Evaluation Criteria Identification

This form is for Quality Control and Monitor member (QCMM) to identify criteria for task evaluation.

**QCMM Name: Supapan Chaiprapat**

**WP No.: WP4**

**Task No.: 4.3**

1. **Objective(s) and Deliverable(s)**

*The main objective(s) of this task:*

1. To select an auditor or a team of auditors qualified to conduct the evaluation process of the project results, through an auditor selection process approved by QCMB.

2. To monitor the auditing process and ensure that it proceeds as according to the project requirements.

3. To ensure that reports as outputs of the auditing process comply with the EU regulations and the project requirements.

*The deliverable(s) of this task:*

1. An auditor or a team of auditors who possess qualifications specified in the criteria of the auditor selection process (\*see Annex 1).
2. Two external QCM reports.
3. **Process Monitoring & Assessment**

*In your opinion, what should we look at in order to say that the task is done properly and met the objective?*

The task is considered to be done successfully if:

1. The auditor is selected according to the selection criteria, mentioned in III.1:
2. The external QCM reports meet the approval of QCMB and PEC, within the time frame according to the Working Plan

*Can we measure them and how do we measure them? If you can’t measure it, please remove and find another one.*

1. The auditor(s) will be selected according to the selection process procedure, described in the annex 1 of this document.
2. The external QCM reports will be evaluated according to QF\_DES – Deliverable Evaluation by QCMB and PEC:
3. **Deliverable Assessment**

*In your opinion, what should be the specifications of the deliverable(s)?*

1. The auditor must be is selected according to the following selection criteria:

a) Education: a bachelor’s degree (or equivalent), major in engineering is preferred, from an accredited university as a minimum

b) Auditing professional experience: the auditor/auditors shall have experiences in the field of external project quality control and monitoring. Will be a plus, if the auditor/auditors are knowledgeable about educational quality management systems; ESG, EHEA or other related EU quality guidelines is preferred.

d) Communication and interpersonal skills: Good communication and interpersonal skills are required.

e) The auditor/auditors must not be employed in any matter that would create a conflict of interest.

1. The reports, will include, according to the project timeline activities, the evaluation results on the followings:

a) Teaching/learning materials

b) Implementation of the activities, outputs and outcomes, the planned workload

c) Assessment of the sustainability of the project results (curriculum, syllabuses, teaching materials, etc.)

d) Intermediate and final verification and validation of the project teaching/learning materials and results in accordance with the QCMP.

The reports (2 a) – 2 c)) must be submitted at M18, and (2 b) – 2 d)) at M36.

The quality of the reports can be assessed in different aspects as follows.

1. Format: the deliverable can be assessed with respect to the rules of Document Control in this project.
2. Content: the deliverable must be comprehensive enough to ensure an adequate coverage of the topics mentioned above
3. Time: the reports must be submitted by the timeline mentioned above

*Please identify similar deliverable(s) elsewhere.*

Not applicable. These outcomes are developed specifically for this project only.

*Please rate those deliverables according to your specifications.*

Not applicable.

*What are the criteria or scales that you have used to rate those deliverables?*

See Annex 1.

*According to your criteria, please set the target specifications for our deliverables to claim that the objective is met?*

1. For the auditor(s) selection, the total score is 11 and to meet the objective the score should not be less than 4.
2. The report must be approved by QCMB and PEC.

***ANNEX 1***

**Auditor selection Questionnaire**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Education**
 |
| **Rating (Score)** | **Education**  |
| (0) | Not shown/Unable to identify |
| Compulsory (1) | Bachelor degree in engineering (or related field) from an accredited institution in the country of origin |
| Preferable (2) | Master degree or higher in engineering (or related field) from an accredited institution in the country of origin |
| 1. **Work Experiences**
 |
| **Rating (Score)** | **Experience** |
| (0) | Not shown/Unable to identify |
| Acceptable (1) | Experiences in working within Erasmus projects as expert |
| Preferable (2) | Experiences in working within Erasmus projects as member of management team/ quality team or project coordinator |
| Preferable (3) | Experiences in working within similar Erasmus projects as project coordinator |
| 1. **Auditing Experiences**
 |
| **Rating (Score)** | **Auditing Experience** |
| (0) | Not shown/Unable to identify |
| Compulsory (1) | Experiences in any type of project for external quality control and monitoring. |
| Acceptable (2) | Experiences in education projects for external quality control and monitoring. |
| Preferable (3) | Experiences in European education projects for external quality control and monitoring. |
| 1. **Communication and Interpersonal Skills**
 |
| **Rating (Score)** | **Communication and Interpersonal Skill Level** |
| (0) | Not shown/Unable to identify |
| Compulsory (1) | Communication via planned use of interpreters |
| Acceptable (2) | Communication in good written and spoken English |
| Preferable (3) | Communication in excellent written and spoken English |

\* The auditor selection process

The process can be broken down into the following steps.

1. Establishing the auditor selection panel: The auditor selection process will be carried out by the auditor selection panel who in this project can be QCMB. The panel is responsible for the following tasks.
2. Setting up the criteria to select the auditors: The above criteria are tentatively imposed and needs revision.
3. Ranking the criteria: The criteria can be divided into factual criteria (educational background, experience, regulatory knowledge, for example) and soft-skill criteria (recognition and communication and interpersonal skill). The panel will have to assess which criteria are “of utmost importance”, “importance”, “nice to have”, and “not applicable”, and impose numeric scores accordingly.
4. Listing auditors who have qualifications that meet the criteria in 2)
5. Rating the auditors with respect to the rubric in 3)
6. Inviting the auditors with the highest score: if they are not available, the auditors with the next highest score will be considered.