



# **MODERNIZING AND ENHANCING INDIAN E-LEARNING EDUCATIONAL STRATEGIES – MIELES**

**MIELES Quality Assurance Plan (WP6)**

With the support of the  
Erasmus+ programme of  
the European Union



## **INTRODUCTION**

Evaluation of quality and monitoring is an important part of project management. The evaluation of the project's processes, activities, and outcomes is usually developed by the application of empirical methods aimed at assessing and improving the results of the project's work packages.

The evaluation and quality assessment process will:

- Support the project development and provide continuous feedback on the extent the project objectives are accomplished;
- Allow the project results to be improved by comparing the identified objectives and the established processes/means;
- Support the project decision-making process by evaluating the results;
- Monitor the involvement of all project partners and other stakeholders;
- Monitor the means used and the level of efficiency with which the project components are being implemented;
- Identify any risks and potential issues/obstacles related to the project implementation, alert the Management Team, and propose possible solutions.

This document details the quality and monitoring plan for the MIELES project, including the purpose and scope, key outputs/indicators, internal evaluation procedures, external evaluation procedures, and communication and reporting procedures. This document's target audience is mainly the project partners so that they may have a clear and concise understanding of the project's quality management aspects. In addition, this document will help the European Commission officials understand the quality management approach adopted by the partnership.

## **PROJECT OVERVIEW**

### ***Project summary***

The general objective of MIELES is to modernise and enhance access to the Indian higher education system by supporting the development of diverse institutional e-learning strategies. The specific objectives are to:

- support Indian institutional management to assess their interests and needs with regards to e-learning
- build the capacity of Indian institutions to develop clear, realistic, and tailored strategic approaches to e-learning
- enhance the capacity of Indian institutions to implement their institutional e-learning strategies, both through staff training and collaborative pilot projects
- enable transfer of knowledge within India regarding e-learning strategy and capacity
- enhance Indian-European collaboration in e-learning

### ***Project consortium***

The MIELES project consortium includes a wide variety of Indian and European partners, including some institutions and organisations with favoured economic positions and a long-standing tradition of collaboration in EU projects and some without either. The MIELES project consortium is composed of the following:

#### Indian partners:

- University of Mysore (UOM)
- MEA Engineering College (MEA EC)
- Kahm Unity Women's College (KUWC)
- Amrita University
- Indian Institute of Technology Madras (IITM)
- Indian Institute of Science (IISC Bangalore)

- Edulink Private Limited (EDL)

European partners:

- University of Barcelona (UB)
- KTH Royal Institute of Technology (KTH)
- Technical University of Berlin (TUB)
- Sapienza University of Rome (UNIROMA)
- Centre for the Advancement of Research and Development in Educational Technology, Ltd. (CARDET Ltd.)
- University of Peloponnese (UOP)
- European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)

The expected contribution of each partner to the quality work package (in terms of staff days) is indicated below.

Work package	Partner			Number of staff days					Role and tasks in the work package
				Category 1	Category 2	Category 3	Category 4	Total	
WP 6 QUALITY PLAN	P1	UB	Spain	20	7	0	3	30	The UB will support the QA activities, will implement the QP (6.2) and will cooperate in the selection of the external evaluator (6.3)
	P2	KTH	Sweden	18	2	0	0	20	KTH will support the QA activities, will implement the QP (6.2) and will cooperate in the selection of the external evaluator (6.3)
	P3	TU BERLIN	Germany	29	10	0	1	40	TUB will be a permanent member of the Quality Committee (6.1) will implement the QP (6.2) and will cooperate in the selection of the external evaluator (6.3)
	P4	UR-Sapienza	Italy	18	2	0	0	20	SAPIENZA will support the QA activities, will implement the QP (6.2) and will cooperate in the selection of the external evaluator (6.3)
	P5	CARDET	Cyprus	18	2	0	0	20	CARDET will Support the QA activities, will implement the QP (6.2) and will cooperate in the selection of the external evaluator (6.3)
	P6	UP	Greece	24	2	0	0	26	UP will be a permanent member of the Quality Committee (6.1) and will support and develop the QA activities, will implement the QP (6.2) and will cooperate in the selection of the external evaluator (6.3)
	P7	ENQA	Belgium	29	2	0	0	31	ENQA will lead Quality Committee (6.1) and will support and develop the QA activities, will implement the QP (6.2) and will cooperate in the selection of the external evaluator (6.3)
	P8	IISC Bangalore	India	18	2	0	0	20	IISC Bangalore will Support the QA activities, will implement the QP (6.2) and will cooperate in the selection of the external evaluator (6.3)
	P9	IIT-Madras	India	29	2	0	0	31	IIT Madras will be a permanent member of the Quality Committee (6.1) and will support and develop the QA activities, will implement the QP (6.2) and will cooperate in the selection of the external evaluator (6.3)
	P10	AMRITA	India	29	2	0	0	31	AMRITA will be a permanent member of the Quality Committee (6.1) and will support and develop the QA activities, will implement the QP (6.2) and will cooperate in the selection of the external evaluator (6.3)
	P11	KAHMUWC	India	18	2	0	0	20	KAHMUWC will Support the QA activities, will implement the QP (6.2) and will cooperate in the selection of the external evaluator (6.3).
	P12	UOM	India	29	2	0	0	31	UOM will be a permanent member of the Quality Committee (6.1) and will support and develop the QA activities, will implement the QP (6.2) and will cooperate in the selection of the external evaluator (6.3)
	P13	EDL	India	18	2	0	0	20	EDL will Support the QA activities, will implement the QP (6.2) and will cooperate in the selection of the external evaluator (6.3)
	P14	MEAC EC	India	18	2	0	0	20	MEAC will Support the QA activities, will implement the QP (6.2) and will cooperate in the selection of the external evaluator (6.3)
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>				<b>315</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>360</b>	

### ***Project committees***

In order to ensure the continuity and quality of the project activities and outcomes, the partners have agreed to set up two committees:

1) Management Team (MT)

A management team, composed of KTH, CARDET, EDULINK, IISC, and chaired by UB, will monitor the project's activities and structure the project's financial management. It will serve to schedule meetings, prepare reporting, monitor the project timeline, communicate to the partnership, take corrective measures, resolve conflicts among partners (if needed), and study input from the Quality Committee, making changes to the management approach when needed. The MT will also be responsible for authorising the purchase of equipment, managing the taxation and customs duties in partner countries and all related paperwork. It will meet regularly, in conjunction with other project meetings, and organise ad hoc teleconferences.

2) Quality Committee (QC)

The Quality Committee, chaired by ENQA and composed of one representative from TUB, UOP, UOM, Amrita, and IITM, have prepared this Quality Assurance Plan, which includes indicators for assessing the project milestones and achievements and a methodology for the various QA measures they will undertake. It will coordinate the preparation of the intermediate and final quality assurance reports and communicate its conclusions and recommendations to the MT, the project leader, and the consortium. The Quality Committee will meet three times, in conjunction with a project event whenever possible.

The Quality Committee, through the QA plan, will work closely with the Management Team to identify the early impacts, successes, and areas for improvement concerning MIELES and its implementation. Monitoring the progress in establishing e-learning strategies within Indian HEIs, as well as the roles of partners in this, and the extent to which MIELES helps the HEIs meet policy priorities are essential aspects of the project.

### **PURPOSE AND SCOPE**

The MIELES Quality Committee will organise three different types of quality measures: **peer reviews of project outputs** (mapping studies, major reports produced from events, etc.), **evaluation surveys of the partnership** (twice throughout the partnership, to assess the communication dynamics and general management approach) and **the drafting of the terms of reference for the external evaluation** (6.3). The Quality Committee has also prepared this Quality Assurance Plan.

## OUTPUTS

This section of the plan will focus primarily on the key outputs and some indicators to assess the quality/performance of the project. The identification of key outputs for different types of work packages is necessary to support the evaluator to perform its evaluation role for each work package and to suggest improvements.

### MIELES Project: Outputs

Work package type and title	Preparation	Development	Development	Development	Dissemination and Exploitation	Quality Control	Management
	State of the art and needs assessment for e-learning in Indian higher education	Towards comprehensive e-learning institutional strategies	Implementing e-learning strategies: e-learning pilot projects	Capacity development to further implement and sustain e-learning strategies	Disseminating results and enhancing dialogue on e-learning	Quality tools for the project implementation	Project Management
Work package number	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Key outputs and indicators	<p>Conduct mapping study on trends in e-learning strategies in Europe and India</p> <p>Organise introductory workshop on trends in e-learning in Europe, workshop to prepare SWOT results</p> <p>Organise visits of European experts teams to validate SWOT exercise</p> <p>Perform SWOT analysis in Indian partner universities regarding e-learning interests, needs and current state of play</p>	<p>Organise roundtable for the partnership, policy makers, and additional experts to discuss the why and how of e-learning strategies</p> <p>Organise three focus groups in India to discuss and develop (or refine, if they already exist) institutional strategies, focusing on specific aspects</p> <p>Draft e-learning strategies (Indian partner institutions)</p>	<p>Prepare pilot project work plans</p> <p>Organise workshop to prepare pilot projects</p> <p>Conduct three pilot projects, consisting of virtual meetings, internal consultations in Indian institutions, practice sharing, and two visits of the involved European partners to India</p> <p>Produce outcome report for three pilot projects</p>	<p>Organising study visit to Europe, targeting senior management</p> <p>Organise a training workshop for those managing QA in teaching and learning in Indian institutions</p> <p>Organise a training workshop on staff development for e-learning</p> <p>Organise training workshop on collaborative online courses</p>	<p>Set up and maintain project website, including content derived from bi-monthly updates from Indian partner universities regarding relevant current events and initiatives in India and an intranet and document repository for project partners</p> <p>Design a series of promotional material, including a logo, trademark, brochures, posters, etc., to be printed accordingly during the life-cycle of the project.</p> <p>Organise multiplier workshops</p> <p>Organise European dissemination conference</p> <p>Organise internal dissemination workshops (Indian universities)</p> <p>Produce quarterly updates by e-newsletter</p>	<p>Set up Quality Committee</p> <p>Set up and follow up the Quality Plan</p> <p>Appoint an external evaluator</p> <p>Present feedback and reports regarding the quality procedures of the project</p>	<p>Produce and disseminate Project Management Guidelines</p> <p>Coordinate the project activities</p> <p>Coordinate the MT</p> <p>Organise the KOM</p> <p>Coordinate the communication among the partnership</p> <p>Prepare financial and technical reports</p> <p>Prepare annual work plans</p> <p>Request and collect status and progress reports from WP leaders</p>

				<p>Disseminate flyers at relevant conferences and events that partners attend</p> <p>Produce publications in international journals and deliver presentations at international conference (esp. CARDET)</p> <p>Disseminate outcomes of project via various channels and utilising partner networks</p> <p>Distribute reports among EU and partner universities</p> <p>Report on regular meetings of national educational commissions (e.g. 9 leading institutes of Technology (TU9) in Germany)</p> <p>Ensure multiplying effects and synergies with other EC initiatives operating in India</p>	<p>Request and collect internal progress and financial reports from partners every six months</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

## PROJECT INTERNAL EVALUATION

This section aims to provide the partnership with internal evaluation tools for its activities and outcomes to support and facilitate the partners in controlling and monitoring each step of the project.

### *Partner progress report*

This section provides the Quality Committee with the template of the progress report which will be submitted by the partners every six months to enumerate their own activities and which will inform the Quality Committee's reviews of project outputs. This will allow the Quality Committee to monitor the progress of the project activities and help identify any potential or current issues so it may take actions for resolution.

<b>Partner organisation</b>	
<b>Reporting period</b>	
<b>Date</b>	
<b>Contact person</b>	

### **1. Main activities undertaken in the reporting period**

Please summarise the main activities carried out by your organisation during the reporting period. Please indicate the level of achievement of the project tasks that your organisation is responsible for and the resources allocated to these activities in the table here below.

<b>WP No</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>End date</b>	<b>% of achievement</b>

### **2. Results / outcomes and work plan**

Please list the results/outcomes of the activities that took place during the progress period. Please indicate if any updates have been made to the project work plan. In case of deviation from the work plan, please indicate the activities/results concerned, the amount of delay and the corrective actions taken to improve the situation.

### **3. Dissemination and valorisation**

Please list the type of dissemination/valorisation activities that have been carried out by the partner during the progress period.

### **4. Additional comments and suggestions**

### *Project internal meeting evaluation*

In order to ensure that the internal meetings of the project consortium are conducted satisfactorily and the objectives met, a feedback form will be sent to the participants after each internal meeting. The results will be analysed by ENQA and based on these results, a list of recommendations will be devised to improve future meetings. Below is a list of quality indicators and an example of the content for the questionnaire:

#### INDICATORS OF QUALITY:

- Sufficient and adequate information was sent to partners prior to the meeting
- There was effective communication prior to the meeting

- Partners were given time for introductions (or re-introductions) and had time to update each other on their backgrounds and what they can bring to the project
- The agenda was respected, and any changes were negotiated and agreed upon with the partners
- All partners contributed to the meeting
- The goals of the meeting were clear from the beginning and were met in the end
- The working environment was adequate for the meeting
- The planned activities took place
- The partners have a clear idea of their role in the project and the next steps to be taken
- The accommodation, food, and social element were satisfactory

FEEDBACK QUESTIONNAIRE CONTENT:

<b>Prior to the meeting</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Was sufficient and adequate information provided prior to the meeting?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Was the communication prior to the meeting effective enough?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Were the meeting's goals clear?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Was the workload prior to the meeting acceptable?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Were you able to accomplish the tasks you were supposed to deliver prior to the meeting?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>The meeting</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Was the set agenda respected? If any changes occurred, were they discussed and agreed upon?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Were all the goals of the meeting met? If not, please specify which goals were not met?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Did the meeting provide sufficient time for introductions (or re-introductions) and sharing of the background of the partners?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Are you satisfied with your level of contribution to the discussions and the decision-making?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Follow-up of the meeting</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Do you consider that there is a clear and reasonable timeline for the future activities to be undertaken?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Do you consider that the necessary decisions were taken?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Are the decisions taken clear and realistic to you?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Do you have a clear understanding of your overall and specific role in the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Was the follow-up of the meeting done in an effective and timely manner?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Additional elements</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>Comments</b>

Were you satisfied with the working environment (venue, facilities, noise, light, etc.)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Were you satisfied with the accommodation, food (lunch and/or dinner), and the social activity (if any)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

### ***Evaluation of events***

This section provides the Quality Committee with the suggested content for the assessment of events. The participants will be sent the feedback survey after each project event to evaluate the level of satisfaction concerning the organisation, content, and relevance of the event, including the clarity of the objectives set. The results will be used to inform the Quality Committee's reviews of project outputs and to improve further events.

### ***Feedback questionnaire content***

<b>Themes</b>	<b>Performance Indicators</b>	<b>5 - strongly disagree</b>	<b>4 - disagree</b>	<b>3 - neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>2 - agree</b>	<b>1 - strongly agree</b>
<b>Organisation of the event</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• registration process handled professionally</li> <li>• evidence of good planning</li> <li>• realistic timescales</li> <li>• appropriate selection of contributors/speakers</li> <li>• appropriate event venue and facilities</li> </ul>					
<b>Provision and suitability of materials, resources and equipment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• sufficient information about the event provided beforehand</li> <li>• Relevance and quality of materials issued during the event</li> <li>• Extent to which technology and other resources are used effectively and with innovation</li> <li>• Sufficiency, range and suitability of other resources, including, where appropriate, ICT</li> </ul>					
<b>Content and appropriate range of sessions/ activities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• appropriate content, clearly related to the aims and objectives of the event</li> <li>• relevant sessions/activities e.g. icebreaking activities, didactic sessions, social activities, breaks etc.</li> <li>• appropriate social programme</li> </ul>					

<b>What did you find positive about the event?</b>	
<b>What did you find negative or that could be improved about the event?</b>	
<b>Do you have any other comments or suggestions?</b>	

### ***Evaluation of partnership***

This section provides the Quality Committee with the suggested content for the evaluation of the partnership. The project partners will be sent the feedback survey twice during the duration of the

project - after year 1 and after year 2 - to assess the communication dynamics and general management approach for the MIELES project. The results will be used to help the Quality Committee identify any potential or current issues so it may take actions for resolution.

Question	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Not satisfied	Not applicable
Are you satisfied that the deliverable dates are met/will be met according to the project plan?				
Are you satisfied with the level of involvement of your organisation?				
Are you satisfied with the level of involvement of the other partners?				
Have problems been addressed and resolved in a timely manner?				
What is your overall level of satisfaction with the project's ability to meet the set expectations?				
Are you satisfied with the quality process used during the project?				
What is your overall level of satisfaction with the project management process?				
Overall, are you satisfied with the amount of information you received during the project regarding status, problems, and progress?				
What communication, organisation, and general structural problems were encountered, and how could the project management have done better in these areas?				
Do you have any other questions or comments?				

## PROJECT EXTERNAL EVALUATION

### *External evaluator*

An external evaluator/advisor with scientific expertise in e-learning tools and e-learning institutional strategies, as well as TEMPUS and Erasmus projects, will be selected by - and will report to - the Quality Committee. S/he will conduct a review after the second year of the project, verifying the quality of the deliverables and the achievement of milestones and objectives, evaluating the results of each work package, and providing recommendations which will later feed into the final quality assurance report. To inform the report, the expert will participate in selected project activities, interview partners, and observe meetings. S/he will also examine all project documents and the website and interview other relevant beneficiaries, in particular different staff members involved with Indian partners. The report produced by the evaluator will be discussed by the Management Team and with the Quality Committee. Key messages will be used to enhance procedures during the last project year and to ensure the sustainability of results.

TUB is in charge of preparing the Memorandum of Understanding to be signed with the evaluator.

The Quality Committee agreed to nominate \_\_\_\_\_.

Suggestions:

Darco Jansen (EADTU, OpenUpEd)

George Ubachs (EADTU)

Ebba Ossiannilsson (Swedish Association for Distance Education)

Israel Conejero Arto (Open University of Catalunya)

## **COMMUNICATION AND REPORTING**

### ***Communication of results***

As the leader of the Quality Control work package, ENQA will oversee the collection and analyses of the responses in surveys and reports and ensure regular communication with the Quality Committee and the other partners. Project meetings and virtual means will be used for this purpose.

### ***Intermediate report***

An intermediate report will be submitted midway through the project's lifetime.

### ***Final report***

A final quality assurance report, including the findings of the internal evaluation of the project, will be submitted along with the project final report.