

EXTEND

Quality Report #1

Deliverable 4.1 -
Internal monitoring
and quality control,
the first six months
of the Project

April 2019



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

Quality Report #1 WP4

Project Acronym:	EXTEND
Project Full Title:	Excellence in Engineering Education through Teacher Training and New Pedagogic Approaches in Russia and Tajikistan
Project No:	586060-EPP-1-2017-1-RO-EPPKA2- CBHE-JP
Funding Scheme:	ERASMUS+
Coordinator:	UPB – University Politehnica Buchareșt
Project Start Date:	October 15, 2017
Project Duration:	36 months

Abstract	This document presents the first Quality Report for the EXTEND Project covering the first 6 months of the project.
----------	--

Quality Report #1 WP4

Document Control Sheet

Title of Document:	Quality Report #1
Work Package:	WP4
Last version date:	9/4/2019
Status:	Final
Document version:	V.02
File name:	EXTEND Quality Report 1.doc
Number of Pages:	9
Dissemination Level:	Public

Versioning and Contribution History

Version	Date	Author (Partner/Person)	Revision Description
v.01	9/4/19	Robin Clark (WU)	1 st draft version
v.02	12/4/19	Elena Smirnova (BMSTU) Maria Dascalu (UPB) Doina Simion (UPB) Natalia Zerkina, (NMSTU) Karlis Valtins (RTU)	2nd draft version modified
v.02	13/4/19	Elisabeth Lazarou (UPB)	Finalized version

Quality Report #1 WP4

Table of contents

1. Introduction.....	5
2. Activities Undertaken	5
3. Results.....	5
4. Discussion	6
5. Conclusions	6
Appendices.....	7
A. Survey Tool for Moscow (December 2017).....	7
B. Survey Tool for Saransk (February 2018)	8

Quality Report #1 WP4

1. Introduction

This document is the first Quality Report for the EXTEND Project. It is based on the presentation given at the Bucharest Project Meeting in June 2018 and covers the first 6 months of project activity.

2. Activities Undertaken

As a consequence of the process being followed to transfer the EXTEND Project to Warwick, the Quality Work Package was significantly impacted. Hence this initial report is somewhat limited, although based on data collected following the initial two project meetings in Moscow in December 2017 and Saransk in February 2018.

For the Moscow meeting, a data collection tool consistent with the Quality Plan was employed and responses were received from all of the participating institutions.

For the Saransk meeting, one of the project partners introduced a simpler data collection tool that was more focused on Likert Scale responses and thus did not have the richness of data present in the initial instrument.

These first two meetings were very much focused on defining the way forward for the project, understanding responsibilities and starting to get to know each other and share knowledge on different aspects of engineering education. As such the first two instruments were generic to all partners and simple in form such that they could be presented on one page.

These first two tools are given in Appendix A and Appendix B.

3. Results

The results for each meeting will be presented in turn.

Moscow – December 2017

13 respondents

Instrument used a 10 point scale (10 – fully, 0 – not at all)

- Meeting objectives met – 9.46
- Clarity about Project aims – 9.23
- Clarity about what you will be doing – 8.38

Key Comments

- Meeting and understanding the project aims and operation was valued
- Understanding the different institutional contexts was important
- Practical concerns were expressed – travel, scheduling, language
- Emphasis was placed on the need for greater clarity in order to realise impact
- Concerns over time and potential scope creep were expressed
- Comments were made emphasizing the need to ensure that the pedagogy considerations weren't lost as the work progressed

The comments summarized above were very representative of the overall feeling from the data collected. The quote below from one of the returned questionnaires evidences how the aims of the initial meeting were met.

This is my first project that is why everything was new and interesting. I understood the way the projects are organized and conducted. I know what I should do and whom we should invite to

Quality Report #1 WP4

the project to achieve the aim. I liked the team of our project. My professional and teaching interests coincide with the goals of the project.

Saransk – February 2018

23 respondents

Instrument used a 3 point scale (happy, not happy, neither)

All questions scored 'happy'

Relevance of the meeting

- Meeting had clear objectives (2.87)
- Methodological understanding of the meeting was clear (2.96)
- Gained a good understanding of the Learning and Teaching approaches explored (2.89)

Meeting Design

- Agenda was consistent with objectives (2.87)
- Useful materials were made available (2.78)
- Meeting arrangements were good (2.85)

Meeting Impact

- Satisfaction with the different elements of the meeting e.g. approach, group work, networking etc. (combined Q's score of 2.83)
- Meeting met expectations (2.78)

For the Saransk meeting the instrument used did not afford the collection of verbatim comments from the participants hence the data is based solely on the Likert Scale results.

4. Discussion

This initial data set suggests that the Project Team is starting to form and that there is an exchange of knowledge, experiences and ideas taking place.

The format of presentations followed by discussion around specific approaches and contexts was seen to be helping the partners from the Russian Federation and Tajikistan to formulate the ideas for their EXTEND Centres.

For both meetings the participants felt that what was achieved was both useful and also met their expectations prior to attending.

5. Conclusions

This report details the initial part of the Quality Work Package data collection and has demonstrated that, despite the absence of the WP4 lead in the face-to-face meetings, the project has started in a productive manner. The networking opportunities and understanding differences have been an important initial step. Participants minds are now focused on framing the future and identifying the specific opportunities for individual EXTEND Centres.

Quality Report #1 WP4

Appendices

Appendix A – Data Collection Instrument – Moscow December 2017

	Kick Off Meeting
	20 and 21 December 2017 - Moscow
	<i>Person completing and Date of completion</i>
How well were the objectives of the meeting met? (10 – fully, 5 – partially, 0 – not at all)	
How clear are you about the aims of the project? (10 – very, 5 – somewhat, 0 – not at all)	
How clear are you about what you will be doing in the project? (10 – very, 5 – somewhat, 0 – not at all)	
Please identify the positive features / outcomes of the meeting for you	
What problems / challenges do you foresee as the project progresses?	
Any other comments you would like to offer	

Quality Report #1 WP4

Appendix B – Data Collection Instrument – Saransk February 2018

Quality Report #1 WP4

2

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

**Evaluation form for the meeting in Saransk (26.02.2018.-
02.03.2018.)**

Home university: BMSTU

Home country: RF

1. Relevance of the meeting

1.1	The objectives of the meeting were clear and explained well	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
1.2	During the meeting I was able to understand overall idea and methodology of the meeting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
1.3	As a result of the meeting I have a clear understanding about the meaning of teaching and learning methods and tools	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
1.4	Presented modules were up to date and clearly presented	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
1.5	After the meeting I have a good basic understanding about new teaching and learning approaches	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

2. Quality of the meeting design and implementation

2.1	The issues on the Agenda were consistent with the Meeting objectives	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2.2	The materials produced before and during the meeting are/were clear and useful	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
2.3	The accommodation was satisfactory (room, food, location)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
2.4	Equipment provided during the meeting was satisfactory (Projector, PC, Internet connection)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

Quality Report #1 WP4

2.5	Logistics during the meeting were adequate and effective	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
2.6	Length of the meeting was in line with its objectives and aims	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
3. Meeting impact and communication				
3.1	I got to know more about my EXTEND colleagues and their local teaching approaches and methods	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
3.2	During group work, my suggestions were taken into account	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
3.3	All the information prior to the meeting was presented in timely manner	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
3.4	Teaching methods and tools presented during the meeting are clear and I know how they could be applied	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3.5	I feel that all the partners contributed to the success of this EXTEND meeting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
3.6	I would be able to explain learned outcomes of the seminar to my colleagues (Teaching & learning methods, tools)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
3.7	I will start using presented tools and methods	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
3.8	Information presented to me in a foreign language was clear and translation was provided when needed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
3.9	Social programme was interesting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
3.10	The meeting met my expectations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

Comments and suggestions:

Very good organization from the side of hoster university
Thanks to them!