



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

## Work Package 4 (WP4) Handbook

### Quality Assurance

**Establishing Modern Master-level Studies in Information Systems**

**561592-EPP-1-2015-1- FR-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP**

**Version 3.0**



**Lead Organisation:**

***Guido Carli Free International University for Social Studies  
Lviv Polytechnic National University (P12)***

Document Information

<b>Grant Number</b>	<b>Agreement</b>	<b>561592-EPP-1-2015-1-FR-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP</b>	<b>Acronym</b>	<b>MASTIS</b>
<b>Full Title</b>	Establishing Modern Master-level Studies in Information Systems			
<b>Topic</b>	ERASMUS+ CBHA			
<b>Start Date</b>	15 <sup>th</sup> October 2016	<b>Duration</b>	36 months	
<b>Project URL</b>	http://mastis.pro/			
<b>Project Coordinator</b>	Prof J-H CHAUCHAT, Lyon2			
<b>Work Package</b>	WP4 – Quality Assurance			
<b>Date of Delivery</b>	Contractual	M3	Actual	31/08/16
<b>Nature</b>	R – Report	<b>Dissemination Level</b>	P - Public	
<b>Lead Beneficiary</b>	Lyon2			
<b>Responsible Author</b>	LPNU (P12)	Email	Ol.ih33@gmail.com	
		Phone		
<b>Responsible Author</b>	Guido Carli Free International University for Social Studies			
<b>Responsible Author</b>	MONTENEGRO			
<b>Reviewer(s):</b>	All partners			
<b>Keywords</b>	Quality Assurance, Evaluation program, External quality control			

Document History

Version	Issue Date	Stage	Changes	Contributor
1.0	28/09/08/2016	Draft	Circulation of the 1st DRAFT version to all partners for comments (1st level check)	ALL
2.0	10/12/2016	Draft	Circulation of the 2st DRAFT version to all partners for comments (1st level check)	ALL
3.0	13/02/2017	Draft	Circulation of the 3st DRAFT version to all partners for comments (1st level check)	ALL

## **CONTENTS**

**Unit 1. WP4 description according to Detailed Project Description (DPD)**

**Unit 2. What project outcomes are going to be evaluated and how.**

**Unit 3. The Evaluation Team.**

**Unit 4. The Evaluation Program.**

**Unit 5. The External evaluation of master educational program in IS.**

**6. Appendixes**

## 1. WP4 description according to Detailed Project Description (DPD)

WP4 is aimed at external and internal quality control & self-evaluation of project process & results by students, academic staff, experts & business representatives.

It will be achieved through project results evaluation (outputs and outcomes), the effectiveness of measures implemented under the project and partners' activity.

**For the regular assessment, it is planned to select a team of project evaluators, who will develop the evaluation program and conduct monitoring and control of its implementation, to attract internal and external experts for the project assessment.**

The deliverables of these activities will be the following results: evaluation program development as well as internal and external project quality assessment.

The results of the project quality assessment program implementation must be reflected in generating evaluation reports and publishing evaluation digest.

## 2. What project outcomes are going to be evaluated and how.

If the process of outcome development is relatively simple (development of handbook, organization of the project meeting, organization of the project dissemination event) only summative evaluation is going to be applied. In the same time to improve, the quality assurance of Master program in IS both summative and formative evaluations are going to be applied.

Considering the description of WP4 presented in Detailed Project Description the following project outcomes are going to be evaluated:

1. **The handbooks for Work Packages 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.** The handbook for each work package is going to be evaluated by the members of the project Evaluation Team. Each member of the project Evaluation Team is expected to fill in the Questionnaire (Appendix E). The results of the feedback are going to be aggregated in the Report (Appendix F). The partner responsible for aggregation is determined in the Evaluation Program (Unit 4. of this Handbook).
2. **The project meetings.** The project meetings are going to be evaluated by the participants of project meetings. Each project meeting participant is expected to fill in the Questionnaire (Appendix A). The results of the feedback are going to be aggregated in the Report (Appendix C). The partner responsible for aggregation is determined in the Evaluation Program (Unit 4. Of this Handbook).
3. **The dissemination events in the particular Universities.** The project meetings are going to be evaluated by the participants of the dissemination events. Each dissemination event participant is expected to fill in the Questionnaire (Appendix B). The results of the feedback are going to be aggregated in the Report (Appendix D). The partner responsible for aggregation is determined in the Evaluation Program (Unit 4. Of this Handbook).
4. **The Master program in IS developed as the result of the project.** The questionnaire based on "Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG)" is going to be developed by the Evaluation Team to evaluate the master educational program in IS. The formative quality assurance of Master program in Information System will be conducted at the following stages: development of program profile, program projection, development of program courses, program pilot functioning. At the end of the project the summative evaluation of the final version of Master program in IS will be applied.

### 3. The Evaluation Team.

A team of project evaluators (Evaluation Team) consists of one representative from each Partner University and the representative of the University of Agder.

The names and contacts of the Evaluation Team representatives are presented in the table below.

**Evaluation Team**

Guido Carli Free International University for Social Studies, Italy (WP Leaders)		
LPNU (WP Leaders)	Ihor Oleksiv	<a href="mailto:ol.ih33@gmail.com">ol.ih33@gmail.com</a>
KhNUE	Oleksandr SHCHERBAKOV	oleksandr.shcherbakov@hneu.net
NTUU KPI	Tamara TIELYSHEVA,	<a href="mailto:telyshevat@mail.ru">telyshevat@mail.ru</a>
VNTU	Volodymyr DUBOVOY	v.m.dubovoy@gmail.com
KSU	Hennadiy KRAVTSOV	<a href="mailto:kgm@ksu.ks.ua">kgm@ksu.ks.ua</a>
NTU KhPI	Olga KANISHCHEVA	kanichshevaolga@gmail.com
UDG		
UNIM		

### 4. The Evaluation Program.

The evaluation program is going to be directed at the evaluation of each of the project outcomes presented in Unit 2 of this Handbook.

**Evaluation program for MASTIS project**

<b>Outcomes</b>	<b>Methods of evaluation</b>	<b>Feedback providers (survey participants)</b>	<b>The report due dates</b>	<b>Partners responsible for aggregation of survey results and preparation of the Report</b>
<b>Handbook on WP1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questionnaire (Appendix E)</li> <li>• Report to aggregate the information received by the survey (Appendix F)</li> </ul>	Evaluation Team	10 days after final version of handbook is provided and placed on Dropbox	NTU KhPI (Report Appendix F)
<b>Handbook on WP2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questionnaire (Appendix E)</li> </ul>	Evaluation Team	10 days after final version of	NTUU KPI (Report Appendix

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report to aggregate the information received by the survey (Appendix F)</li> </ul>		handbook is provided and placed on Dropbox	F)
<b>Handbook on WP3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questionnaire (Appendix E)</li> <li>• Report to aggregate the information received by the survey (Appendix F)</li> </ul>	Evaluation Team	10 days after final version of handbook is provided and placed on Dropbox	VNTU (Report Appendix F)
<b>Handbook on WP4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questionnaire (Appendix E)</li> <li>• Report to aggregate the information received by the survey (Appendix F)</li> </ul>	Evaluation Team	10 days after final version of handbook is provided and placed on Dropbox	KSU (Report Appendix F)
<b>Handbook on WP5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questionnaire (Appendix E)</li> <li>• Report to aggregate the information received by the survey (Appendix F)</li> </ul>	Evaluation Team	10 days after final version of handbook is provided and placed on Dropbox	KhNUE (Report Appendix F)
<b>The project meetings</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questionnaire (Appendix A)</li> <li>• Report to aggregate the information received by the survey (Appendix C)</li> </ul>	Participants of project meetings	10 days after project meeting completion	LPNU (Report Appendix C)
<b>The dissemination event at the particular University</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questionnaire (Appendix B)</li> <li>• Report to aggregate the information received by the survey (Appendix D)</li> </ul>	Participants of the dissemination event	10 days after dissemination event completion	The University at which dissemination event was conducted (Report Appendix D)
<b>The educational program in IS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questionnaires to evaluate program profile, program projection, program courses, program pilot functioning and educational program in general</li> </ul>	Evaluation Team	?????	Guido Carli Free International University for Social Studies

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report to aggregate the information received by the survey</li> </ul>			
--	--	--	--	--

## 5. The External evaluation of educational Program in IS.

The External Project Evaluation Team should be created by Month 20 of the project. The team will include 3 people (1 representative of business, 1 representative of the Universities outside the project, 1 representative of National Methodical Commission).

The Questionnaire for external evaluation of educational program in IS will be developed by the Evaluation Team. The Questionnaire will include the evaluation of Master's thesis, results of graduates' internships MPIS program and verification of compliance of students' knowledge and skills with the requirements in competence profiles and will be based on "Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG)".



**Questionnaire  
for MASTIS meeting evaluation**

**Dates:**

**Place:**

Country							
Position							
<i>Evaluation of the quality of meeting considering proposed criteria: "A" - if level is high; "B" - if level is adequate; "C" - if level is average; "D" - if level is low</i>							
<b>To what extent?</b>				<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
1	The meeting was planned						
2	The date of the meeting was communicated to partners in good time						
3	The programme of the meeting was clear and adequate to the aim						
4	The schedule of the meeting was in line with the plan						
5	Activities were organised						
6	The coordinator conducted the meeting in a professional manner						
7	The technical support was adequate						
8	The amount of time allocated to each objective was adequate						
9	Participants were allowed the opportunity to express their opinions and views						
10	Participants were given the opportunity to ask questions						
11	The response to the questions were satisfactory						
12	The meeting has achieved its aims						

13. Could you please comment on what can be improved in meeting organization and conduction as well as on the lessons learnt from the meeting? \_\_\_\_\_

---



---



---



---





**Questionnaire  
for MASTIS dissemination event evaluation**

**Dates:**

**Place:**

Country									
Position									
<i>Evaluation of the quality of dissemination event considering proposed criteria: “A” - if level is high; “B” - if level is adequate; “C” - if level is average; “D” - if level is low</i>									
		<b>To what extent?</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>			
1	The event was planned								
2	The date of the event was communicated to participants in good time								
3	The programme of the event was clear and adequate to the aim								
4	The schedule of the event was in line with the plan								
5	Activities were organised								
6	The organizer conducted the event in a professional manner								
7	The technical support was adequate								
8	The amount of time allocated to each objective was adequate								
9	Participants were allowed the opportunity to express their opinions and views								
10	Participants were given the opportunity to ask questions								
11	The response to the questions were satisfactory								
12	The event has achieved its aims								

13. Could you please comment on what can be improved in event organization and conduction? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_



## **Meeting Evaluation Report**

**Place:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Activity:** \_\_\_\_\_

### **Establishing Modern Master-level Studies in Information Systems**

561592-EPP-1-2015-1-FR-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

Number of participants \_\_\_\_\_

**The answers provided by the participants of the project meeting**

*Evaluation of the quality of meeting considering proposed criteria: "A" - if level is high; "B" - if level is adequate; "C" - if level is average; "D" - if level is low*

<b>To what extent?</b>		<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
1	The meeting was planned				
2	The date of the meeting was communicated to partners in good time				
3	The programme of the meeting was clear and adequate to the aim				
4	The schedule of the meeting was in line with the plan				
5	Activities were organised				
6	The coordinator conducted the meeting in a professional manner				
7	The technical support was adequate				
8	The amount of time allocated to each objective was adequate				
9	Participants were allowed the opportunity to express their opinions and views				
10	Participants were given the opportunity to ask questions				
11	The response to the questions were satisfactory				
12	The meeting has achieved its aims				

13. Comments written by the participants to answer the question 13.



## **Dissemination Event Evaluation Report**

**Place:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Activity:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Establishing Modern Master-level Studies in Information Systems**

561592-EPP-1-2015-1-FR-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

Number of participants \_\_\_\_\_

**The answers provided by the participants of the project meeting**

*Evaluation of the quality of dissemination event considering proposed criteria: “A” - if level is high; “B” - if level is adequate; “C” - if level is average; “D” - if level is low*

<b>To what extent?</b>		<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
1	The event was planned				
2	The date of the event was communicated to participants in good time				
3	The programme of the event was clear and adequate to the aim				
4	The schedule of the event was in line with the plan				
5	Activities were organised				
6	The organizer conducted the event in a professional manner				
7	The technical support was adequate				
8	The amount of time allocated to each objective was adequate				
9	Participants were allowed the opportunity to express their opinions and views				
10	Participants were given the opportunity to ask questions				
11	The response to the questions were satisfactory				
12	The event has achieved its aims				

13. Comments written by the participants to answer the question 13.



**Questionnaire  
for MASTIS Handbook Evaluation**

**Handbook for WP\_\_\_\_\_**

Country								
Position								
<i>Evaluation of the quality of handbook considering proposed criteria: "A" - if level is high; "B" - if level is adequate; "C" - if level is average; "D" - if level is low</i>								
<b>To what extent?</b>					<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
1	The handbook is logical and well-structured							
2	The handbook is easy for understanding							
3	The tasks presented in Handbook are clear							
4	The WP responsibilities are distributed among the consortium members							
5	Partners responsible for submitting the reports are determined							
6	The deadlines for WP task completion are set							
7	The necessary Appendixes (Annexes) are available							

8. Could you please comment on what can be improved in the evaluated handbook

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



## **Handbook Evaluation Report**

**WP \_\_\_\_\_**

**Establishing Modern Master-level Studies in Information Systems**

561592-EPP-1-2015-1-FR-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

**The aggregated answers provided by MASTIS Evaluation Team**

<i>Evaluation of the quality of handbook considering proposed criteria: "A" - if level is high; "B" - if level is adequate; "C" - if level is average; "D" - if level is low</i>					
<b>To what extent?</b>		<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>
1	The handbook is logical and well-structured				
2	The handbook is easy for understanding				
3	The tasks presented in Handbook are clear				
4	The WP responsibilities are distributed among the consortium members				
5	Partners responsible for submitting the reports are determined				
6	The deadlines for WP task completion are set				
7	The necessary Appendixes (Annexes) are available				

8. Comments written by the participants to answer the question 8.

Control and monitoring of the project quality should be carried out by the project coordinator, a group of internal experts (contact persons from the partner universities), a group of external experts (IT-business and National Methodical Commission's representatives), as well as academic staff and students. For regular evaluation, it is planned to select the team of project evaluators. The external evaluation should be carried out once a year. Besides it is planned to involve external experts (from the university or from an enterprise) to all project meetings in universities. Points to be evaluated are quality of presentations, debate organization in order to help to organize future meetings and activities. The internal evaluation should be carried out twice a year. Every 6 months the team of project evaluators including the project coordinator and one expert from each member of the consortium will meet to discuss the results of the project. Online tool "Monkey" will be used for evaluation survives collecting.