

ROMOR Quality Assessment Plan



D 6.1

Author(s)	Joy Davidson (HATII, University of Glasgow)
Document status	Live Document
Document version and date	2.0
Dissemination level	Internal
Description:	Plan describing the quality assurance procedures for the ROMOR project.
Filename:	ROMOR_GLA_6.1_QA_Plan_100318

Version	Date	Status	Author	Changes
1.0	04/03/2017	draft	Joy Davidson	Draft version made available for comment
2.0	07/11/2017		Joy Davidson	Shortened; links to templates and guidance provided; added detail around OAIRs

1 Contents

Introduction.....	3
Project objectives	3
Partners	3
Aim and scope of the Quality Assurance (QA) Plan	4
Monitoring Quality Assurance and Measuring progress towards objectives	4
QA roles and responsibilities.....	4
General Quality Assurance Processes and Procedures	5
Managing and sharing working documents.....	5
File naming.....	6
Levels and timeframes for peer review	6
Publishing.....	7
Archiving outputs.....	8
Specific Quality Assurance Measures by activity type	8
Communications	8
Project meetings	8
Educational materials	9
Training events.....	9
OAIRs	9
Special Mobility Strand.....	10
Schedule of QA activities.....	10

2 Introduction

The Research Output Management through Open Access Institutional Repositories in Palestinian Higher Education Institutions (ROMOR) project aims to improve the management, visibility, and accessibility of scientific research outputs in Palestinian HEIs by establishing new or enhancing existing Open Access Institutional Repositories (OAIRs), improving institutional capacity for the management and sharing of research outputs held within the repositories, and developing and/or refining curricula to ensure that emerging researchers are better able to manage their work across the entire research lifecycle.

3 Project objectives

- reviewing the current status of research outputs management in 4 PS HEIs
- assessing the drivers and barriers influencing PS staff and students with regards to sharing their research outputs
- developing tailored training to increase capacity among PS research support staff for designing, implementing, operating, populating, and sustaining OAIRs
- equipping PS research support staff to deliver training on research output management to researchers at their own institutions
- implementing 4 OAIRs in partner PS HEIs that can facilitate storage, visibility, and access to a range of research outputs including publications and research data
- providing a national focus into research output management and scale-up the IUG OAIR to deliver services at a national level
- raising the awareness and promote the benefits of research output management and sharing to researchers - especially students and early career researchers
- Illustrating how better visibility and access to PS research outputs can benefit non-HEI stakeholders – specifically policy makers and industry

4 Partners

The project brings together partners from 4 Palestinian HEIs and four European HEIs to share examples of good practice emerging in Europe – where funding body mandates relating to Open Access have been in existence for more than a decade.

-Islamic University of Gaza (IUG)

-Birzeit University (BZU)

-Al-Quds Open University (QOU)

-Palestine Technical University - Kadoorie (KAD)

-Technische Universitaet Wien (TUWIEN)

-Universita Degli Studi Di Parma (PARMA)

-University of Brighton (BU)

-University of Glasgow (GLA)

5 Aim and scope of the Quality Assurance (QA) Plan

This plan describes quality assurance processes for ROMOR outputs along with key roles and responsibilities. The plan has been kept intentionally brief to ensure that it serves as a useful reference point for all project staff. This plan is intended to be used in conjunction with other project documents such as the current project plan and risk assessment. The plan is primarily intended for internal use but has been made publicly accessible as a means of transparency.

6 Monitoring Quality Assurance and Measuring progress towards objectives

Quality assurance will be monitored over the life of the ROMOR project. All work package leads are required to familiarize themselves with the objectives set out in the ROMOR [Logical Framework Matrix \(LFM\)](#) and possible challenges in realizing these set out in the ROMOR [Risk Assessment](#). Progress against targets set in the LMF will be reviewed as part of the annual QA meeting. Where necessary, the QA plan will be updated to ensure that the targets set out in the LMF can be effectively measured through qualitative and quantitative approaches. A review of the Risk Assessment table will also be carried out as part of annual QA meeting.

A [Quality Assurance schedule](#) including all planned project outputs has been jointly drafted by all partners and will be reviewed periodically. The schedule will be assessed during the annual QA meetings which will be held virtually each year with the participation of the QA Panel and workpackage leaders. Two brief periodic reports will be submitted to the Project Management Committee each year.

7 QA roles and responsibilities

Ensuring high quality outputs is a shared responsibility involving all members of the project team to varying degrees. Specific partner roles and responsibilities are described below.

The **Quality Assurance Panel** is responsible for reviewing all project outputs identified in the QA schedule as well as for reviewing the bi-annual QA assessment reports and providing recommendations on improvements.

Partner	Quality Assurance Panel Representative
Islamic University of Gaza (IUG)	Rawia Awadallah
Birzeit University (BZU)	Adnan Yahya
Al-Quds Open University (QOU)	Yousef Abuzir
Technische Universitaet Wien (TUWIEN)	Andreas Rauber
Universita Degli Studi Di Parma (PARMA)	Anna Maria Tamaro

University of Brighton (BU)	Janet Delve
University of Glasgow (GLA)	Joy Davidson
Palestine Technical University - Kadoorie (KAD)	Nael Salman

The workpackage leaders (as outlined in the table below) are responsible for managing day to day activity in delivering the project tasks to a high standard of quality. WP leaders may delegate this responsibility to a member of their team. If this is the case, the named individual should be clearly identified as the key contact in the QA Schedule.

WP1 – Needs Assessment	Janet Delve, BU
WP2 – Training and Educational Material	Anna Maria Tamaro, PARMA
WP3 – Training and Teaching	Andreas Rauber, TUWIEN
WP4 – Developing IR Models	Adnan Yahya, BZU
WP5 – Building IRs	Iyad Alagha, IUG
WP6 – Quality Assurance	Joy Davidson, GLA
WP7 – Dissemination and Exploitation of Results	Yousef Abuzir, QOU
WP8 – Project Management	Rawia Awadallah, IUG

In some cases, external QA reviews will be sought from ROMOR’s associate partners which include:

- Accreditation and Quality Assurance Commission (AQAC)
- The Palestinian Scientific Research Council (PRC)
- Stichting Eifl (EIFL)

Ad-hoc meetings will be scheduled by the QA Panel as needed to facilitate review discussions with external reviewers.

8 General Quality Assurance Processes and Procedures

The following section describes the general approach to quality assurance for all project activities.

8.1 Managing and sharing working documents

All working documents should be shared the ROMOR Google Drive. During the life of the project, [Freedcamp](#) will be used as an internal project management and communication tool.

Final versions of project outputs should be deposited to the appropriate folder in the [ROMOR Google Drive](#) for reference and each partner should ensure that local copies of working and final documents they are responsible for are maintained at their own institution for backup purposes.

8.2 File naming

All project outputs should adhere to the following file naming format.

ROMOR_Partner acronym_workpackage number_title_ddmmyyyy

For working documents in Google Drive, please include the status label 'draft'. For example, using the approach described, the **draft** Quality Assessment Plan is named as:

ROMOR_Partner acronym_workpackage number_title_status_ddmmyyyy

For example, the final QA plan will be named:

ROMOR_GLA_6.1_QA_Plan_draft_21022017

The final output that will be published in Zenodo do not require a status label and should be named according to the following example:

ROMOR_Partner acronym_workpackage number_title_status_ddmmyyyy

For example, the final QA plan will be named:

ROMOR_GLA_6.1_QA_Plan_28022017

9 Levels and timeframes for peer review

Peer review will be employed to assure the quality of training and educational materials, surveys, reports, and dissemination materials including the project website. There are three levels of quality assurance. The recommended QA timeframes below will allow sufficient time for peer review of ROMOR project outputs. All participants are asked to build in the required time needed to facilitate QA when planning their activities.

9.1 Workpackage level

QA at the workpackage level will include clear communication from the WP lead or delegated individual to all staff involved to ensure that activities are carried out efficiently, effectively and in line with project objectives. Peer review at this level will involve at least two members of the WP team carrying out a review of the outputs prior to being finalised.

9.2 Light-touch

QA at this level will be carried out by the Quality Assessment (QA) Panel but will be limited to a review of presentation and adherence to house style rather than on the quality of the content itself. This level of peer review will be particularly targeted towards promotional and

dissemination materials. For outputs requiring only a light-touch peer review, at least one member of the QA Panel will carry out the review.

- Drafts should be submitted at least 5 days prior to delivery deadline.
- Comments from QA Panel will be returned at least 2 days prior to delivery deadline.
- Revised version will be submitted to QA Panel for sign-off at least 1 day prior to delivery deadline.

9.3 Rigorous

QA at this level will be carried out by the QA Panel following standard WP level review. The outputs will be reviewed for content and accuracy in addition to presentation and style. In some cases, external reviewers will be brought in to carry out rigorous review for specific deliverables based on their subject expertise.

- Drafts should be submitted to the QA panel for review at least 10 days prior to delivery deadline.
- Comments from QA panel will be returned to author(s) for consideration at least 5 days prior to delivery deadline.
- Revised version will be submitted to QA Panel for sign-off at least 2 days prior to delivery deadline.

10 Publishing

All final deliverables should be wrapped with the [ROMOR cover sheet](#) provided in the document template folder.

- Save reports as PDF and assign a filename using the recommended format (described in previous section on file naming).
- Save data as CSV and assign a filename using the recommended format.
- Save training materials as PDFs or PPTs and assign a filename using the recommended format.

The consortium will make all ROMOR outputs (project reports, cleaned data, and training materials) openly available for use and reuse. Unless otherwise agreed, all ROMOR outputs shall be released under a **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 license**.

 <p>الرخص نسب المصنف CC BY</p>	<p>Creative Commons Licenses https://creativecommons.org/licenses/</p> <p>Creative Commons Arabic https://creativecommons.org/licenses/?lang=ar</p>
---	---

11 Archiving outputs

A Zenodo Community has been set up to enable project partners to deposit, describe, persistently identify, and provide longer-term access to project outputs.

Please note that only **final** deliverables should be allocated a DOI and deposited with Zenodo following the outlined QA procedures described in previous sections of the Quality Plan.

Please deposit documents as PDF files and data as CSV files. A [step by step guide to uploading to Zenodo](#) has been provided.

Important URLs for partners to make note of include:

- ROMOR Community collection link - links directly to community collection:
<https://zenodo.org/communities/romor/>
- ROMOR upload link - use this link to add items to the community collection:
<https://zenodo.org/deposit/new?c=romor>
- ROMOR curation link – takes you to the private curation URL. All uploads pending curation are found here. Joy Davidson, HATII is the ‘curator’ of the ROMOR community. <https://zenodo.org/communities/romor/curate/>
- ROMOR harvesting URL - links to a OAI-PMH feed, which can be used by other digital repositories to harvest this community. Please make sure to link existing and new IRs set up in partner institutions:
https://zenodo.org/oai2d?verb=ListRecords&set=user-romor&metadataPrefix=oai_dc

12 Specific Quality Assurance Measures by activity type

Some ROMOR activities require specific quality assurance procedures in addition to the generic QA procedures described above. These are listed below with links to guidance and templates.

13 Communications

Communication workflows and standards have been outlined in the project plan. Partners will utilize standard formats and templates for all formal project communications. [Templates](#) for deliverables and presentations have been provided.

14 Project meetings

After each project team meeting, an evaluation will be conducted to ensure that the structure and format of the meetings are meeting requirements. [Standard evaluation forms](#) have been

provided by the Project Coordinator. The evaluation forms will be reviewed at each QA meeting and updated as required.

15 Educational materials

Educational materials will be produced to reflect the findings of the Needs Assessment workpackage (WP1). A template will be provided to record information about intended audience, level of capability and intended learning outcomes for each set of educational materials. The educational materials should be deposited in the ROMOR [Moodle](#) for use by partner HEIs and, where appropriate, for public access and reuse in the ROMOR Zenodo collection.

16 Training events

Prior to each training event, a detailed workshop description will be drafted including clear learning outcomes for participants. Following each training session, feedback will be sought using a [standard online](#) form to ensure consistency across the life of the project. A short summary of event feedback will be produced as a report and will be used to help refine training events that are run at later stages of the project.

17 Dissemination Activities

The outcomes of the dissemination activities as described in the [dissemination plan](#) shall be collected by all project partners and submitted to the project coordinator and WP7 Leader for further processing. The dissemination related information is analysed in order to document project dissemination progress and for further improvement of the dissemination materials and activities. A [template for reporting the dissemination actions](#) is used by IUG and the WP7 Leader to collect and compile the information on the dissemination events and shared among project partners and other interested stockholders.

18 OAIRs

In general, the quality of the OAIRs will be assessed by three key factors:

- Availability of a policy governing the acquisition, management, access and retention of content into the repository
- Meeting targets for number of items added to the repository over the life of the project (based on WP1 findings)
- Meeting the minimum standard agreed for metadata describing repository content

As there are varying degrees of maturity among the PS HEIs in terms of repository infrastructure, all PS HEIs have been requested to complete a Business Model Canvas (BMC) outlining their specific value proposition for their repositories and the resources available. Partner-specific quality assurance measures will be developed in year two of the project based on the outcomes of the BMC activity.

19 Special Mobility Strand

Concrete activities will be planned jointly by the sending and receiving institutions prior to the selection of visiting researchers. Staff and student exchanges will be selected by coordinators based on mutual agreement based on their field of expertise. Where necessary, video conferences between participants, sending and receiving institutions will be carried out prior to the visit to allow proper planning of the activities to be undertaken effectively. The achievements of staff and students participating in the special mobility strand will be assessed by the sending and receiving organisations based on a joint review of the mobility objectives and the participants' completed mobility report. External examiners may be appointed PS partners for training materials developed and delivered in Arabic. The main coordinator of the Mobility Strand program will be the University of Parma however each EU partner institution will be responsible for the local implementation of the mobility visits in line with the [detailed guidance](#) provided. Templates to be used in the different phases of the mobility (preparation, implementation, and follow-up and staff and students evaluation forms) are in the [Annex folder](#) of the guidance folder. Google Forms are used to gather mobility staff and students feedback (e.g. [template](#)).

20 Schedule of QA activities

Output	Date
Annual QA meeting 1 (co-located with kick-off meeting)	January 20, 2017
Draft QA plan prepared and circulated for comment	June 30, 2017
2nd Annual QA meeting	February 2018
Periodic QA report (1)	March 31, 2018
Periodic QA report (2)	September 30, 2018
3rd Annual QA meeting	January/ February 2019
Periodic QA report (3)	March 31, 2019
Periodic QA Report (Final)	October 15, 2019