable", please give your comments or suggestions for improvement:

This Project has received funding from the European Commission ERASMUS+ Programme under grant agreement no. 101082928.

7. Personal remarks

Strengths of the course:

Weaknesses of the course:

Comments and suggestions for improvement:

Any further comment:

8. PERSONAL INFO

Please state your organisation and your name.

All data are treated with confidentiality!

Reviewer's name:

Date of Review:

Reviewer's organisation

P1	TALLINNA TEHNIKAÜLIKOOL
P2	KATHOLIEKE UNIVERSITEIT LEUVEN
P3	POLITECHNIKA WROCLAWSKA
P4	IVAN FRANKO NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF LVIV
P5	KRYVORIZKYJ NATIONALNYJ UNIVERSYTET
P6	V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University
P7	KHMELNITSKY NATIONAL UNIVERSITY
P8	ODESSA NATIONAL POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY
P9	INSTITUTE OF HIGHER EDUCATION OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES OF UKRAINE
P10	KHERSON STATE UNIVERSITY

Co-funded by
the European Union

This Project has received funding from the European Commission ERASMUS+ Programme under grant agreement no. 101082928.

P11 NATIONAL AGENCY FOR HIGHER EDUCATION QUALITY ASSURANCE

12 PUBLIC ORGANIZATION "UKRAINIAN SCIENTIFIC AND

EDUCATIONAL IT SOCIETY"

13 Kryvyi Rih Foundation of the Future

Co-funded by the European Union

This Project has received funding from the European Commission ERASMUS+ Programme under grant agreement no. 101082928.

QUALTY ASSURANCE PLAN: ANNEX 5: TRAINING/COURSE EVALUATION FORM

We'd like to have your opinion on the organizational aspects and the overall quality for the training. Please complete the evaluation for the training session. Your feedback as trainee is valuable.

Location of course/training:

Your name (not compulsory):

Your university/company/organization (not compulsory):

1. Please rate the overall educational experience.

Strongly disagree Disagree Undecided Agree Strongly agree

The course/training was well planned and organized.

The technical resources and communication tools used were satisfactory.

Materials provided were helpful.

The objectives of the course/training were clearly defined and met.

The course/training content was well organized.

The topics of the course/training were clear and easy to follow.

Laboratory Training was sufficient and adjusted to the course

Length of course/training was sufficient.

The course/training enhanced my understanding on the subject.

The course/training was relevant to my needs.

The course/training was a valuable addition to my studies

The course/training will be useful to my work and my professional growth.

The course/training met my expectations.

2. What is your opinion of the Educators

Strongly Disagree Disagree Undecided Agree Strongly Agree

The educator was well acquainted with the training topic.

This Project has received funding from the European Commission ERASMUS+ Programme under grant agreement no. 101082928.

The educator had the ability to explain and illustrate concepts.

The topics were presented in a clear and understandable manner.

The educator encouraged participation, interaction and answered questions clearly.

The educator ’s communication style kept me focused and interested.

3. Was this course/training appropriate for your level of experience?

Yes

No

4. Open questions:

Which topics were not covered or insufficiently covered in your opinion?

Which topics were not relevant in your opinion?

What did you like best about the training?

What suggestions or comments do you have for making the program more effective?

Co-funded by the European Union

This Project has received funding from the European Commission ERASMUS+ Programme under grant agreement no. 101082928.

QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN: ANNEX 6: EVENT EVALUATION FORM

Please answer the following questions using a 1 to 5 scale

1. Was the invitation clear as to the purpose and agenda of the event?

poor/inadequate

1

2

3

4

5

very good/very much

2. Was the event well organized?

poor/inadequate

1

2

3

4

5

very good/very much

3. Were the venue and facilities suitable for the organization of this event ?

poor/inadequate

1

2

3

Co-funded by the European Union

This Project has received funding from the European Commission ERASMUS+ Programme under grant agreement no. 101082928.

4

5

very good/very much

4. Did the speakers address each subject adequately?

poor/inadequate

1

2

3

4

5

very good/very much

5. Did the event manage an adequate level of interaction between participants?

poor/inadequate

1

2

3

4

5

very good/very much

6. Did you find the event interesting?

poor/inadequate

1

2

3

4

5

very good/very much

7. Did the event manage to offer you useful information about your education or professional development?

poor/inadequate

1

2

3

4

5

very good/very much

8. Please add any additional comment that you wish to be taken into account:

ID Question (not obligatory)

1. Please choose your organization

Higher Educational Institute/University

Vocational Education and Training Organization

Secondary Education Vocational School

Public organisation (not educational)

Private for-profit organization / SME

Private non-profit organization / Association / NGO

Other :

2. Is your organization a SMART-PL project partner?

Yes

No

I am not sure

3. Please state your position in the organization

Student/Trainee

Teacher/Professor/Educator

Administrative or Technical staff of educational organisation

Director/Administrator of non educational organisation / SME owner

Staff of non educational organisation

Self-employed professional

Volunteer

Other :

4. Please state your age group

More than 60

50-60

40-49

30-39

24-29

18-23

5. If you wish to receive further information about SMART-PL project, please provide your e-mail address and we will keep you updated : ……..

Co-funded by
the European Union

This Project has received funding from the European Commission ERASMUS+ Programme under grant agreement no. 101082928.

QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN: ANNEX 7: MEETING EVALUATION FORM

1. Was the preparation of the project meeting adequate? (Early setting of dates; enough information on travel arrangements)

poor/inadequate

1

2

3

4

5

very good/very much

2. Was the preparation of the project meeting inclusive? (Common decision on dates; agenda decided amongst partners, have partners recommendations been considered?)

poor/inadequate

1

2

3

4

5

very good/very much

3. Was the invitation clear as to the purpose and agenda of the project meeting?

poor/inadequate

1

2

3

4

5

very good/very much

4. Was the project meeting well organized?

poor/inadequate

1

2

3

4

5

very good/very much

5. Was the venue well equipped and accessible?

poor/inadequate

1

2

3

4

5

very good/very much

6. Was the agenda and time frame respected?

poor/inadequate

1

2

3

4

5

very good/very much

7. Did the speakers address each subject adequately?

poor/inadequate

1

2

3

4

5

very good/very much

8. Did the project meeting manage to enhance collaboration between partners?

poor/inadequate

1

2

3

4

5

very good/very much

9. Do you think that the project meeting achieved its goals?

poor/inadequate

1

2

3

4

5

very good/very much

10. Please add any additional comment, not covered by the questionnaire, that you wish to be considered: (open question)

Co-funded by the European Union

This Project has received funding from the European Commission ERASMUS+ Programme under grant agreement no. 101082928.

QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN: ANNEX 8: INDICATORS

1. Level of support for the introduction of the policy of personalized learning by Ukrainian HEIs

poor/inadequate

1

2

3

4

5

very good/very much

2. Feedbacks recommendations from students, teachers, administrative staff and

Employers

poor/inadequate

1

2

3

4

5

very good/very much

3. Reduction of anxiety about the introduction of a new educational model of personalized learning - building commitment to project goals

poor/inadequate

1

2

3

4

5

very good/very much

4. Reduction of anxiety about the introduction of a new educational model of personalized learning

poor/inadequate

1

2

3

4

5

very good/very much

5. Partners' ability to adapt SMART platform for use by employers: in dual education projects, continuing education courses

poor/inadequate

1

2

3

4

5

very good/very much

6. Support for the SMARTPL centres by stakeholders

poor/inadequate

1

2

3

4

5

very good/very much

7. Level of development of inclusive education programs for students with disabilities by SMARTPL partners

poor/inadequate

1

2

3

4

5

very good/very much

8. Level of activation of the process of involving students in the formation of the content of educational programs

poor/inadequate

1

2

3

4

5

very good/very much

9. Quality of communication between quality assurance departments, teachers and students

poor/inadequate

1

2

3

4

5

very good/very much

This Project has received funding from the European Commission ERASMUS+ Programme under grant agreement no. 101082928.

10. Correspondence of the results of the adaptation of curricula and materials according to the model of personalized learning, to what was declared in developed electronic books

poor/inadequate

1

2

3

4

5

very good/very much

Co-funded by
the European Union

This Project has received funding from the European Commission ERASMUS+ Programme under grant agreement no. 101082928.

QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN: ANNEX 9: TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EXPERT

1. Background on the assignment

SMART-PL is a 3-year EU-funded project, focused on introducing a model of personalized learning, based on the virtual learning environment of Intellectual Tutoring "Learning with No Limits". Intellectual tutoring is a set of learning tools: SMART online platform for virtual personalized learning and formative student assessment; co-working center with equipment for organizing hybrid learning, which increases the educational process's efficiency and gives both teachers and students more opportunities.

During the SMART-PL project two quality control mechanisms will be used: internal and external. External quality control mechanism is to be performed by means of independent quality audit by two external experts selected from non-participating institutions.

The personnel involved in external monitoring will be able to offer an objective point of view for SMART-PL project results and potential issues.

The external independent audit of the project will be prepared by the independent auditor (experts) after the project end. The results of the audit will be submitted together with the Final report.

2. Tasks

The specific contents of the external evaluation include:

- the evaluation of the project deliverables;
- the evaluation of the interim and final report;
- processing Deliverable Evaluation Form;
- processing Review Evaluation Form;
- processing Training/Course Evaluation Form;
- the assessment of the developments and results based on the indicators (Annex 8);
- interview with the selected participants from partner country.

3. Timing

Expected contract duration is: 01.12.25 - 30.01.26

4. Expertise

- Master's degree in Engineering Sciences, Economics, Statistics, or other related subject;
- Demonstrated professional experience in the field of EU academic projects (7-10 years);
- Practical experience in project management actions;
- Familiarity with evaluation procedures and quality control actions; expertise in project reporting;
- Familiarity with EU funded grant programs;
- Demonstrated ability to write clearly;
- Proactive, self-starting, and strong attention to details;
- Excellent verbal communication and writing skills in English.