



Quality Assurance Plan

Mark Sanders, Martina Chýlková

Document Identifier

D1.1 Quality Assurance Plan

Version

1.0

Date Due

M3

Submission date

M4

WorkPackage

1 Management and Coordination

Lead Beneficiary

1 Universiteit Utrecht



Grant Agreement Number 649378

Change log

Version	Date	Amended by	Changes
1.0	15.9.2015	Martina Chýlková	Document finalised for submission

Content

1. Executive summary	4
2. Review Process	4
2.1 Planning.....	4
3. Quality Indicators	5
4. Editorial standards.....	6
5. Annex I – Reviewers Comment Sheet	7

1. Executive summary

This deliverable is the key document to provide continuous control on the project's academic standards and societal relevance. It will ensure that all deliverables of the FIRES-project are of high quality. It describes a framework for the quality assessment of all its deliverables. It will establish the procedures and standards to be employed in the project, and to allocate responsibilities for ensuring that these procedures and standards are followed. This deliverable will also set the editorial standards for the content of project document.

This quality assurance plan is effective throughout the lifetime of the project, but will be open to revision if deemed necessary.

2. Review Process

The quality of all deliverables is firstly and primarily the responsibility of the Work Packages. The WP coordinators will ensure that the quality of the deliverable falls within the quality standards described below. All project activities will also be reviewed by two persons from outside the work packages in order to conduct peer review of all the work done. The ultimate responsibility for the quality of the deliverables resides with the Executive Board.

The Scientific Advisory Board will be asked to ensure that this process is sufficiently transparent.

2.1 Planning

Each deliverable has an official due date, which is stated in the list of deliverables. The planning for the internal review process is as follows:

2 months before the due date:	The Work Package Coordinator appoints in consultation with the Scientific Coordinator two reviewers from within the FIRES consortium who will review the deliverable.
6 weeks before the due date:	The draft deliverable is sent by the Work Package Coordinator to the appointed reviewers.
4 weeks before the due date:	The reviewers send the 'reviewers comment sheet' to the Work Package Coordinator and the authors of the deliverable.
1 week before the due date:	The Work Package Coordinator will send the final draft of the deliverable to the Scientific Coordinator, who will give his final approval. When in doubt of the quality of the deliverable, the Executive board can be discussed. Approved deliverable is sent to the central coordination team (Fires@uu.nl).
Due date	Central coordination team will submit the deliverable to the project officer in Brussels.

The list of all deliverables and their corresponding internal deadlines for reporting can be found on the FIRES internal site.

3. Quality Indicators

In order to facilitate the internal review process we have described a number of Quality Indicators which we will ask the reviewers to assess the deliverable by. These indicators fall into three categories

- 1) Scientific Quality
- 2) Societal Relevance and Impact
- 3) Editorial Standards

Quality Indicator		Reviewer's Conclusion		If insufficient, give suggestions for revision
		Sufficient	Insufficient	
Scientific Quality	Is the research depicted in the deliverable of sound scientific quality?			
	Is it clear what scientific method is used? Does the deliverable contain an explicit and feasible research question and has research been based upon relevant, solid and extensive analysis of sources that are relevant for the subject matter?			
	Does the deliverable meet the expected outcomes as described in the Description of Work?			
	Has the deliverable been clearly structured (introduction, body text and the conclusion)?			

Societal Relevance and Impact (only if appropriate)	Does the deliverable indicate – when appropriate –it’s possible impact for policy and on relevant stakeholders? Does the deliverable clearly state its policy and institutional reform implications in the executive summary?			
Editorial Aspects	Is the language of the deliverable clear, understandable and without grammatical or spelling errors?			
	Does the deliverable meet the set of editorial standards set for the project?			

4. Editorial standards

Official Project Deliverables should use the template created for FIRES deliverables (an example can be found in in Annex II), including cover-page, heading and footers, follow the instructions for references etc.

Furthermore, they should abide to the following guidelines:

- The deliverable should start with an Executive Summary that outlines the policy implications and implications for institutional reform(s) (max. one page)
- The deliverable should end with a one-page conclusion
- The deliverable should – when appropriate – describe its possible impact for policy and on stakeholders.
- The deliverable should include:
 - a table of contents
 - a list of abbreviations used
 - a list of Figures (where appropriate?)
 - a list of Tables (including the ones of the Annexes) (where appropriate?)
 - a list of references
 - all detailed technical and other information in Annexes

All deliverables shall be written in English. If necessary, they will be edited by a native speaker.

5. Annex I – Reviewers Comment Sheet

Deliverable number:	
Deliverable name:	
Version:	
Name reviewer:	

Rating of the Deliverable:		Action:		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Fully accepted	Send to Work Package Coordinator with cc to Central Coordination Office for further distribution		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Minor revisions required	Send back to Work Package Coordinator with instructions for Improvement		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Major revisions required	Send to Executive Board for further action		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Rejected	Send to Executive Board for further action		
Quality Indicator		Reviewer's Conclusion		If insufficient, give suggestions for revision
		Sufficient	Insufficient	
Scientific Quality	Is the research depicted in the deliverable of sound scientific quality?			
	Is it clear what scientific method is used? Does the deliverable contain an explicit and feasible research question and has research been based upon relevant, solid and extensive analysis of sources that are relevant for the subject matter?			
	Does the deliverable meet the expected outcomes as described in the Description of Work?			

	Has the deliverable been clearly structured (introduction, body text and the conclusion)?			
Societal Relevance and Impact (only if appropriate)	Does the deliverable indicate – when appropriate –it’s possible impact for policy and on relevant stakeholders? Does the deliverable clearly state its policy and institutional reform implications in the executive summary?			
Editorial Aspects	Is the language of the deliverable clear, understandable and without grammatical or spelling errors?			
	Does the deliverable meet the set of editorial standards set for the project?			