

5. Appendices

4.1 Appendix 1: Instrument used for piloting the first version of the comprehensive instrument for the monitoring grid

Please provide concrete feedback and justify your point:

Table A: Feedback about the quality indicators for the monitoring grid

| Quality indicator | Is it easy to understand? Include feedback to improve writing or description | Is it appropriate? Include feedback to improve the content or nature of the quality indicator | Is it measurable? What kind of evidence might be provided? |
|---|---|--|---|
| 1. Development of a Consortium Agreement that clearly outlines duties and responsibilities, securing widest impact through open access foreground and open research data facilitation | | | |
| 2. Efficient meeting planning (also in cooperation with partners when meetings hosted by partners) | | | |
| 3. Strategic scheduling of the meetings (communicating with partners, keeping in mind upcoming tasks and different lines of actions, establishing collaborations between WPs) | | | |
| 4. Efficient communication and coordination with European Commission / Executive Agency, handling of all contractual matters / | | | |

| Quality indicator | Is it easy to understand? Include feedback to improve writing or description | Is it appropriate? Include feedback to improve the content or nature of the quality indicator | Is it measurable? What kind of evidence might be provided? |
|---|--|---|--|
| obligations and taking corrective actions if needed | | | |
| 6. Financial reporting and related payment of instalments according to schedule | | | |
| 7. Implementation of Strategic Leader Board and Governance Board | | | |
| 8. Facilitation of fluid communication among partners | | | |
| 9. Efficient communication between management and partners, providing information, templates etc. | | | |
| 10. Literature supports topics and ways of working in the modules | | | |
| 11. PD modules are based on research findings about effective TPD | | | |
| 12. Partners are actively involved in the development of the PD concept | | | |
| 13. Examples (contexts) from each partner become part of the PD materials. | | | |
| 14. There is 'evidence' in every partner country that the MaSDiV teacher training approach is fitting in the national 'tradition' of teacher training | | | |
| 15. National agencies/partners are involved in disseminating the final (translated) PD materials | | | |
| 16. The research design fits the research | | | |

| Quality indicator | Is it easy to understand? Include feedback to improve writing or description | Is it appropriate? Include feedback to improve the content or nature of the quality indicator | Is it measurable? What kind of evidence might be provided? |
|--|---|--|---|
| objectives and it is based on appropriate research methodologies | | | |
| 17. The research design is accepted by consortium members | | | |
| 18. The research instruments are validated | | | |
| 19. They allow appropriate data gathering to address the research questions | | | |
| 20. Research instruments are accepted by consortium members | | | |
| 21. It is driven by smart aims (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, time-based aims) | | | |
| 22. It involves the use of validated instruments and ensures the reliability of results | | | |
| 23. It provides clear and detailed guidelines for implementation | | | |
| 24. Partners accept the experimentation protocol. | | | |
| 25. Partners are committed to data collection and meet numbers | | | |
| 26. Data collection fits the aims of the project | | | |
| 27. Data collection provides good evidence for the policy experimentation | | | |
| 28. Partners are informed about the status of the experimentation protocol and | | | |

| Quality indicator | Is it easy to understand? Include feedback to improve writing or description | Is it appropriate? Include feedback to improve the content or nature of the quality indicator | Is it measurable? What kind of evidence might be provided? |
|---|--|---|--|
| data | | | |
| 29. The announcement template is appropriate for the needs of the project and has the required criteria identified by partners. | | | |
| 30. The required number of participants has been reached. | | | |
| 31. Field trials are carried out according to the experimental protocol agreed by partners. | | | |
| 32. Data collection is carried out within the agreed timeframe. | | | |
| 33. Data collected is of high quality i.e. collected in a consistent, reliable and valid way. | | | |
| 34. PD course for control group is carried out. | | | |
| 35. Workshop on field trials supports exchange, discussion and reflection. | | | |
| 36. Standardised procedures are used to analyse data | | | |
| 37. Results/Data are discussed with the partner | | | |
| 38. Valuable conclusions are drawn | | | |
| 39. A public final report is produced on the basis of data analysis | | | |
| 40. Stakeholder Analysis is provided | | | |

| Quality indicator | Is it easy to understand? Include feedback to improve writing or description | Is it appropriate? Include feedback to improve the content or nature of the quality indicator | Is it measurable? What kind of evidence might be provided? |
|---|--|---|--|
| 41. Draft of European dissemination plan is provided | | | |
| 42. Dissemination form to evaluate dissemination means is provided | | | |
| 43. Dissemination, communication and exploitation workshops to refine related strategies | | | |
| 44. Setting up European project website, suitable presentation for target groups, template for national websites is provided | | | |
| 45. Final conference to ensure policy measure scale-up – including a policy seminar targeted to policy makers and stakeholders from educational authorities | | | |
| 46. Development of an efficient exploitation and sustainability strategy plan to guide activities and give recommendations on scaling up beyond project end | | | |
| 47. Partners set up national dissemination plans | | | |
| 48. Partners proactively carry out dissemination and scaling-up activities | | | |
| 49. Evaluation of activities using the dissemination form | | | |
| 50. Participation in dissemination, | | | |

| Quality indicator | Is it easy to understand? Include feedback to improve writing or description | Is it appropriate? Include feedback to improve the content or nature of the quality indicator | Is it measurable? What kind of evidence might be provided? |
|--|--|---|--|
| communication and exploitation workshops | | | |
| 51. Partners set up national websites | | | |
| 52. Active participation in the final conference | | | |
| 53. All partners contribute to the exploitation and sustainability strategy plan | | | |
| 54. The evaluation grid is based on the quality criteria provided by key stakeholders. | | | |
| 55. The evaluation grid is piloted in order to ensure its validity | | | |
| 56. Partners show a high commitment to quality issues | | | |
| 57. Partners identify strengths in the project processes and products | | | |
| 58. Partners identify weaknesses in the project processes and products | | | |
| 59. Partners provide constructive feedback | | | |
| 60. Partners suggest ways to improve | | | |
| 61. There is a fluid and efficient communication among WP leaders and partners | | | |
| 62. There is an open and efficient communication to society | | | |

Table B: A view of the **instrument to evaluate the quality** of the management and activities of the MasDiV project ('monitoring grid')

WP:

| Quality indicator | To what extent has this quality indicator been met? Scale: 1-4 1 = Unsatisfactory 2 = Improvement needed 3 = Meets expectations 4 = Excellent | How can we improve to better meet this quality indicator in the future? Explain and justified your ideas | Others Not applicable A = I cannot evaluate that B = not applicable at this stage |
|-------------------|--|---|--|
| ... | | | |
| ... | | | |
| ... | | | |
| ... | | | |
| ... | | | |
| ... | | | |
| ... | | | |

There will be a monitoring grid concerning any WP. Do you have any suggestion about the monitoring grid presented above?

4.2 Appendix 2: Revised version of the comprehensive instrument for the monitoring grid

WP1 Management

| Quality indicator | This indicator has been met in way that can be described as | | | | How can we improve to better meet this quality indicator in the future? | Others A = I cannot evaluate that B = not applicable at this stage |
|--|---|-----------|-----------|----------------|---|--|
| | 1 Bad | 2 Poor | 3 Good | 4 Excellent | | |
| The Consortium Agreement clearly outlines duties and responsibilities, securing widest impact through open access foreground and open research data facilitation. | | | | | | |
| The communication and coordination with European Commission / Executive Agency allows a productive handling of all contractual matters legal issues. | | | | | | |
| The technical reports are prepared based on reports by partners, providing feedback regarding contractual obligations and taking responsive actions. | | | | | | |
| Financial reports and related payment of instalments are according to schedule. | | | | | | |
| There is a productive management and collaboration within the Strategic Leader Board and The Governance Boards | | | | | | |
| There is a continuous communication between leaders and partners regarding milestones, pending tasks, deadlines, and deliverables... | | | | | | |
| The project management supports the consortium activities though the provision of information, templates and advice... | | | | | | |

WP1 Management (cont.)

| Quality indicator | This indicator has been met in way that can be described as | | | | How can we improve to better meet this quality indicator in the future? | Others A = I cannot evaluate that B = not applicable at this stage |
|--|---|-----------|-----------|----------------|---|--|
| | 1 Bad | 2 Poor | 3 Good | 4 Excellent | | |
| WP1 collaborates with partners (hosts/leaders) for the preparation of meetings. | | | | | | |
| The objectives and activities (agenda) of the meeting have been clearly communicated. | | | | | | |
| The schedule of the meeting is appropriate for conducting the planned activities. | | | | | | |
| The sessions at the meeting have been useful and met my expectations. | | | | | | |
| I have been provided with appropriate materials to work on different tasks and sessions on time. | | | | | | |
| The meeting has contributed to achieve my personal objectives in relation to the project. | | | | | | |
| The meeting has contributed to achieve the project's objectives. | | | | | | |
| I feel I have been given opportunities to actively contribute at the meeting. | | | | | | |
| I feel others have been given opportunities to actively contribute at the meeting. | | | | | | |

WP2 PD concept and materials

| Quality indicator | This indicator has been met in way that can be described as | | | | How can we improve to better meet this quality indicator in the future? | Others A = I cannot evaluate that B = not applicable at this stage |
|--|---|-----------|-----------|----------------|---|--|
| | 1 Bad | 2 Poor | 3 Good | 4 Excellent | | |
| Literature supports topics and ways of working in the modules | | | | | | |
| PD modules are based on research findings about effective TPD | | | | | | |
| Partners have had the opportunity to take part in the development of the PD modules | | | | | | |
| The PD modules can be implemented into my national context adapting to existing structures | | | | | | |
| National agencies/partners are involved in disseminating the final (translated) PD materials | | | | | | |

1.

WP3 Experimentation protocol

| Quality indicator | This indicator has been met in way that can be described as | | | | How can we improve to better meet this quality indicator in the future? | Others A = I cannot evaluate that B = not applicable at this stage |
|---|---|-----------|-----------|----------------|---|--|
| | 1 Bad | 2 Poor | 3 Good | 4 Excellent | | |
| The research design fits the research objectives | | | | | | |
| The research design is based on appropriate research methodologies | | | | | | |
| The research instruments have been validated using adequate techniques | | | | | | |
| The experimentation protocol provides clear and detailed guidelines for implementation | | | | | | |
| Partners are informed about the status of the experimentation protocol and the different phases | | | | | | |
| There is a general commitment to implement the experimentation protocol | | | | | | |

WP4 Field trials

| Quality indicator | This indicator has been met in way that can be described as | | | | How can we improve to better meet this quality indicator in the future? | Others A = I cannot evaluate that B = not applicable at this stage |
|---|---|-----------|-----------|----------------|---|--|
| | 1 Bad | 2 Poor | 3 Good | 4 Excellent | | |
| The template to advertise the PD courses is appropriate for the needs of the project. | | | | | | |
| The template to advertise the PD courses meets partners expectations | | | | | | |
| Field trials are carried out according to the experimental protocol agreed by partners. | | | | | | |
| The required number of participants has been reached. | | | | | | |
| Data collection is carried out within the agreed timeframe. | | | | | | |
| A waiting/control group of teachers has been used according to the experimentation protocol | | | | | | |
| Workshop on field trials supports exchange, discussion and reflection. | | | | | | |

WP5 Data Analysis

| Quality indicator | This indicator has been met in way that can be described as | | | | How can we improve to better meet this quality indicator in the future? | Others A = I cannot evaluate that B = not applicable at this stage |
|---|---|-----------|-----------|----------------|---|--|
| | 1 Bad | 2 Poor | 3 Good | 4 Excellent | | |
| Standardised procedures are used to analyse data | | | | | | |
| Results/Data are discussed with the partner | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis and discussion of data | | | | | | |
| A public final report is produced on the basis of data analysis | | | | | | |

WP6 Dissemination

| Quality indicator | This indicator has been met in way that can be described as | | | | How can we improve to better meet this quality indicator in the future? | Others A = I cannot evaluate that B = not applicable at this stage |
|--|---|-----------|-----------|----------------|---|--|
| | 1 Bad | 2 Poor | 3 Good | 4 Excellent | | |
| A stakeholder analysis is provided | | | | | | |
| A European dissemination plan is provided | | | | | | |
| Dissemination form to evaluate dissemination activities is provided | | | | | | |
| Dissemination, communication and exploitation workshops are held to refine related strategies with the participation of partners | | | | | | |
| A European project website with suitable presentations for different target groups is set up | | | | | | |
| A template consistent with the international website is provided for national websites. | | | | | | |
| A final conference to support the scaling up of the Masdiv policy measure will be held with the active participation of partners. | | | | | | |
| A policy seminar targeted to policy makers and stakeholders from educational authorities will be held at the final conference. | | | | | | |
| An exploitation plan and a strategy for sustainability will be developed to provide recommendations on scaling up beyond the project in collaboration with partners. | | | | | | |
| Partners carry out dissemination and scaling-up activities. | | | | | | |
| The dissemination activities are reported through the dissemination form (template for reporting and monitoring dissemination actions). | | | | | | |
| Partners set up national websites according to the template provided | | | | | | |

WP7 Quality Assurance

| Quality indicator | This indicator has been met in way that can be described as | | | | How can we improve to better meet this quality indicator in the future? | Others A = I cannot evaluate that B = not applicable at this stage |
|--|---|-----------|-----------|----------------|---|--|
| | 1 Bad | 2 Poor | 3 Good | 4 Excellent | | |
| The evaluation grid is based on the quality criteria suggested and discussed by key stakeholders (WP leaders and partners) | | | | | | |
| The evaluation grid has been piloted (discussed and revised by experts and consortium members) | | | | | | |
| Partners show a high commitment to quality issues (keep quality criteria in mind and try to meet them; provide constructive feedback for improvement). | | | | | | |