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**3. Quality and Evaluation Plan**

**3.1 Introduction**

This plan supports the quality and evaluation activities in LanCook. It forms part of Work Package 2: Quality Assurance.

**3.1.1. Defining quality and evaluation**

The quality and evaluation plan in LanCook aims to ensure the quality of the project’s processes, outputs and outcomes. The plan itself is based around an informed approach which draws on guidance from EU LLP programme, examples of best practice from previous EU LLP programmes as well as the skills and expertise of LanCook’s project participants. A helpful characterisation to support LanCook’s quality and evaluation plan is that these two components should: “be seen as a process […] This process should be driven by questioning and by the desire for a high quality project” (Survival Guide, p. 99).

In addition, the following definitions are also useful:

“Quality is partly defined through the impact of the project, but should also extend to relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and long term sustainability”

“Evaluation is the systematic application of empirical methods which aims to assess and improve the planning, implementation and impact of a project”

(Survival Guide, p. 99).

The process-oriented nature of the plan demonstrates the overriding objective of the project participants to be reflective throughout the lifetime of the project. This is achieved through different forms of internal and external evaluation throughout the project as well as towards the end when our final products are ready.

LanCook works towards its aim to ensure quality by focussing on three key areas: Processes, Outputs/Outcomes and Products.

The processes concern the quality of project’s management including its project structure, communication systems, quality and evaluation activities, the extent to which the deliverables conform to the original proposal and the extent to which the project maintains its focus on the main product. Outputs/Outcomes concern financial processes and efficiency, dissemination activities and exploitation. Products are the technologically enhanced learning materials in 5 languages which aim to promote language learning and culture.

These 3 areas are interrelated but become more or less prominent in different Work Packages (1-8). In Section 3.3, the relationship between the Work Package activities and the planned quality and evaluation activities are discussed in more detail.

**3.1.2 Outline of the quality and evaluation plan**

This plan describes how the envisaged activities relating to processes, outcomes/outputs and products will be addressed and includes the tools that will be used to manage quality and evaluation. Section 3.2 describes how LanCook manages quality assurance and evaluation with specific details about its methodology. Section 3.3 concerns quality and evaluation more specifically in relation to different work packages. Finally, Section 3.4 provides a list of templates which have been produced in order to collate information and evidence to support LanCook in its internal and external evaluation activities.

LanCook’s quality and evaluation activities and plan were discussed during the kick-off meeting in Newcastle (June 2012). P3 prepared a presentation about QA, and the approach to evaluation was discussed and agreed by partners. Subsequently the Quality Plan has been prepared by P3 (as lead in Work Package 2: Quality Assurance) and P1 (as Project Co-ordinator).

**3.2 Managing Quality and Evaluation**

The quality of LanCook will be monitored throughout the project through various means of pre-defined methods for ensuring quality as well as a system of evaluation. P3 is responsible for establishing the project’s quality system and for implementing quality control in order to assure good project quality. Quality and evaluation is an ongoing activity; LanCook will employ both formative and summative evaluation as well as internal and external evaluation. The participants will use a range of methods to evaluate the development of the project.

**3.2.1 Management of formative and summative evaluation**

The management of formative and summative evaluation is built into LanCook through this plan which identifies both the targets for evaluation and a methodology for reviewing progress and different data collection methods.

*Identifying targets for evaluation*

The targets for evaluation are those in the three areas of processes, outcomes/outputs and products. Led by P3 and P1, the project participants have identified specific themes of the project that fall within each of these areas:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Processes (WP 1 & 2)** | **Outputs/outcomes (WP 7,8)** | **Products (WP 4,5,6)** |
| Project Co-ordination | Dissemination activities | Learning materials |
| Communication | Exploitation |  |
| Quality and Evaluation |  |
| Financial processes and efficiency |
| Progress towards Deliverables |

*Methodology for quality and evaluation: Formative, summative, internal and external evaluation*

Formative evaluation will take place throughout the project and concerns the different levels of feedback both from stakeholders and self-evaluation carried out by the project participants in relation to the identified targets of evaluation. Summative evaluation will also take place in relation to these targets in terms of the internal and external deliverables (tasks) and milestones (points in time identified to achieve those tasks).

Internal evaluation is a form of self-evaluation by the project participants and is closely related to formative evaluation. External evaluation is feedback by person independent of the project who can provide input throughout the different stages of the research work.

*Summative evaluation methods*

The main methods for summative evaluation relate to the project deliverables.

The core questions for summative evaluation are:

* was the deliverable achieved on time and according to plan?
* how were any changes rationalised?

Specific methods for summative evaluation are:

1. A planned series of face to face and virtual review meetings at important points in the lifetime of LanCook where achievement of and progress towards the relevant project deliverables are mutually reported on, discussed and evaluated by all project participants.

2. The preparation for an externally submitted document to the EACEA, part of which reports on interim progress in terms of project deliverables

3. The preparation for regularly submitted internal report forms where project participants report on their achievement of and progress towards the relevant project deliverables. The findings are reviewed by P3 and P1 and are subject to discussion at the review meetings as in point 1..

4. The preparation for the submission of 2 planned quality reports, part of which report on the activities of the quality and evaluation activities as described in this plan.

5. The recruitment of external evaluators who will provide an independent voice to reviewing the range deliverables (particularly in relation to the LanCook products)

In all cases, where summative evaluation concerning deliverables has led to ‘lessons learned’, a revised approach will be taken which takes into consideration the views of all project participants, the external assessor from the EACEA and the external evaluator appointed by LanCook.

*Formative evaluation methods*

Formative evaluation concerns the evaluation of the identified targets which take place beyond the main deliverables of LanCook and involves internal evaluation.

Specific methods for formative evaluation are:

1. A quality and evaluation plan (this document) which identifies the targets for evaluation. This is a working document which may be edited and added to as the project progresses, based on the findings of subsequent evaluation activity.

2. The development of specific opportunities for evaluation which are made up on specific methods to collect evidence which can be acted upon. These methods which may be modified or more methods might be introduced as the project progresses, based on the findings of subsequent evaluation activity:

Questionnaires

Virtual meetings

Online discussion board

Focus groups

3. An accessible space (a discussion board) where project participants can record their day to day evaluation of the different aspects of the project. This space can also be accessed by the EACEA and external evaluators.

4. A system (a working document) for recording both the findings of evaluation activities for the identified targets and how these findings are acted upon

5. A system (a working document) for recording any additional or modified targets for evaluation.

**3.3 Quality and evaluation in relation to different Work Packages**

**3.3.1 WP1 – Management**

The aim of the WP1isthe development and implementation of a Project Management system that will enable the consortium to deliver the project according to the technical description in the application, within the right time frame, of a high level of quality and within budget.

The quality of WP1 is ensured by the following means:

Documents:

1. Project Management Reference Guide: P1 has provided a project reference which includes an overview of the project, project’s objectives, work plan, time line, budget allocation, administrative data and contact details of the participants, methods of communication, and procedures for the certification of deliverables.
2. Virtual shared workspace: an online resource part of the website (wwww.europeandigitalkitchen.com) for all project participants where documentation for LanCook is stored and regularly updated.
3. Internal and external progress reports: Progress reports will provide an overview of the progress made, description of forthcoming tasks, budget consumed and available, minutes of the meetings, fulfilment of the action plan. Internal progress reports are discussed in the consortium meetings, external reports will be sent to the EACEA.

Organisation:

1. Steering committee: A steering committee has been established by the lead staff from partner institutions to coordinate and monitor the progress of the project.
2. Periodic consortium meetings: A kick-off meeting was organised via Skype, and a major planning meeting in Newcastle. Virtual meetings via Skype be organised every six months.

**3.3.1.2 Targets for evaluation in WP1**

**See next page for table**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Target** | **Summative** | **Evaluation Method** | **Formative** | **Evaluation Method** |
| **Project Co-ordination** | **Deliverable:**D1.1 Final first version of Project Management Reference Guide | Internal evaluation by all project participants  External evaluation by external evaluator  Feedback acted upon and modifications made  Actions recorded for external reporting | Self (P1) and peer evaluation. Evaluation of the co-ordination and leadership in the partnership | Questionnaires distributed and completed at specific points  Feedback analysed by P1  Further advice sought from external evaluator.  Creation of action plan for improvements  Actions acted upon and communicated to partnership  Actions recorded for external reporting |
| **Communication** |  |  | Self (P1,2,3,4,5) evaluation of the existing communication system for the partnership | Face to face meetings to discuss the development of the communication system (June 2012)  Questionnaires after review each meeting for self /internal (P1,2,3,4,5) evaluation of communication methods during the meeting. Creation of action plan for improvements, actions recorded and external reporting |
| **Financial processes and efficiency** |  |  | Self (P1) and peer evaluation. Evaluation of financial management and reporting in the partnership | Internal report forms at 6 monthly intervals where each partner reports on spending in relation to project deliverables.  Consortium meeting will provide outlet to discuss each partner’s financial management and provide any peer feedback/advice. |

**Table 3.1 Targets for Evaluation: WP1**

**3.3.2 WP2 – Quality Assurance**

WP2 aims to ensure all project deliverables meet their respective objectives and achieve high quality standard. WP2 will also enable to implement an ongoing evaluation and is strongly linked to WP1's reference guide. The quality of WP2 is ensured by the following means:

Documents:

1. Design template: P1 has produced template for materials design so as to ensure pedagogical consistency among the consortium partners and to ensure that the learning materials are of a high quality. See WP5 Documentation. points 1. and 2.
2. A Quality and evaluation plan as part of the Project Management Reference Guide, to specify how the quality of different Work Packages is ensured.
3. Quality reports: periodical quality reports are to be attached to the Progress reports to be produced within WP1 Management.

Organisation:

### Periodic quality review meetings every 6 months via Skype. Before the meeting, the partners report in internal report forms what they have achieved and what problems they have encountered.

**3.3.2.1 Targets for evaluation in WP2**

See next page for table

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Target** | **Summative** | **Evaluation Method** | **Formative** | **Evaluation Method** |
| **Quality and Evaluation** | **Deliverable:**  **D2.1 Template for materials** | Peer evaluation of design template at face to face meeting of all project participants  Creation of action plan for improvements with additional communication methods (discussion board) devised to provide further feedback  Actions recorded for external reporting | Peer evaluation of quality and evaluation plan  External evaluation of quality and evaluation plan | Quality and evaluation plan distributed to project participants and external evaluator  Feedback analysed by P3 and P1  Creation of action plan for improvements  Further advice sought from external evaluator.  Actions acted upon and communicated to partnership  Actions recorded for external reporting |
| **Quality and Evaluation** | **Deliverables:**  **D2.2 Quality Report 1**  **D2.2 Quality Report 2** | Preparation of quality reports for EACEA based on analysis of data from internal report forms prepared by each partner in relation to their project activities  Feedback gained from EACEA assessor  Creation of action plan for improvements by partnership.  Actions recorded for external reporting |  |  |
| **Progress towards Deliverables** | D1.2 30/12/12 Internal report form  01/06/13 External report form  D1.3 30/12/13 Internal report form  01/06/14 Internal report form  D1.4 01/12/14 Internal Report form  01/01/15 Final Internal Report | 1. Internal evaluation of progress towards deliverables based around a series of internal reports at specified dates. Reviewed in the first instance by P3 and P1.  Written data in internal reports to be discussed at 6-monthly meetings by all project participants.  Internal evaluation by all project participants, feedback acted upon and modifications made, Actions recorded for external reporting.  2. External evaluation by EACEA for externally submitted progress reports.  Feedback gained from EACEA assessor, creation of action plan for improvements by partnership  Actions recorded for external reporting | On-going peer evaluation of project participants day to day progress | Internal evaluation through discussion board providing immediate feedback by P1 and peers on different activities of the project |

**Table 3.2 Targets for Evaluation: WP2**

**3.3.3 WP3 – Curriculum development**

WP3 involves the design of the language learning materials linked to each specific culture and cuisine. The quality of WP3 is ensured by the following means:

Documents:

1) Guide to the materials design: A guide produced by P1 which details the pedagogical and technological design to support project participants in their understanding of the materials and the curriculum to be developed. This is subjected to peer review and modified accordingly.

2) Guide to recipe building: A guide produced by P1 which details how to select and develop recipes suitable for integration into the curriculum.

3) Authoring tool: The materials created for LanCook will be programmed into the software in the portable kitchens through the use of an ‘authoring tool’. An authoring tool is a computer based system that allows participants to programme content in a structured and consistent way.

Organisation:

1. Face to face meetings for collaborative discussion on the contents and development of the curriculum in the form of a series of workshops in June 2012.
2. Guidance by P4 and P5 on the integration of Culture and CEFR into the materials
3. Use of discussion forum for communication concerning materials design where all project participants and comments on the development of a consistent curriculum.
4. Use of ‘drop box’ where project participants can share curriculum resources being designed in each country.

**3.3.3.1 Targets for evaluation in WP3**

See next page for table

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Target** | **Summative** | **Evaluation Method** | **Formative** | **Evaluation Method** |
| **Learning materials** | D3.1: Training materials for 7 kitchens | 1. External evaluation of curriculum materials by suitably qualified and experienced teachers through focus group and questionnaire.  Feedback acted upon and modifications made, Actions recorded for external reporting.  2. Self/Internal (P1,2,3,4,5) evaluation of materials by each partner of their own materials through face to face meetings by teams in each partner institution  3. Internal evaluation of materials by peer review using drop box and discussion board and from P1 in face to face meetings at visiting stage in November 2012. | Internal peer evaluation of developing materials by all project participants | Using discussion board and drop box, participants discuss the development of their materials and provide feedback.  Feedback acted upon and modifications made, Actions recorded in discussion board for external reporting/assessment of evaluation process. |

**Table 3.3 Targets for Evaluation in WP3**

**3.3.4 WP4 – Fabrication of the technology**

The objective of WP4 is to produce the technology for 4 new portable digital kitchens. This will be carried out at Newcastle University and involves the fabrication of all hardware for the kitchens: sensors, attachments for sensors, specialised utensils, casing for touchscreen, interactive tool for communication with kitchen and authoring tool.

Documentation:

1) Guide to using the hardware: a guide to support partners in their operation of the portable kitchens, produced by P1.

2) Guide to authoring tool: a guide to support partners in their use of the authoring tool which will allows them to upload their curriculum materials into the portable kitchen, produced by P1.

Organisation

1) Members of P1 to visit each partner and work one to one on uploading their curriculum materials to the portable kitchens in November 2012.

2) Use of discussion board to support partners in their preparation of using the technology

**3.3.4.1 Targets for Evaluation in WP4**

See next page for table

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Target** | **Summative** | **Evaluation Method** | **Formative** | **Evaluation Method** |
| **Learning materials** | D4.1: 4portable kitchens | 1. Self/Internal (P1) evaluation of all aspects of the production of the portable kitchens by cross-disciplinary team in P1. | Internal peer evaluation of developing technology by all project participants | Using discussion board and drop box, P1 keeps all project participants updated on technological developments and asks for feedback for certain aspects.  Feedback acted upon and modifications made, Actions recorded in discussion board for external reporting/assessment of evaluation process. |

**Table 3.4 Targets for evaluation in WP4**

**3.3.5 WP5 – Study conduct**

The objective of WP5 is to trial the materials with target users and assess progress in language learning and motivation. The quality of WP5 is ensured by the following means:

Documentation:

1) Guide to running the trials: a user guide to using the portable kitchens with participants based on a template in English (which may be translated), produced by P1.

2) Templates for data collection: a series of templates in English (which may be translated) will be produced which provide the basis for data collection instruments to run the trials to include- pre-test, post-test documentation, user experience questionnaire and biographical questionnaire.

3) Data collection log: a document that allows partners to record their data collection activity as well as record any particular successes, issues and concerns and how they were dealt with.

Organisation:

1) Use of discussion board to report on any issues experienced during the trials

2) Use of virtual meetings where those running the trials in each country can communicate issues, concerns and general experiences of running the trials

**3.3.5.1 Targets for Evaluation in WP5**

See next page for table

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Target** | **Summative** | **Evaluation Method** | **Formative** | **Evaluation Method** |
| **Learning materials** | D5.1: Collected data set | Summative evaluation provided through WP6. | Internal and external evaluation of study conduct throughout the lifetime of the work package | 1. Self/internal evaluation by each partner through discussion board, set up to provide a space to discuss problems, issues.  Feedback acted upon and modifications made, Actions recorded in discussion board for external reporting/assessment of evaluation process.  2. External evaluation by target users in focus group and through questionnaire (part of data collection also).  Any feedback acted upon if possible and modifications made, Actions recorded in ‘data collection log’ for external reporting. |

**Table 3.4 Targets for Evaluation WP5**

**3.3.6 WP6 – Data analysis and re-design**

WP6 involves analysing the results of the trials and improving the design of the technologically- enhanced curriculum. The trials will be evaluated in terms of two main areas 1) impact and feedback from learners about the kitchens and 2) by analysing the sensor data and display data, video and audio data and transcripts, which will feed into the re-designing phase. The quality of WP6 is ensured by the following means:

Documentation:

1) Complete set of data, gathered using a consistent design across partners.

2) Guide to data analysis: a guide produced in collaboration with all partners which details the various methods to be adopted to carry out the analysis which will lead to re-design.

Organisation:

1. Project participants will share data, findings and question using drop box and discussion board.
2. Virtual meetings will also provide a context to discuss the findings
3. *Potential* face to face meeting in NCL to discuss the new design subject to additional funding by NCL to accommodate partners.

**3.3.6.1 Targets for Evaluation in WP6**

See next page for table

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Target** | **Summative** | **Evaluation Method** | **Formative** | **Evaluation Method** |
| **Learning materials** | D6.1: Sensor data, reports and transcripts of the video and audio data, modified curriculum and learning materials | 1. Self/internal evaluation (P1,2,3,4,5) of findings/implications from analysis which lead to the re-design through sharing of documentation through drop box/virtual meetings.  2. Self/internal evaluation (P1,2,3,4,5) through the quality reports as in Section 3.3.2.  3. External evaluation of modified curriculum materials by suitably qualified and experienced teachers through focus group and questionnaire.  4. External evaluation of modified curriculum materials by academics through peer-review when results are submitted for publication in scientific journals. | Internal evaluation of study data analysis during the lifetime of the work package. | Self/internal evaluation (P1,2,3,4,5) through discussion board, set up to provide a space to discuss problems, issues in data analysis.  Feedback acted upon and modifications made, Actions recorded in discussion board for external reporting/assessment of evaluation process. |

**Table 3.5 Targets for evaluation: WP6**

**3.3.7 WP7 – Dissemination**

WP7 will inform the public of the progress of the project and will provide a framework for dissemination of the results. The quality of WP7 is ensured by the following means:

Documentation:

1. Dissemination plan: guidelines for all dissemination activity including how to make local dissemination plans in the partner countries. A powerpoint presentation for this is also available which was given at the face to face meeting in June 2012 (all on the Virtual Shared Workspace).
2. Guide to [Dissemination Requirements of the EU LLP](http://europeandigitalkitchen.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/02/Dissemination-rules-for-all-partners.docx) (on the Virtual Shared Workspace)
3. [Dissemination Planning tool](http://europeandigitalkitchen.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/dissemination_planning_tool.docx): a tool which allows partners to plan their local activities taking into consideration aims and objectives (on the Virtual Shared Workspace)
4. [Dissemination timeline](http://europeandigitalkitchen.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/dissemination_timeline1.xlsx): an overview of the lifetime of the project with suggested dates for local dissemination activities as well as overall project deliverables (on the Virtual Shared Workspace).
5. Templates: Templates will be provided for all project participants so materials for dissemination are consistent in design

Organisation:

1) Face to face meeting to discuss the overall aims and objectives of the dissemination strategy for LanCook during the meeting week in June 2012.

2) Drop Box and Discussion board provides space where documentation and general advice can be sought and shared between partners

**3.3.7.1 Targets for evaluation in WP7**

See next page for table

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Target** | **Summative** | **Evaluation Method** | **Formative** | **Evaluation Method** |
| **Dissemination** | D7.1 Dissemination Plan | 1. Self/internal evaluation (P1,2,3,4,5) of dissemination plan.  2. External Evaluation by qualified external evaluator  Both sets of feedback analysed P1.  Creation of action plan for improvements  Actions acted upon and communicated to partnership  Actions recorded for external reporting | Internal evaluation of local dissemination plans and their on-going development throughout the lifetime of the project | Self/internal evaluation (P1,2,3,4,5) through discussion board and drop box, set up to provide a space to share dissemination plan ideas.  Feedback acted upon and modifications made, Actions recorded in discussion board for external reporting/assessment of evaluation process. |
|  | D7.2 Online dissemination | 1. Self/internal evaluation (P1,2,3,4,5) by project participants on the first versions of the online dissemination which started in Feb 2012.  2. External Evaluation opportunity provided concerning website through the additional of page where users of the website can leave feedback. This can be acted upon as and when. | Internal and  External | 1. Self/internal evaluation (P1,2,3,4,5) by project participants during the lifetime of the project based on peer review of how the online dissemination is being used. This can be acted upon as and when  2. External Evaluation opportunities may arise as users use the social networking etc because they will be able to leave comments and Like the project on Facebook or tweets on Twitter.  3. External Evaluation: A counter integrated into the website allows P1 to track the number or users of the site and also the geographical make-up. |
|  | D7.3 Local events and international conference | 1. Self/internal evaluation (P1,2,3,4,5) by project participants using self-evaluation questionnaires after each event.  2. External Evaluation provided by target users attending the events using questionnaires after each event.  Both sets of feedback analysed by project participants  Creation of action plan for improvements  Actions acted upon and communicated to partnership  Actions recorded for external reporting |  |  |
|  | D7.4 Marketing materials | 1. Self/internal evaluation (P1,2,3,4,5) by project participants based on the creation of templates provided by P1 which can form the basis of locally produced materials. |  |  |

**Table 3.6 Targets for evaluation: WP7**

**3.3.8 WP8 – Exploitation**

The exploitation work package is led by P2 and will guide LanCook’s activities more specifically as part of Work Package 8 which begins in January 2014. A draft strategy will be produced by **30/12/2013** and will include the formuation of quality and evaluation activities for LanCook.

WP 8 includes the following tasks:

* using the digital kitchens in the host institution (P 1,2,3,4,5)
* extending the use of the technology to local communities and lifelong learning organisations.
* Disseminating the results in conferences and scientific journals
* Engaging into an online community of practice where users in the 7 kitchens are able to communicate with each other via video conferencing to enable exchange of information and experience as well as online community of practice.
* applying for new grants for knowledge transfer following the completion of the project.
* Developing commercial exploitation

**3.4 Summary of documentation for Evaluation Activities per Work Package**

The list below provides an outline of the written documentation which will form part of the *documentation* specifically designed to support the internal and external evaluation activities of LanCook.

Copies of each of these documents are available via the Virtual Shared Workspace on the LanCook website under Work Package 2: Quality Assurance.

**WORK PACKAGE 1**

Project Co-ordination Self evaluation Questionnaire

Meeting Self evaluation Questionnaire

**WORK PACKAGE 2**

Internal Report Forms

**WORK PACKAGE 3**

Curriculum Development External Evaluation Questionnaire

**WORK PACKAGE 5**

User Experience (part of data collection for trials) External Evaluation Questionnaire

**WORK PACKAGE 6**

Phase 2 (re-design) Curriculum Development External Evaluation Questionnaire

**WORK PACKAGE 7**

Event Self evaluation Questionnaire

Event External Evaluation Questionnaire (users)

NOTE: documentation highlighted in yellow is under construction but not yet finalised.