THEME [SiS.2013.1.2-1 SiS.2013.1.2-1]
[Mobilisation and Mutual Learning (MML) Action Plans: mainstreaming Science in Society actions in research Mobilisation and Mutual Learning (MML) Action Plans: mainstreaming Science in Society actions in research]

WP8 EVALUATION   start month 3 End month 48

T8.1 Project Monitoring and ongoing evaluation

2) QUALITY MANAGER (INTERNAL OBSERVER)

concise quality plan setting project standards and procedures

Donato Greco   Rome November 2014

1. REASONS FOR CONDUCTING EVALUATIONS

The notion of evaluation has been around a long time—in fact, the Chinese had a large functional evaluation system in place for their civil servants as long ago as 2000 B.C. In addition to its long history, evaluation also has varied definitions and may mean different things to different people. Evaluation can be seen as synonymous with tests, descriptions, documents, or even management. Many definitions have been developed, but a comprehensive definition presented by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1994) holds that evaluation is "systematic investigation of the worth or merit of an object."
This definition centers on the goal of using evaluation for a purpose.
Accordingly, evaluations should be conducted for action-related reasons, and the information provided should facilitate deciding a course of action.

Why should ASSET do evaluation? There are two very important answers to this question:

First and foremost evaluation provides information to help improve the project. Information on whether goals are being met and on how different aspects of a project are working are essential to a continuous improvement process.
In addition, and equally important, evaluation frequently provides new insights or new information that was not anticipated. What are frequently called "unanticipated consequences" of a program are among the most useful outcomes of the assessment enterprise.

The current view of evaluation stresses the inherent interrelationships between evaluation and program implementation. Evaluation is not separate from, or added to, a project, but rather is part of it from the beginning. Planning, evaluation, and implementation are all parts of a whole, and they work best when they work together.
Evaluators typically talk about two kinds or stages of evaluation :
formative evaluation and **summative evaluation**.
- The purpose of a formative evaluation is to assess initial and ongoing project activities.
- The purpose of a summative evaluation is to assess the quality and impact of a fully implemented project

Formative Evaluation

Formative evaluation begins during project development and continues throughout the life of the project. Its intent is to assess ongoing project activities and provide information to monitor and improve the project. It is done at several points in the developmental life of a project and its activities.
According to evaluation theorist Bob Stake,

"When the cook tastes the soup, that's formative;

When the guests taste the soup, that's summative."

Formative evaluation has two components: **implementation evaluation** and **progress evaluation**.

Implementation Evaluation.

The purpose of implementation evaluation is to assess whether the project is being conducted as planned. This type of evaluation, sometimes called "process evaluation," may occur once or several times during the life of the program. The underlying principle is that before you can evaluate the outcomes or impact of a program, you must make sure the program and its components are really operating and, if they, are operating according to the proposed plan or description.

Progress Evaluation. The purpose of a progress evaluation is to assess progress in meeting the goals of the program and the project. It involves collecting information to learn whether or not the benchmarks of participant progress were met and to point out unexpected developments. Progress evaluation collects information to determine what the impact of the activities and strategies is on participants, curriculum, or institutions at various stages of the intervention. By measuring progress, program staff can eliminate the risk of waiting until participants have experienced the entire program to assess likely outcomes. If the data collected as part of the progress evaluation fail to show expected changes, the information can be used to fine tune the project. Data collected as part of a progress evaluation can also contribute to, or form the basis for, a summative evaluation conducted at some future date.

Summative Evaluation
The purpose of summative evaluation is to assess a mature project's success in reaching its stated goals. Summative evaluation (sometimes referred to as impact or outcome evaluation) frequently addresses many of the same questions as a progress evaluation, but it takes place after the project has been established and the timeframe posited for change has occurred.

2. THE EVALUATION PROCESS— GETTING STARTED

Background:

WP8 Objective

WP8 aims to carry out an in-depth independent evaluation of the methodology and implementation progress of ASSET and of its potential impacts on citizens and civil society, throughout the duration of the project, in relation to its objectives and expected impacts. WP8 objectives are to provide 1) the continuous project monitoring and ongoing evaluation; 2) ex-post evaluation of project WPs and critical activities

The 2 point : Ex-post evaluation will be performed by an independent entity contracted by VITAM.

In this draft we will deal only on the first item T8.1 : Project Monitoring and ongoing evaluation

T8.1 Project Monitoring and ongoing evaluation
Leader: ISS/Zadig Start: m4 End: m48

Contributors: LYON, Prolepsis, EIWH, DBT, FFI, IPRI, ISS, NCIPD, TIEMS, Data Mining, UMFCD, HU, ZADIG, VITAM

T8.1 will ensure the periodic oversight of the implementation of the project and assess the development results. It aims to establish the extent to which work schedules, contractual deliverables, other required actions and targeted outputs are progressing according to plan, are high quality, and are achieving the expected impacts, so that timely action can be taken to correct deficiencies if detected.

The ASSET complexity

With 10 work packages , 59 deliverables for 14 partners coming from 11 countries ASSET has a complex relationship framework : in fact most deliverables are correctly related each other, most work packages do involve near all project participants. Moreover there are clear conditional relationship between work packages : production of many of the 59 deliverables are depending on the completion of other deliverables.

Therefore , before setting any sort of quality assessment tool it look needed to refer to the logic model that offer the project network interrelationship.

It looks clear that workpackages interaction are complex, but also that many workpackages are dependably related to previous ones.

The Protagonists

We have in asset 4 level of participants.

WP leaders :   10

Deliverables responsible :   59

Task responsible :   43

Milestones : 10

And many hundreds of Participants .

Concise quality plan setting project standards and procedures

Quality concept.

Better to make clear that the tasks assigned to this work package " Evaluation" cannot be lived as a mere administrative examinations of the ongoing work ; recognizing the need of a careful monitoring of the ongoing activities and the matching of results with expected deliverables.

The final evaluation of "quality" of ASSET will be a task of the commitment EU, cannot be build inside the project.

Therefore here we speak of Evaluation as an internal horizontal tool to improve our own activity quality , to make visible to the ASSET research workforce the quality of their own work and also to give a look to the quality of you own brother researcher , whose activity is necessarily needed to achieve your own expected result at the best possible quality.

Than is crucial that all we , ASSET participants, come to a convinced agreement on that this evaluation task is not an external expertise exploring our work, nor is another fastidious paper job loaded on already heavy job.

This is for each and all ASSET participants a tool to see what is being produced and how to achieve the best possible quality.

Finally an ongoing project quality evaluation will be definitively instrumental to the ASSET management bodies, let mention the Project Management Office (PMO), the Project Coordinator, and the Project Scientific Coordinator, but also the External Advisory Board, the Project Executive Board (PEB) and the Project Management Board (PMB).

Practically, it is required to set up and implement the QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN of the ASSET project

We use the concept of "quality assurance" as defined in PMI PMBOK, where it is intended to be "*the application of planned, systematic activities to ensure that the project will employ all processes needed to meet requirements*"

The QA monitoring will rely on two main instruments:

1) First level evaluation that will be performed by the Scientific Coordinator (ISS)
2) QA management

In this doc we deal ONLY with the Internal evaluation carried out by the QA manager (ZADIG through Donato).

In the following table are summarized steps, approaches and responsibilities of the QA Plan

Step	Approach	Responsible
1	Sharing principles and ideas for the QA Plan	Donato
2	Distributing the Quality requirements and standard form (Form1, see below)	Donato and Alberto
3	Filling the Quality requirements and standard form (Form1)	Task leaders with following consolidation by WP leaders

4	Self-assessment checklist for partners (Form 2, see below)	Task leaders
5	Filling and circulating the "Short scientific progress report" (Form 3, from DOW page 9, see below)	WP leaders
6	Filling a standardized form with monitoring info (each semester) (Form to be established)	Task leaders with following consolidation by WP leaders
7	Promote a discussion among ASSET CoP members on platform, forum WP8	Donato
8	Provide the Project Management Office (PMO), the Project Coordinator, and the Project Scientific Coordinator with brief quality reports (each six months)	Donato
9	Comprehensive report (annually)	Donato

Quality Assurance Plan	
Form 1 ***Task/WP requirements***	**ASSET**

WP____ _____

Beneficiary Leader Number___

Task____ _____

Beneficiary Leader Number___

Contributors: ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

Task description as from the DOW:

Please, develop a better definition of strategies, objectives, methods, main activities and outputs for your task

(Optionally) If you consider that could help, please, try to set up a Logical Framework Analysis following the table in the scheme below				

	Definition	Indicator	Source of information	Risks and assumptions
Specific objective				
Results				
Activities				

(You can add more lines for more results and, certainly, much more lines for different activities)

Finally, in any case, for the results and activities that you consider as qualifying your task, you should define the quality indicators	
Result 1	
Result 2	
Result……..	
Activity 1.1	
Activity 1.2	
Activity ……..	
Activity 2.1	
Activity …….	

Propose a list of potential feedings towards other tasks/work packages	
1	
2	
3	
4	

Propose a list of potential feedings necessary for your task accomplishments from other tasks/work packages	
1	
2	
3	
4	

The questionnaire data will be promptly analyzed and result make visible on the COP.

Quality Assurance Plan *Form 2* ***Self assessment checklist for partners***	ASSET

Name Surname Institution;   If leader of which WP or task or deliverable

Par 2 : project knowledge and understanding :

Was the assigned role in the project clearly understood ?

comment ?

Was the task assigned clear ?

Comment

Were doubts and deficiencies cleared in the Kick of meeting ?

Comment

Par. 3 : Organization :

Did you set up the expected working team to accomplish your duties ?

Comment

How many working session you had with your team within 2014 ?

comment

Were the allocated human and financial resources sufficient o perform your tasks ?

Comment

Do you believe that the timeframe allocated to your task will be respected ?

Comment

Was the information flow efficient ?

Comment

Did you find the COP as useful ?

Comment

Do you find difficult/complicated the interactions with other ASSET working teams ?

Comment

……..

Form 3: WORK PROGRESS AND ACHIEVEMENTS (M1 – M12)

Example : WP1 ON DIALOGUE & PARTICIPATION (by WP LEADER)

Short description of WP1 from Annex I:

Example: WP1 is about building a common approach concerning the societal challenges among the different project partners and ensuring the overall scientific coordination of the MMLAP.

WP1 main objectives are: 1) building a common approach to ASSET and creation of a common language; 2)

Identifying main topics and opportunities to be addressed in cooperative multi-actor research along the ASSET life; 3) sharing and transferring knowledge among ASSET partners; 4) improving competencies and quality of the leadership; 5) providing the scientific coordination of the project.

1.*Progress towards objectives and details about the WP* **(between 150 - 200 words)**

2. *Significant results / Key findings* **(between 120-150 words)**

3. *Deviations from Annex I - Impact on other WPs and/or available resources and planning* **(If applicable)**

4. *Reasons for failing to achieve critical objectives of WP and/or reason for not being on schedule – Impact on other tasks and/or available resources and planning* **(If applicable)**

5. *Next key steps that will be put in place in order to achieve the WP's objectives*

Role and tasks of the Quality Manager

The Quality Manager general role is to ensure QA (see above) and Quality control, defined as "*an iterative process that should be performed throughout the project's life and involve monitoring and controlling project results to determine whether they comply with defined quality standards outlined in the quality plan*" .

Particularly the QUALITY MANAGER tasks could be:

a. Prepare a concise quality plan setting project standards and procedures

b. Prepare a self-assessment checklist for partners, to be filled out when submitting project outcomes

c. Ensure that project outputs are delivered according to the agreed timeline

d. Review work schedules, contractual deliverables, other required actions and targeted outputs

e. In selected cases, send outputs to other partners or the External Advisory Board for further review

f. Provide after review feedback to the relevant partner

g. Ensure that recommended changes and mitigation measures (if any) are properly implemented

h. Provide early warnings of any event that may threaten project quality

i. Provide each six months the Project Management Office (PMO), the Project Coordinator, and the Project Scientific Coordinator with brief quality reports

j. Report quality in a comprehensive annual report

This draft mainly focused on the task a.

Anonymity will be respected in the analysis , but cannot be adopted in the data collection: the entire evaluation process is maintained within the ASSET confidential environment.

Any comment, suggestion, modification to this draft is welcome : at this time we need to be operative within the month of October 2014, therefore comment are welcome till the end of September.

References

1. Division of Research, Evaluation and Communication National Science Foundation US:The 2002 User-Friendly Handbook for Project Evaluation REC 99-12175
2. Frechtling, J., Stevens, F., Lawrenz, F., and Sharp, L. (1993). *The User-Friendly Handbook for Project Evaluation: Science, Mathematics and Technology Education*. NSF 93-152. Arlington, VA: NSF.
3. Frechtling, J., and Sharp, L. (1997). *The User-Friendly Handbook for Mixed-Method Evaluations*. NSF 97-153. Arlington, VA: NSF.
4. Blank, R. (1993) Developing a System of Education Indicators: Selecting, Implementing, and Reporting Indicators. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 15 (1, Spring): 65-80.
5. American Evaluation Association. (1995). *Guiding Principles for Evaluators*. New Directions for Program Evaluation, No. 66. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
6. Joint Committee on the Standards for Educational Evaluation (1994). *The Program Evaluation Standards*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication, Inc.
7. Altshuld, J., and Witkin, B.R. (2000). *Transferring Needs into Solution Strategies*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
8. Kidder, L., and Fine, M. (1987). *Qualitative and Quantitative Methods: When Stories Converge. Multiple Methods in Program Evaluation*. New Directions for Program Evaluation, No. 35. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
9. Lofland, J., and Lofland, L.H. (1995). *Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
10. Miles, M.B., and Huberman, A.M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis,* 2nd Ed. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
11. Shadish, W.R. (1993) *Program Evaluation: A Pluralistic Enterprise*.New Directions for Program Evaluation, No. 60. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
12. A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK® Guide)—Fifth Edition