

Evaluation Report (R12)

LEONARDO DA VINCI Transfer of Innovation Project
“RELATE – PROMOTING THE RECOGNIZABILITY OF LEARNING OUTCOMES FROM VOCATIONAL EDUCATION TO HIGHER EDUCATION”

Grant agreement number: DE/11/LLP-LdV/TOI/147640

For more information on the project “RELATE” go to our website
www.relate-project.eu

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Fachhochschule Dresden – Private Fachhochschule gGmbH
Fakultät BWL
Karsten König
Gasanstaltstraße 3-5
01237 Dresden

Berlin, 19.11.2015

External Evaluation Final Report

„RELATE Promoting the Recognizability of Learning outcomes from vocational education to higher Education“

Main aim:

Describe summary of the whole external evaluation measures and results into the project development process 2013-2015.

Basic of evaluation process was the RELATE External Evaluation Concept:

General objectives in external evaluation:

- Build up external evaluation structure to support PM and Project Team in successful process and product development;
- Work out Evaluation concept with concrete indicators to check up regularly the connection between plan and current situation in the project development (in time check up);
- Work out mechanism of measures to react on changes in process and product development in project.

Main steps of external evaluation connected with the logic frame of the project development:

- Identify the intervention logic in the project (overall objectives, specific objectives, expected results, activities);
- Identify the objectively verifiable indicators of achievement for all defined levels;
- Define the sources and means of verification;
- Define the assumptions and risks.

LOGICAL FRAMEWORK FOR THE PROJECT				
	Intervention logic	Objectively verifiable indicators of achievement	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions
Overall objectives	<i>What are the overall broader objectives to which the action will contribute?</i>	<i>What are the key indicators related to the overall objectives?</i>	<i>What are the sources of information for these indicators?</i>	
Specific objective	<i>What specific objective is the action intended to achieve to contribute to the overall objectives?</i>	<i>Which indicators clearly show that the objective of the action has been achieved?</i>	<i>What are the sources of information that exist or can be collected? What are the methods required to get this information?</i>	<i>Which factors and conditions outside the Beneficiary's responsibility are necessary to achieve that objective? (external conditions) Which risks should be taken into consideration?</i>
Expected results	<i>The results are the outputs envisaged to achieve the specific objective. What are the expected results? (enumerate them)</i>	<i>What are the indicators to measure whether and to what extent the action achieves the expected results?</i>	<i>What are the sources of information for these indicators?</i>	<i>What external conditions must be met to obtain the expected results on schedule?</i>
Activities	<i>What are the key activities to be carried out and in what sequence in order to produce the expected results? (group the activities by result)</i>	Means: <i>What are the means required to implement these activities, e. g. personnel, equipment, training, studies, supplies, operational facilities, etc.</i>	<i>What are the sources of information about action progress?</i> Costs <i>What are the action costs? How are they classified? (breakdown in the Budget for the Action)</i>	<i>What pre-conditions are required before the action starts? What conditions outside the Beneficiary's direct control have to be met for the implementation of the planned activities?</i>

The external evaluation concept includes the project-related advice and guidance. The evaluation is not presented as a single ex-post evaluation in the form of one final report. The project benefit from the practice-oriented know-how of the expert during the project development.

As important part of the external evaluation, evaluator takes especially care to both value categories: to the evaluation process (e.g., "How do the participants / project partners evaluate the project offer or the project implementation") and to the project results and impacts (e.g. "the qualitative and quantitative project objectives been achieved?").

Methods and tools in external evaluation

The evaluation results are summarized in written reports to the project management. In detail evaluator use the following tools, methods and evaluation products:

- The evaluation concept is matched to the qualitative and quantitative measurement / assessment of goal attainment (indicators of success) in the project:
 - o Fixed PM/QM, work load and communication structure;
 - o Defined personal responsibilities in work packages, work groups, milestones;
 - o Named project results with deadlines in fixed languages;
 - o Level of results implementation and kind of sustainability (e.g.: model, guide, certificate);
 - o Number of participants in meetings, stakeholder trainings, dissemination actions;
 - o Number and kind of dissemination measures;
 - o Number and kind of sustainability actions and networking with stakeholders.
- Regular evaluation meetings and consultations with project management and project partners (face to face and / or by phone, e-mail, Skype) to define gaps and solutions.
- Observation at meetings of the project management, 2x project team meetings and at project events for the project participants.
- Creation of 4 short interim reports (2-3 pages) to the project management according to the results of the individual interviews with partner organisations project staff. Reports analyse the current position of the partner organisation into the project, results of process and product development into partner organisation and partnership.
Aim of those reports: transparency of resources and gaps in partnership to secure efficiency in project work.
- Creation of 1 interim progress report (10-15 pages) to the project management according to the real project progress. Basic of interim report is available project documentation and internal and external reporting on project progress and the interim results and outputs. Evaluation sources are responses of the participants and experts on specially developed questionnaires to represent the current situation from the perspective of those involved.
Aim of that report: analyse the results of process and product development and same time oriented on the challenges in the next period.
- Creation of a final report (20-25 pages) after 24 months of project development, especially in the long-term effect ("sustainability" and "European Added Value"). Base of preparation of the final report are oral and digital Interviews (Skype) and written participant responses to a questionnaire, selected personal interviews, reports, minutes, accounts and final evaluated project results and products.
Aim of that report: evaluate the sustainability and added value of existing project results. Presentation of final evaluation results on final partner meeting in Dresden 2015.

The evaluation concept timescale oriented on the project progress and the agreed work plan. The external evaluation activities will be matched with the development processes of the project:

Activities	Date
Support within the dissemination of the project result	

and summaries for the webpage and different publications	
Elaboration of evaluation concept	3/2014
Development of the different survey instruments and testing	2014 / 2015
Evaluation interviews with the partners	2014 / 2015 (two per year)
Participation in telephone conferences	2014 / 2015 (once at month)
Participation in at least two partner meetings	(22.-25.10.2014 Haapsalu; Estonia; 29.6.2015-2.7.2015 Dresden, Germany)
Participation in trainings in the test phase	2014 / 2015 in Dresden
Evaluation interviews with stakeholders	2014 / 2015
Document analysis	2014 / 2015
Evaluation of the master data and project results	2014 / 2015
Creation of evaluation interim-reports	2014
Creation of evaluation report	2015

The final external report based on the follow activities, sources and results:

- Elaboration of the external evaluation concept (June 2014), include PPP for the partners;
- Development and implementation of questionnaires and interviews for external evaluation in each partner meeting in RO, EE, FI, DE in 2014-15;
- Skype interviews with new partners in FI in 2015;
- Participation in Skype partner meetings in 2014-15;
- Participation in simulation training in test phase in SUAS / Kuopio / FI in June 2015;
- Regular document analysis;
- Regular evaluation of the master data and project interim / final results and reports;
- Creation of 4 external evaluation interim reports.

Evaluation of RELATE project development in project phase October 2013 – April 2014

Most important challenges in first phase of European project development and management are:

- Implement project partners in content planning and development (work packages, milestone planning, work load, timetable);
- Define together the project management (PM) structure and personal responsibilities (Leadpartner, Co-ordinator, responsibilities in work packages and/or work groups, responsibilities in reporting);
- Organise stabile, accessible, regular and transparent information and communication system in project (information and documentation tools, information flow, full access to all documents, minutes, reports, deadlines).

Good information and communication in cross border European Projects is the half of success.

Used database:

- RELATE project documents;
- Communication with Karsten König (FH-Dresden);
- Results of questionnaire used in second partner meeting in May 2014 in Pitesti/RO (13 answered questionnaires);
- Meeting with Leadpartner AfBB and project partner FH-Dresden 15th May 2014 in Dresden with discussion about current project situation.

To get the relevant information first questionnaire structured in follow parts:

- I. General Information about recent project experience
- II. The project RELATE in general
- III. The RELATE project organisation
- IV. The RELATE project communication
- V. The project work results in first period (October 2013 – April 2014)

Part I:

In this part questions cleared the basic knowledge of project partners in development and implementation of national, international and European projects. Important is the knowledge in financial administration and reporting.

Results:

100% are experienced in project implementation, more than 84% in national projects (range 1 to 20 projects) and more than 69% in international projects (range 3 to 100 projects). Last years many of RELATE-partners included as partner in other European project too (range 4 to 100). This huge practice knowledge in European project work is helpful in RELATE implementation.

Challenge:

Only 46% have experiences in financial management. This knowledge is important to realise right reporting procedures based on EU-administration guides and tools.

Proposal:

Pay attention to inform and train responsible persons in partner organisation in EU-financial administration.

Organise common project reporting tools and financial reporting deadlines connected with workflow. Organise connection between work results, reporting and payment.

Part II:

In this part shows the connection between partner organisations and RELATE project (in process of project development, in network, in volume of work, in work flow). It's important to understand the role of RELATE project in work of responsible persons in project organisations. Same time to understand the RELATE position in workload of partner organisation.

Results:

More than 69% are involved as former partners based on long term relationships with Lead partner in DE. More than 61% involved in active project application development. In starting phase October 2013 69% felt well informed about objectives and content of the project. 77% know their role in project. The volume of work is different by each organisation and person (range 1 hour per week to 10 hour per week). More than 50% project workers supported by other employees in the organisation.

Challenge:

Hold on high level the role and ranking of RELATE project development in partner organisation. It's usually strong connected to the impact of project results for partner beneficiaries, stakeholder and/or target groups.

Proposal:

Pay attention on good connection between RELATE project persons and management in partner organisation (regular information, invitation to meetings, discussion, networking).

Part III:

Partner answered about their view on project organisation, especially on kick off meeting. For successful PM it's important to start efficient project organisation. Do partners know the responsible persons and support in project?

Results:

77% are satisfied with the organisation of project start in kick off meeting in Dresden. Most of them know the lead persons (PM, co-ordinator) in project and the way of communication and contacts. 84% evaluated RELATE project structure very effective or effective. 92% underlined the high benefit of direct partner meetings. Otherwise more than 53% don't know concrete mentor yet for e.g. financial issues advice.

Challenge:

Keep on attention the connection between professional development and results and administrative and financial reporting.

Proposal:

Realise regular contact with administrative person in partner organisation (e.g. quarterly). Invite them in special tasks in Skype or phone conferences. It's important to show them the connection between budget, workflow and results.

Part IV:

Partner evaluated the RELATE project communication structure. How they feel informed? Do they have full access to all documents? What's the communication level between partners and PM?

Results:

All partners feel very well and well informed about project development and 92% with full access to project information. 61% define very high communication level between PM and project partners, 31% high level and 8% middle level. All partners wrote about regular contact with PM and other partners. 70% define very high level of communication between partners, 30% high level and 30% middle level.

Positive comments about internal project communication:

- Permanent contact;
- Continuity;
- Thoroughness;
- Such communication provides immediate solutions;
- Each person can express without being afraid of misunderstandings;
- Mutual understanding;
- Engagement;
- Fast reply;
- Openness;
- Regularly Skype;
- Partners quickly reply the e-mails;
- Everybody is equally contributed and interested in results.

Challenge:

In the first project period most of partners very high motivated and engaged. Important to keep on those level project workload, results, dissemination, reporting, administration in whole project period.

Proposal:

Involve equally partners in workload responsibility. Use different tools as a reward (e.g. praise on meetings) for very good work results. Organise common cultural events on direct project meetings to support intercultural communication.

Part V:

Partners evaluate their own work results in first half year in RELATE project. It's important to understand the view of each partner to the work results in common project.

Results:

All partners underline their active involvement in first work package. 92% know the concrete results of this work package and same time the results of the other partners. 46% was involved on very high level in workload, 8% on high level and 46% on middle level.

All partners know the planed work packages, milestones and goals in 2. half year 2014.

Challenge:

Continue project work on that high level.

Proposal:

Regular check up of project progress, project results and clear understanding of what is realistic to achieve and what not.

Brief comments of partners to support successful work progress in next period:

- Maintain the style (2x).

- Keep on communication well!
- All agreed on the meeting.
- Clear understanding of what is realistic to achieve and what not.

Evaluation of RELATE project development in project phase May 2014 – October 2014

Most important challenges in this period of European project development and management are:

- Strong time management in work package development and realisation;
- Permanent connection between responsible partners / persons for different work package development;
- Check up work package results quality;
- Strong administrative discipline between partners and lead partner to secure budget accounting in time and roles;

Education Product Quality Check up in HEI (High School Institution) method based on EU-TEMPUS Project (530838-TEMPUS-1-2012-1-RU-TEMPUS-SMGR): “Independent quality assurance model for degree programmes in Russia” Methodology for evaluation of HEIs’ study programmes.

QM methods are useful to multiply in other education project contexts too (e.g. RELATE). They help to check up and secure the high quality level of education standards, especially in RELATE context: promoting the recognisability of learning outcomes from VET to HEI.

Any specifics are special in Russian HEI system and need to be adapted in RELATE education context. External evaluator keep this facts in mind and use only the matching points of the TEMPUS system in RELATE evaluation.

External Evaluator analysed evaluation method and use part of this system in RELATE work package results evaluation.

The TEMPUS evaluation criteria system structured follows:

	Area and criteria	Operationalisation and Indicators	Scale	Additional criteria
1	2	3	4	5
	1.The aims and learning outcomes of the study programme			
1.1	The learning outcomes have been specified. They are achievable, valid and reflect currently foreseeable development in the subject area	The learning outcomes are documented in study regulations, study guide, website, Diploma Supplement... Learning outcomes are fully integrated into courses/subjects within the programme. Data on regular assessment/ revision of learning outcomes as well as involvement of stakeholders in the decision-making	Conform/ partially conform/ not conform	Indication where the programme fits among the other programmes of the same study field provided by the higher education institution
1.2	The learning outcomes correspond to the requirements of employers. Relevant stakeholders were involved in the formulation of the learning outcomes.	Data/research for clarification of necessary competences (knowledge, skills, abilities) within respective professional area Data on the professional	Conform/ partially conform/ not conform	

	The training offered is appropriately linked to professional practice.	activities of graduates Data on demand on the labour market; Feedback from employers/labour market representatives; Description of the modules including practical experiences		
1.3	The aims and learning outcomes conform to state educational standards or framework for higher educational qualifications	Compliance with higher education legal acts and other relevant documents establishing academic or professional requirements for the qualifications of specialists trained (in terms of their links to the learning outcomes)	Conform/ partially conform/ not conform	
1.4	The programme aims and learning outcomes are consistent with the level of qualifications offered	Compliance with Dublin Descriptors (Bachelor, Master)	Conform/ partially conform/ not conform	
1.5	The learning outcomes are accessible to the relevant stakeholders (e.g. lecturers, students). The issue of an English language Diploma Supplement is mandatory. It provides information about the intended learning outcomes, structure, level and individual performance	Learning outcomes are documented in study regulations, study guide, website, Diploma Supplement	Conform/ partially conform/ not conform	
1.6	The title of the programme, the learning outcomes, content and the qualifications offered are compatible with each other	No additional comments	Conform/ partially conform/ not conform	The name of the programme reflects also the linguistic focus of the programme.
2. Curriculum design				
2.1	The curriculum design assures the achievement of learning outcomes. It also in accordance with legal requirements and state standards	There is a clear relationship between the aims and level of the course, the teaching and learning strategies employed, and the outcomes that are demonstrated by students in the assessment process Indicators: course handbook, objective matrix, examination results Compliance with higher education legal acts and other relevant documents External evaluation reports	Relations hips are clear, partially clear, not clear at all Meets standards/ partially meets/doe s not meet requireme nts External reports confirm/pa rtially	Curriculum documents logically link the elements of aims, teaching and learning, and assessment of outcomes. It should be clear how individual subjects contribute to achieving aims overall. Staff teams should be able to explain what courses are trying to achieve, and how they know if they are being successful.

		<p>and peer reviews confirm currency of content, and appropriateness for level of study. Learning aims and objectives show progression according to level.</p>	<p>confirm/do not confirm currency and appropriateness</p> <p>Progression is shown/partially shown/not shown</p>	<p>The bias should be towards maximizing the discretion of the institution to vary requirements where there are good reasons to do so, without compromising the common identity of awards offered at different institutions or their legal validity</p> <p>At Masters level aims include mastery of the discipline, ability to conduct independent research, with a high level of analytical complexity. In professional masters programmes a high degree of currency with the latest industrial or commercial practice will normally be expected.</p> <p>At undergraduate level progression is expected from simpler descriptive, structured work at first year, to more independent, analytical, theoretical or abstract applications using wider ranges of sources at final year level.</p>
2.2	<p>The content of the programme is up to date, reflects latest achievements in the subject area</p>	<p>External evaluation reports and peer reviews confirm currency of content, and appropriateness for level of study.</p> <p>Employability rates in the relevant work field.</p> <p>Continuous staff development is shown in the CV's of teaching teams</p> <p>Existence of internal quality</p>	<p>The programme is current/partially current/not current</p>	

		assurance mechanism for the review and monitoring of the programme under review.		
2.3	Each individual subject is described according to the university's standard format	The University's template (if any) is used so that students receive full relevant information about each subject of study Indicator: Course descriptions	Full relevant information is provided/partially provided/not provided at all	Key areas will include: Learning hours Timetable Teaching team Contact details Credit rating Course aims Learning outcomes How the course will be taught Reading lists Assessment details, including timing, duration, and assessment criteria
2.4	The curriculum design allows students to combine modules flexibly (students have sufficient opportunity for choice)	At each level of study there should be a range of core (compulsory) subjects and designated options, enabling specialization according to interest	Sufficient student choice is available/partially available/not available	Highly specialized programmes (e.g. Masters) will tend to have less student choice, as will courses which have specific professional requirements imposed by regulatory bodies
2.5	The structure of curriculum and the descriptions of modules are available for relevant stakeholders	Indicator: published course descriptions	Available/partially available/not available	Full module descriptors may only be available to registered students and staff
2.6	The curriculum design has a consistent pedagogical approach based upon the student as the centre of learning	A consistent overall teaching and learning strategy is articulated by the University, Faculty and course teams	Consistent strategy is shown/partially shown/not shown by course documentation and the explanation of course teams	Though strategies may vary across institutions it is important that modern principles of student centered learning and the integration of ICT in the curriculum are consistently demonstrated
3. Teaching staff				
3.1	Qualification and number of teaching staff is adequate to ensure learning outcomes. Its composition meets the legal requirements. The available contact hours are sufficient for teaching and student	Staff handbook Professors/students ratio Participation of staff in research projects 27 teaching hours per week h (for bachelor level); from 8 to 27 teaching hours per week h (for master level) - in Russia		Quality of teaching process (*hard to quantify)

	supervision.			
3.2	Opportunities for development of subject-related knowledge and teaching skills are available for teaching staff	number of trained professors per academic staff unit		
3.3	Members of teaching staff hold relevant degrees for the programme profile.	Number of teaching staff holding relevant degrees	50%	
3.4	Teaching staff is involved in research projects	Number (per academic staff unit)	100%	
3.5	Opportunities for development of subject-related knowledge and teaching skills are available for teaching staff	Number of trained professors per academic staff unit	Each professor once in 3 years	
	4. Facilities and learning resources	It is recommended to include information on the updating and upgrading of the learning resources and renovation of facilities where appropriate		
4.1	Number of computers is adequate	Data on computers per student available for the delivery of the programme	Expert evaluation	
4.2	Number of classrooms and study areas available is adequate	Data on study areas per student used for the delivery of the programme	Expert evaluation	
4.3	Access to internet (including libraries, dorms)	Data on study areas and other facilities equipped with Wi Fi	Expert evaluation	
4.4	Teaching and methodological materials (textbooks, books, periodical publications, databases, interactive resources) are adequate, accessible and sufficient	Data on the teaching/learning materials available at the institution, access to e-publications, etc.	Expert evaluation	
4.5	There are adequate arrangements for students' practice	Data on the facilities and equipment used for students' practice used for the delivery of the programme	Expert evaluation	
4.6	The amount of social facilities	Data on the facilities and their capacity used for the social needs of students	Expert evaluation	
	5. Study process and students' performance assessment			
5.1	The procedure for admission to the programme is governed by strictly applied and transparent procedures and quality criteria	published regulations that define the admissions and entry requirements	Expert evaluation	Rules are in place to enable flexibility in the admission for

				those who fall short of some admission or entry requirements.
5.2	The admission and entry requirements are designed to facilitate the achievement of the learning outcomes.	published regulations that define the admissions and entry requirements	Expert evaluation	The admission and entry requirements ensure that those students admitted possess the required competences and formal training.
5.3	Students are provided with opportunities to participate in student mobility programmes	published regulations that define the recognition of activities completed externally; Curriculum; Offer of mobility programmes	Expert evaluation	The programme concept allows for time to be spent at another higher education institution without loss of time; Regulations are in place covering the recognition of activities completed externally
5.4	The assessment system of students' performance is clear, adequate and publicly available. The evaluation criteria are transparent for lecturers and students and focus on achieving the learning outcomes.	Module descriptions, published regulations that define examinations, timescale for making exams	Expert evaluation	Examinations are coordinated so that students have sufficient time to prepare for them. It is checked whether students are capable of orally discussing a problem from their specialist area
5.5	The degree programmes ends with a final thesis that guarantees that students can carry out an assigned task independently and at the level of the qualification sought.	published regulations that define the final thesis; sample final theses	Expert evaluation	The supervision of final thesis carried out externally is subject to strict regulations ensuring its meaningful incorporation within the curriculum
5.6	Student workload is realistic, so that the programme can be studied within the standard period of study	Number of classroom hours per week	27 h (for bachelor level); from 8 to 27 h (for master level) - in Russia	
5.7	The programme is modular. A credit point system is in place. All the work done by students is appropriately represented within it (in the ECTS system this means 25–30 h/1CP). The allocation of credit points to modules is transparent and logical.			
5.8	Study subjects have a logical	Core or essential modules are clearly indicated, and	Course documenta	Staff teams should be able to articulate

	sequence and show progression through the programme	<p>staff are able to indicate the rationale for subject inclusion and sequencing at each level of study.</p> <p>Students are able to make connections between modules, and to build learning on the basis of prior study.</p>	<p>tion has a logical structure /partially logical/not logical at all.</p> <p>Students are enabled to make connections between subjects, and to build knowledge sequentially/ partially enabled/not enabled at all</p>	<p>the reasoning behind curriculum design</p> <p>Assessment should not Key be uneven, unduly bunched, light, or onerous</p>
6. Quality Management				
6.1	<p>A quality assurance concept is in place. It is regularly developed and designed to ensure the continual improvement of the degree programme</p> <p>The concept correspond to state standards and legal regulations, e.g. to national qualifications frameworks, subject benchmarks etc.</p>	<p>Relevant aspects of the quality code are adhered to by course and module teams</p> <p>The University has an adequate quality manual which describes its internal processes</p> <p>Instruments such as customer satisfaction, surveys/students feedback and benchmarking are used to check the effectiveness of performance</p>	<p>Adhered to/partially adhered to/not adhered to at all</p>	<p>E.g. entry requirements are clearly articulated and adhered to assessment is equitable and transparent</p>
6.2	<p>The evaluation and improvement processes involve stakeholders (professors, students, graduates, employers etc.)</p>	<p>External and internal moderation of examination and assessments is undertaken regularly by qualified individuals. Employers and graduates are involved in the process of course review</p>	<p>Undertake n/partially undertake n/not undertake n at all</p> <p>Involved/partially involved/not involved at all</p>	<p>Within rules that limit the possibility of undue influence</p>
6.3	<p>Responsibilities for decision-making and monitoring of the implementation of the programme are clearly allocated</p>	<p>A course leader is clearly identified, and the role of such leaders is specified.</p> <p>Course leaders are accountable for the successful operation of courses, particular retention,</p>	<p>Retention, progression and attainment of students is routinely monitored/partially</p>	<p>using valid and reliable data to monitor student retention, progression and achievement is non-negotiable as without this, courses</p>

		progression and attainment of students (RPA)	monitored/ not monitored at all where results on courses are poor evidence of remedial action must be clear	cannot be monitored or managed at all persistent poor RPA data with no managerial response shown is prima facie evidence of a poor or failing institution and should be a major warning signal for assessors. Where exceptionally high or excellent RPA data exists care should be taken to check this.
6.4	Information and data on the implementation of the programme are regularly collected and analysed (systematic self-evaluation)	RPA and other performance data is collected centrally by an appropriately qualified and independent University body and discussed at scheduled meetings of the university/course management	RPA and other data is collected/partially collected/not collected The data is used/partially used/not used	The existence of RPA data does not mean it is being used effectively, nor that it is valid or reliable. Checks should be made.
6.5	Outcomes of internal and external evaluation of the programme are used for the improvement of the programme	An annual report is produced by the course leader, summarizing the results of all evaluations and actions from the previous year's report, together with plans for the year ahead	A course planning cycle exists using evaluation data/does not exist/partially exists	
6.6	Suitable methods and instruments are used to ensure that the quality of degree programmes is maintained and further developed. They are documented and their effectiveness and efficiency are regularly reviewed.	There is evidence that the processes are being followed	Quality manual adequate/partially adequate/inadequate Staff are able to demonstrate that the systems and processes are followed	Generally this kind of evidence is paper based – reports of boards of examiners, staff and student meetings, external examiner reports etc. Though excessive formality or paper should not be expected, an institution which lacks established routines which are widely understood and which follows its

				own rules (which are themselves reasonable) should not be accredited
	7. Time table of the study programme			
7.1	Accordance with state educational standards	Educational standards indicators (for Russia)	100%	Well-timed correction of the timetable
7.4	Availability of the timetable for students	Ways of access to the timetable (web, hard copies, information panels)	Available/ partially available/ not available	
	8. Quality of research			
8.1	Scientific publications of professors in the field of the programme	number (per academic staff unit)	min 1 per professor	
8.2	Research infrastructures in the field of the programme	Number of research centers etc.	min 1	
8.3	Students' participation in research	Number of student scientific publications	min 1 per student per period of studies	
8.4	Students' involvement to research in academic units	Number of events for students' involvement to research in academic units		
8.5	Students' participation in conferences	Number of conferences	min 1 per student per period of studies	
8.6	Awards received for thesis or other research projects	Number of awards		
8.7	Professors' participation in conferences	Number of conferences	min 1 per professor	

Evaluation of RELATE project realisation in project period October 2014 to end of May 2015

Most important challenges in this period of European project development and management are:

- Manage the partner change RO to FI in content management, time management and project administration;
- Regular connection between responsible partners / persons for different work package development, especially with new partner UAS SAVONIA in Kuopio/FI;
- Check up quality of work package results;
- Prepare interim report;
- Communication into new partnership and push interaction between partners in WP development.

Evaluation in this phase based on 2 questionnaires (RELATE Meetings 03.-04.02.2015 in Kuopio/FI and 22.-24.04.2015 in Kuressaare/EE), participation in Skype Meetings and Skype interviews with 2 responsible persons at new VET and HE partners in FI.

Evaluation questionnaires (14 participants) about **RELATE project phase October 2014 – February 2015** showed following results:

I. RELATE – General situation

Do you feel well informed about the current situation in the project (WP contents, results, partners, changes)?

- 28,6% know the concrete current WP's content, results, partners and changes
- 57,1% know approximate WP's content, results, partners and changes
- 14,3% didn't know what's going on in the project

Are you satisfied with the current results of WP3, WP4, WP5 and WP6?

- 14,3% completely satisfied with the current results of WP's
- 57,1% satisfied with the most important results of WP's
- 7,1% not completely satisfied with the current results of WP's
- 21,4% with no comment

Are you clear about your / your organisation's workload in next 6 month?

- 28,6% know concrete workload in next 6 month
- 57,1% know approximate workload in next 6 month
- 14,3% didn't know the concrete workload in next 6 month

Are you sure about your / your organisation's resources to realise all tasks in next 6 month?

- 57,1% definitely sure about resources to realise all tasks in next 6 month
- 42,9% sure approximate about resources to realise all tasks in next 6 month

How many time you work in RELATE project? (appr. hours per week)
Working time between 3h (1), 4-6h (2), 7-8h (4), more than 8h-20h (5)

Do colleagues support you in your organisation to realise project work?

- 64,3% get regular support in their organisation
- 35,7% get irregularly support in their organisation

II. RELATE project organisation and communication

Do you feel well integrated in the current project team?

- 35,7% feel very well integrated in the current project team
- 28,6% feel well integrated in the current project team
- 28,6% are new partner, but feel well integrated in the current project team

Do you have full access to project information?

71,4 answered: yes, 14,3 not full access to all information, 7,1% no comment

Do you well integrated and active in RELATE communication structure (PB works, Skype conferences, phone calls, e-mails, project meetings)?

64,3% answered: yes, 14,3% no, 21,4% no comment

Communication level between project management and project partners?

14,3% answered with: very high, 28,6% high, 42,9% middle, 7,1% low, 7,1% no comment

Communication level between project partners?

14,3% answered with: very high, 35,7% high, 42,9% middle, 7,1% no comment

Do you keep in regular contact with project partners and project management?

78,6% answered: yes, 21,4% no comment

How you satisfied with programme, organisation and results of the RELATE meeting in Kuopio/FI?

35,7% very satisfied, 64,3% satisfied

III. Your proposals for success in next RELATE phase (February – September 2015: testing phase WP7, WP8, WP9)

Please describe briefly your personal proposals to push efficiency and success in RELATE organisation and/or work. What's your personal contribution?

- We should have **regularly Skype Meetings** to support efficiency as well as monthly meetings with national groups;
- Organisation, **project management**, supporting of content;
- I'm going to describe the RPL-process in Savonia in concrete level; I start to plan education to simulation educators and how to use simulations in RPL-process;
- I hope, we can **develop useful methods/tools for RPL to shorten the studying time of those students who have VET studies and diploma**;
- Everything is o.k. and on the way now;
- I think we should **produce less papers, agree more in principals and present it visually to make the project outcomes more practical**;
- Concentration in **project tasks keeping the deadlines**; communication with other partners and with the national group;
- Continue in the same way! I'll fulfil my tasks;
- I'll fulfil tasks related to WP's that our institution is responsible for; also for other WP's;
- Developing self evaluation criteria's using in the process of recognition.

External Evaluator's comments:

1. Use efficient communication tools and timetables in partnership (between PM and partners, between partners, between national groups) is important to push the information level;
2. Clear responsibility for each WP development step in new partnership;
3. Exchange of good practice into partnership to support practical character of project outcomes;
4. Use more visually methods to support practical character of project outcomes.



RELATE Project Meeting in February 2015 in Kuopio/FI

Evaluation questionnaires (11 participants) about **RELATE project phase in April 2015** shows following results:

I. RELATE – General situation

Do you feel well informed about the current situation in the project (WP contents, results, partners, changes)?

- 27,3% know the concrete current WP's content, results, partners and changes
- 72,7% know approximate WP's content, results, partners and changes

Do you satisfied with the current results and plans of WP7, WP8, WP9 and WP1 (timetable)?

- 9,1% completely satisfied with the current results and plans of WP's
- 63,6% satisfied with the most important results and plans of WP's
- 18,2 % not completely satisfied with the current results and plans of WP's
- 9,1% with no comment

Are you clear about your / your organisation's workload and timetable in final project phase?

- 63,6% know their concrete workload and timetable in next month
- 36,4% know approximate their workload and timetable in next month

Are you sure about your / your organisation's resources to realise all tasks in final project phase?

- 45,4% definitely sure about their resources to realise all tasks in next month
- 45,5% sure approximate about their resources to realise all tasks in next month
- 9,1% not sure about my/our possible resources to realise all tasks in next month

How you satisfied with programme, organisation and results of the RELATE meeting in Kuressaare?
27,3% very satisfied, 54,5% satisfied, 18,2% no comment

II. RELATE project phase WP 7 – test phase

Do you feel well informed about the whole workload and common results in WP7?

- 27,3% feel very well informed
- 54,5% feel well informed
- 18,2% didn't fell well informed

Do you feel well prepared to fulfil your workload and results in WP7?

- 9,1% feel very well prepared
- 63,6% feel well prepared
- 9,1% new partner, but feel well prepared
- 18,2% didn't fell well prepared

III. RELATE project phase WP 8 – recommendations and guidelines

Do you feel well informed about the whole workload and common results in WP8?

- 36,4% feel very well informed
- 45,5% feel well informed
- 18,2% didn't fell well informed

Do you feel well prepared to fulfil your workload and results in WP8?

- 18,2% feel very well prepared
- 63,6% feel well prepared
- 18,2% didn't fell well prepared

IV. RELATE project phase WP 9 – sustainability and dissemination

Do you feel well informed about the whole workload and common results in WP9?

- 18,2% feel very well informed
- 54,5% feel well informed
- 9,1% new partner, but feel well informed
- 18,2% didn't fell well informed

Do you feel well prepared to fulfil your workload and results in WP9?

- 27,3% feel very well prepared
- 45,5% feel well prepared

- 9,1% new partner, but feel well prepared
- 18,2% didn't feel well prepared

V. RELATE final project phase

Do you feel special challenges in RELATE final project phase? If "yes", how to deal with them?

- On our side I feel sure that we will manage as we have already adapted a methodology and also tested it. Though I'm a bit worried about whether German partners will manage (Finnish will have simulation in summer) as we have presented a lot of materials for them as an example, but so far **the adaptations and learning by German partners is minimum** (especially VET);
- **Not sure about the final conference** – who, when, what is the aim and expected results;
- **More cooperation with VET and HE in future.**

External Evaluator's comments:

1. Reflect the efficiency and practical usability of each WP's results for each partner to push the trust and the sustainability inside and outside the RELATE partnership;
2. PM/Coordinator need to keep in regular contact with the whole partnership (all organisations and responsible persons) to prepare and realise a successful last project phase, include the final conference in Dresden/DE;
3. Use easy layouts to push visualisation and practical usability of project results for RPL-processes VET-HE.



RELATE Project Meeting in April 2015 in Kuressaare/EE

Evaluation of RELATE simulation pedagogy course 02.-03.06.2015 in SAVONIA UAS in Kuopio/FI in connection with the use as a tool for RPL in health care professions

Main characteristics of simulation pedagogy in health care professions:

- Simulation pedagogy combine the practicing in situations similar to the real life without risks for customers or patients based on mistakes or errors in real clinical settings;
- Simulation pedagogy use real experiences in controlled and guided training environment with reflection (experiential learning);
- Simulation pedagogy gives opportunity to learn from each other and reflect on the learning together;
- Simulation pedagogy as a learning tool integrate discipline theory and practice;
- Simulation pedagogy add new skills and knowledge on base of the previous competencies;
- Simulation pedagogy train students in complex background of communication skills, technical skills and problem solving skills;
- Simulation pedagogy support students self confidence and team work skills and helped them to adapt fluently in clinical practice;
- Simulation pedagogy can be used with different kind of learners and trainees and with different techniques: simulator can be stopped, paused, restarted, forward to make things happen with special aims of acting and reflection (modification of reality to maximize learning results);
- Simulation pedagogy use instructors to support learning effects (guided training environment);
- Simulation pedagogy can be used as high quality technique for performance assessment, special exams and evaluation (here: pilot testes in RPL process).

Main steps of simulation scenario planning (full scale simulation):

- What learners are able to do after the exercise? Setting 2-3 concrete learning objectives / outcomes for the simulation.
- What kind of subject/topic supports the achievement of the objectives? Choosing the subject/topic for the simulation scenario includes level of the learner's prior competence.
- What kind of practical solutions of the scenario needs the subject/topic? Prepare the students, the environment and the simulator and define step by step the scenario process (include closing criteria, life-saver).
- What learners learnt? Plan for the debriefing with description phase, analysis phase, application phase and closing. Examine how closely the performance approached the objectives/targets. Define observed gaps and discuss useful measures.

RELATE-Participants in simulation pedagogy course 02.-03.06.2015 in SAVONIA UAS, Kuopio/FI:

Responsible Finnish SUAS simulation pedagogy experts (Marja Silén-Lipponen, Helena Pennanen, Päivi Smahl, Tommi Kinnunen) prepared the simulation pedagogy course to the project partners from Finland, Estonia and Germany to evaluate the method as a possible RPL assessment method (3 simulations).

The course was organised with facilitators as a pedagogical mentoring process for the participants, including all simulation phases (planning scenario, briefing, facilitation to the debriefing).

The focus of this course was to learn how to:

- Design and develop simulation scenarios;
- Facilitate simulation pedagogy;
- Provide effective feedback and debriefing;
- Evaluate the use of simulation pedagogy in RPL processes.

External Evaluation process based on following measures:

- Direct participation in all parts of simulation pedagogy course;
- Direct acting in one scenario as participant;
- Direct acting in two scenarios as observer/evaluator;
- Interviews with group participants.

SAVONIA UAS Simulation Centre used regularly for internal and external clients and participants, especially in health care professions trainings, assessments and examinations. Technical equipments

based on "Nordic Simulators Oy" with Europe wide knowledge and expertise in Simulation centres.
<http://www.nordicsimulators.com/>

This training centre is highly equipped on best current standards. Those simulation courses with full equipment in health care professions are cost intensive. Simulation pedagogy courses in general could be organised on lower level of technical equipment. Especially in health care professions those high level equipment is helpful to organise sceneries close to the real clinical/practical life.

Main challenges of simulation pedagogy course as method in RPL-process:

- 1.) Simulation pedagogy course needs midterm/ longterm preparation on VET/HE-level and participant (VET + non-formal practical knowledge) need to be prepared to use this form of performance assessment / examination (e.g. using videos; level of open communication on observation).
- 2.) Trainers/Mentors need deep practical knowledge in simulation pedagogy to use this method in examination of trainee's non-formal practical knowledge.
- 3.) This course as train the trainer course showed special challenges to define the concrete position of teachers/trainers position in the simulation preparation and realisation process (e.g. define clear objectives, define teachers/trainers position in debriefing phase, check the connection between objectives and results in view of teacher/trainer and participant).
- 4.) Trainers/teachers/mentors need to be trained in problem solve techniques (e.g. each group member need to have the freedom of open speech; only if whole team involved in discussion can be defined common solution).
- 5.) Communication between all team-members is highly important (not only the question of used common language!) Only if all participants understand the situation in the same way – define the problem on common view – team is possible to define clear objectives and solution.
- 6.) Debriefing is the main important phase in simulation pedagogy course, especially as method in RPL: e.g. start with positive results in scenario; equal discussion between all team-members; analysing body-language in scenario; use the position of life-saver to give the scenario positive push; each role model need to be clear since the beginning of the simulation course).
- 7.) Usual teachers role need to be changed in simulation process, especially in debriefing phase: e.g. teacher asks/talks all the time (low level); team don't define clear learning results (middle level); team/students take the active role in debriefing, without permanent teachers questions (high level).

External Evaluators Comments:

- Simulation pedagogy is useful method in RPL (respect to non-formal collected knowledge);
- Trainers/Experts/Mentors need to be practical trained to use this method as performance assessment;
- Need to be organised minimum of technical equipment to realise environment close to practice (costs for simulation pedagogy);
- Check up the combination between theory and practice (simulation scenario) examination tools;
- VET-participants need to be prepared to this form of examination.



Photo-Impressions of the RELATE simulation pedagogy course 02.-03.06.2015 in Kuopio/FI

Evaluation of RELATE project realisation in final project period to end of October 2015

(8 questionnaires filled in on final meeting 06.-07.10.15 in Dresden/DE)

I. RELATE – General situation

Do you satisfied with the final project results (especially WP8 and WP9)?

12,5% answered: yes, I'm completely satisfied with the current results of WP's

50% answered: yes, I'm satisfied with the most important results of WP's

37,5% answered: no, I'm not completely satisfied with the current results of WP's

II. RELATE project organisation and communication

Do you feel well integrated in the project team?

37,5% answered: yes, I feel very well integrated in the project team

62,5% answered: yes, I feel well integrated in the project team

Communication level between project partners in final project phase?

37,5% answered: very high

12,5% answered: high

25% answered: middle

25% answered: low

How you satisfied with programme, organisation and results of the final RELATE meeting in Dresden/DE?

12,5% answered: very satisfied

62,5% answered: satisfied

12,5% answered: less satisfied

12,5% answered: not satisfied

Comments:

- Could have been more participants on the conference but otherwise very successful meeting;
- Good overview what has been done and still need to be done.

III. Your personal comment for final RELATE phase (March-October 2015)

Main personal comments about RELATE organisation and work in final project phase:

- There was confusion with the coordinator and due to that some misunderstandings on deadlines and tasks;
- Very happy to have Claudio now with us in the project as well;
- Organisation have had some lacks;
- Lots of confusion;
- It has been difficult to get always all information about administration and finances;
- During the last meeting it would have been good to check and create the final report;
- More rigour with timetables;
- Too many time discussions on same topics we have already closed;
- Atmosphere was very good;
- Sometime it was very confusing with all those WPs and Results and papers. In our own country everything went quite nice because we had the clear understanding what to do.

External Evaluators final summary Comment:

RELATE project management solved any challenges: a very complex structure of work packages and results, implement and keep in function efficient communication system with all partners and persons, implement and keep in function efficient information and documentation system, changing partners (RO to FI) and changing coordinator in finale project phase. New Finnish partner SUAS / Kuopio very knowledge in RELATE processes and pushed the whole content development with innovative methods and tools. They organised very successful simulation pedagogy course as method in RPL-process in June 2015. Partner countries EE, FI and DE organised successful RPL-test phase with their students and cleared by this way the main important questions of the RPL-procedure from the perspective of the students, the public administration and the VET and HE administrations. Important challenge for the future is to interest the main stakeholders in European VET and HA systems to support RPL-procedures in their countries. The need of qualified work forces especially in elderly care and health care professions increases immensely. This economic sector is growing in all EU regions.

European Project Management

Dr. Renate Eras
European Project Manager
Siebweg 21 A
D-12526 Berlin

Telefon +49 30 676 99 51
Fax +49 30 67809270
Mobil +49 177 2964096
e-mail renate-eras@t-online.de

Photo-Impressions of the RELATE final conference 06.- 07.10.2015 in Dresden/DE



Dr. Renate Eras, external evaluator in RELATE project