
Deliverable 1.3 Quality Assurance Plan

Authors

Frode Paulsen

Key words

Quality assurance

Description

Outlines indicators for measuring planned outcomes, assess timely implementation, measures to mitigate risks, reporting procedures, and ensures compliance with quality standards.

The purpose of this Quality Assurance Plan is to create a framework for the project to meet the quality standards and requirements specified in the Erasmus+ programme guidelines and reach the project's objectives, thus catering for maximum impact from the project.



**Co-funded by
the European Union**

Project Consortium

	Partner	Short	Country
1	NORGES IDRETTSHOGSKOLE	NIH	Norway
2	UNIVERSITE DU LUXEMBOURG	Uni.Lu	Luxembourg
3	FREDERICK UNIVERSITY	FredU	Cyprus
4	UNIVERSITATEA DIN CRAIOVA	UCV	Romania
5	LIETUVOS SPORTO UNIVERSITETAS	LSU	Lithuania
6	INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF HEALTH, EXERCISE & SPORT SA	LUNEX	Luxembourg
7	Ungt Entreprenørskap Norge	JA Norway	Norway
8	JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT - YOUNG ENTERPRISES CYPRUS	JA Cypus	Cyprus
9	Stiftelsen Beitostølen Helsesportsenter	BHSS	Norway
10	ASOCIATIA LANGDON DOWN OLTENIA-CENTTRUL EDUCATIONAL TEODORIA	Aldo-CET	Romania
11	FIT4CURE	FIT4Cure	Denmark
12	WAVY MEET SARL	Wavy MEET	Luxembourg
13	Melathron Agoniston tis EOKA	Melathron	Cyprus



**Co-funded by
the European Union**

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Disclaimer

This document may contain material, which is the copyright of certain SPIEP consortium parties, and may not be reproduced or copied without permission. All SPIEP consortium parties have agreed to full publication of this document. The commercial use of any information contained in this document may require a license from the proprietor of that information.

Neither the SPIEP consortium, nor a certain party of the SPIEP consortium warrant that the information contained in this document is capable of use, nor that use of the information is free from risk and does not accept any liability for loss or damage suffered using this information.



**Co-funded by
the European Union**

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Document History

Version	Date	Contributor(s)	Description
1.0	27/03/ 2025	Frode Paulsen	First draft
1.1	31/03/ 2025	Thorben Hülsdünker	Review & edits
1.2	31/03/ 2025	Frode Paulsen	Review & edits
1.3	04.02.2026	Karoline Oftedal	Format edits



**Co-funded by
the European Union**

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Definitions, Acronyms and Abbreviations

GDPR	General Data Protection Regulation
HEI	Higher Education Institution
I+E	Innovation and Entrepreneurship
SSPA	Sport Science and Physical Activity
WP	Work Package
WPL	Work Package Leader
COO	Coordinator
PM	Project Manager
PPL	Partner Project Lead
E-URAB	End-User Relevance Advisory Board
QAP	Quality Assurance Plan
PQAT	Project Quality Assurance Team



**Co-funded by
the European Union**

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Content

<i>Introduction</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>2 Quality assurance objectives</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>3 Project quality assurance team</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>4 Quality assurance criteria, standards and indicators</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>5 Quality assurance process.....</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>Project risk management</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>Evaluation and monitoring.....</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>Household rules to ensure good team spirit inducive to quality assurance.....</i>	<i>13</i>



**Co-funded by
the European Union**

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Introduction

In the quality assurance approach SPIEP leans toward the definitions in ISO 8420 and ISO 9402. ISO 8402 defines quality as “The totality of features and characteristics of a product or service that bear on its ability to satisfy stated or implied needs,” while ISO 9402 elaborates further that “In some reference sources, quality is referred to as ‘fitness for use’ or ‘fitness for purpose’ or ‘customer satisfaction’ or ‘conformance to the requirements.’”

In line with the Agile Project Management adopted across all stages and levels of SPIEP to efficiently achieve the project objectives and produce high-quality outcomes, and while inspired by the 3P Quality Model (People, Process, Product), the SPIEP Quality Assurance Plan (QAP) encompasses:

- All phases of the project, including planning, execution, monitoring, closing and sustainability of the project results (scope)
- The quality assurance objectives
- The Quality Assurance Team’s composition, responsibilities and activities
- The indicators, standards, and criteria which the Quality Assurance Team will use to assess the project activities and outcomes quality
- The quality assurance process
- The project risk assessment and mitigation procedures
- The project evaluation and monitoring procedures
- Household rules to secure smooth management of quality assessments, risks, and evaluation

2 Quality assurance objectives

The overall objective with this QAP is to create a framework for the project to meet the quality standards and requirements specified in the Erasmus+ programme guidelines and reach the project’s objectives, thus catering for maximum impact from the project. The specific quality objectives are to:

- Deliver high-quality outputs that meet Erasmus+ programme standards.
- Ensure compliance with relevant national and EU regulations and guidelines.
- Foster continuous improvement throughout the project lifecycle.
- Secure long-term impact from the project through delivering high quality outcomes and results
- Obtain and keep an excellent team spirit throughout the project



**Co-funded by
the European Union**

3 Project quality assurance team

To ensure high quality in project output and results, each HEI partner will assign an expert to the Project Quality Assurance Team (PQAT), which will be led by the PM. The PQAT will meet digitally in fixed intervals, relative to delivery deadlines for quality planning, quality assurance and control, evaluation and monitoring regarding the project progress and deliverables, as well as discussions on quality metrics, tools, and techniques. The PQAT will perform quality control by monitoring and consolidating quality assurance results, assessing compliance and performance, recommending necessary changes, and planning or refining quality assurance activities.

4 Quality assurance criteria, standards and indicators

Quality assurance criteria, standards, and indicators are essential components of a quality plan because they provide a structured framework for ensuring that project deliverables meet predetermined expectations and requirements. The criteria, standards, and indicators for assessing the quality of the SPIEP deliverables and activities are:

Core quality standards are:

- **Erasmus+ Programme Guidelines:** Adherence to the guidelines provided by the European Commission.
- **Regulatory Requirements:** Compliance with EU regulations and national laws.
- **Project-Specific Standards:** Defined in the project description, objectives, the grant agreement and requirements documentation.

The quality criteria for the deliverables are:

- That they are in line with the project description
- That the responsible partner reports the deliverable details in the standard template provided by the COO (e.g., scope of work, target audience),
- That they are written in clear, coherent and valid English
- Their accuracy, completeness, relevance, and appropriate depth

The quality criteria for communication and dissemination activities are:

- Clear definition of communication goals supporting raising awareness of the project and engaging stakeholders
- Identify key target groups and tailor the key messages accordingly by means of content and communication channel
- All communication adheres to the visual identity developed for the project as well as acknowledgement of EU funding



**Co-funded by
the European Union**

- Respect of ethical principles including respect for privacy and data protection

The quality criteria for the main project outcomes, are:

- That they meet the needs our students
- That the outcomes provide our students skills which vulnerable groups represented by the SPIEP End-User Relevance Advisory Board (E-URAB) find adequate
- That the project outcomes provide a solid basis for the sustainability and impact of SPIEP, in that peer HEIs are willing and able to use them

5 Quality assurance process

The steps in the quality assurance process:

- 1) PM secures that the PPLs are aware of their contractual responsibilities for producing outcomes, deliverables, hosting meetings etc.
- 2) PPLs assign the responsibility for the partner's production of outcomes, deliverables etc. internally in the partner
- 3) PPL informs PM about the internal delegation of responsibility
- 4) PM sets and communicates deadlines for timely submission of outcomes, deliverables etc., catering for sufficient time for quality assessment
- 5) PQAT assesses the outcomes and deliverable against the quality standards and criteria defined in the quality assurance plan,
- 6) The COO submits to EACEA when required and publishes the deliverables on public website, after amendments, if any.

Project risk management

The need for a strict focus on risk management in SPIEP is illustrated by the complexity in the composition of the consortium, composed of 13 partners from 6 countries, including HEIs, representatives from the public sector, NGOs and a private company. The success of SPIEP depends on the work of the project partners, the participation and engagement of students, and the extent to which the partnership accomplishes to incorporate the results into the HEIs programmed activity. Also, it is dependent on the project accomplishing to involve education professionals and integrate input from the various non-HEI partners. Finally, the implementation of the project must meet the requirements of Erasmus+ and EU.

To reduce the risks for failure in the implementation of the project the consortium identified the risks the critical risks, uncertainties or difficulties related to the implementation of the project, and the measures/strategy for addressing them, described in the table below, when initiating



**Co-funded by
the European Union**

the project. For each risk the impact and the likelihood that the risk will materialise (high, medium, low) has been indicated, after considering the mitigating measures.

Critical risks and risk management strategy			
Risk No	Description	WP	Proposed risk-mitigation measures
1	Key personnel (PM, PPL, WPL) on sick leave	All WPs	Medium impact / Low likelihood: It is impossible to guarantee that key personnel will not get sick. With regular management committee meetings, all partners will have the chance to rapidly change key personnel if needed.
2	Lack of interest and participation by key target groups	2-5	High impact / low likelihood: SSPA-students are the key target group in the project and their lack of interest and participation could endanger the project. However, this risk is unlikely considering that it is a demand-driven project and the SSPA students have expressed a need for digitalisation and I/E-skills in their education. To ensure that we will be able to recruit enough students, all modules will be broadly advertised.
3	Lack of engagement by consortium partners	All WPs	High impact / Low likelihood: Each partner has a clear and defined role, and also a unique interest and motivation to participate in the project.
4	Challenges with IPR	3 and 4	Low-medium impact / medium likelihood: This will be addressed at the beginning of the project, and the WP leaders must provide clear rules and guidelines regarding IPR. Also, WP leaders and partner leaders responsible for implementing the modules in the HEIs partners will ensure that the problems and cases provided from collaborating partners from different sectors are not directly linked to the partners core business or activities, but rather encompasses a wider societal issue, thusly mitigating the risk for inconveniences regarding IPR.



**Co-funded by
the European Union**

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

5	Challenges with adding extracurricular courses within study programs	2-5	Medium impact / medium likelihood: Extracurricular courses must often be approved through an internal process at each HEI, which can be time consuming. Each HEI will start the internal approval process immediately in M1.
6	Failing to engage external collaborating partners that will provide real-life challenges	2-4	Medium impact / low likelihood: The consortium consists of partners with a wide network of external partners which will be used extensively.
7	Failing to reach out to key umbrella associations that will disseminate progress and results to policymakers, SSPA candidates and individuals in vulnerable groups	5	Medium impact / low likelihood: SPIEP has identified some the key umbrella associations (Exercise is Medicine, AIESEP and EUPEA) and will start the involvement of the associations at an early stage to secure progress.

Furthermore, the risk of a serious problem with one of the partners not performing in accordance with the Grant Agreement and contributing towards the project objectives has been considered when designing the consortium, thus the planned activities may be carried out by more than one partner, securing the completion of the project.

Grounded on a continuous risk analysis methodology a systematic **risk management and contingency plan**, covering potential challenges and problems the project might face during the implementation - in financial, administrative, and technical dimensions - has been set up with the following process steps to identify, analyze and respond to project risks during its implementation:

1. **Risk management planning:** strategy on how to approach and plan for the risk management of project activities.
2. **Risk identification:** determining which risks might affect the project and documenting their characteristics.
3. **Qualitative risk analysis:** measuring the probability and consequences of risks and estimating their implications for reaching the project objectives.
4. **Risk response planning:** developing procedures and techniques to enhance opportunities and reduce threats to the project objectives.
5. **Risk monitoring and control:** monitoring residual risk, identifying new risks, executing risk reduction plans, and evaluating their effectiveness throughout the project life.



**Co-funded by
the European Union**

Following these steps, monitoring results and additional factors like the probability of identified risks happening and the importance of their potential impact, necessary corrective actions will be taken for swift risk mitigation. As a result, the partnership will have the ability to anticipate and address issues through respective contingency actions and measures should they occur.

Evaluation and monitoring

In line with the agile project management adopted by SPIEP, the PM and the PPLs will monitor the project activities closely. This close monitoring will enable execution of continuous improvement according to the principle of Analysis-Plan-Do-Check-re-Act, core to agile project management.

As part of the creation of the main outputs from SPIEP, the **educational modules** to be developed in WPs 2-4 the following assessments are planned:

- Pre- and post-course assessments measuring students' proficiency in basic digital skills such as computer literacy, internet navigation, and software usage (WP2)
- Evaluation of students' ability to use specialized software, tools, and technologies relevant to sports technology, such as data analysis software, motion tracking devices, or virtual reality platforms (WP2).
- Feedback from collaborating partners on the problem-solving skills demonstrated by graduates through the program (WP3)
- Pre- and post-course surveys or assessments measuring students' understanding of social innovation concepts, principles, and their application in addressing physical inactivity among vulnerable populations (WP4)

The evaluation of the educational modules will use surveys, interviews, and logs to collect feedback from participants and industry partners, aiming to understand the program's relevance and effectiveness. Insights gained will inform a report and a white paper (D3.4), offering recommendations for enhancements and broader dissemination of findings to ensure the program's ongoing improvement and sustainability.

Evaluation measures are planned for the support of the implementation of the project, for measuring the extent to which the objectives are met and to secure the sustainability the project results. The evaluation measures will contribute to the identification of achievements, areas for improvement, encourage decisions to be taken, including changes to the project methodology and the long-term objectives (post-project).

A significant part of the SPIEP **evaluation approach** will be the satisfaction surveys from the course participants at the HEI partners, which will be performed using methodology proprietary to each HEI, i.e., their already established student satisfaction methodologies, facilitating benchmarking toward the rest of HEIs' study portfolio. By month 18 these institutional



**Co-funded by
the European Union**

evaluation results from the HEIs will be collected, evaluated and analysed for SPIEP as a whole and presented at the final conference.

Additionally, the project will leverage feedback from partners, in particular the non-HEI partners comprising the SPIEP E-URAB, which will ensure end-user relevance and appropriateness of the project content, leveraging their direct experience with target groups for course relevancy and resilience. This feedback will contribute to the final reports.

Household rules to ensure good team spirit inducive to quality assurance

Household rules to secure smooth management of quality assessments, risks, and evaluation:

- Each partner provides concrete progress reports related to work packages and task to keep everyone informed
- MS teams will be used for open communication to ensure smooth interaction on communication and shared working on documents
- Each partner is encouraged to participate in open discussion and provide solution-oriented feedback for effective and constructive feedback
- Each partner adheres to the clear decision-making process and responsibilities as assigned in the SPIEP proposal and administrative management document (DEL 1.2)
- Each partner follows the agreed quality assurance guidelines to meet the quality standards and EU-regulations
- Partners support peer-review of deliverables before submission by providing constructive feedback
- Partners share knowledge best practice and support other project partners facing challenges
- Respect the opinion and voice of all partners in the consortium during meetings and decision-making



**Co-funded by
the European Union**