



# OER Research Hub

# Quality Plan

## Contents

|   |    |
|---|----|
| OER Research Hub.....                       | 1  |
| Quality Plan.....                           | 1  |
| 1.0 Document Control.....                   | 2  |
| 1.1 Version History.....                    | 2  |
| 1.2 Changes Forecast.....                   | 2  |
| 1.3 Distribution.....                       | 2  |
| 1.4 Related Documents and Forms.....        | 3  |
| 2.0 Purpose of Document.....                | 3  |
| 3.0 Quality Objectives.....                 | 4  |
| 4.0 Quality Assurance Checkpoints.....      | 5  |
| 4.1 Project Governance.....                 | 5  |
| 4.2 Research Evaluation.....                | 6  |
| 4.3 Collaborations.....                     | 7  |
| 4.4 Fellowships.....                        | 7  |
| 4.5 Evidence Hub.....                       | 8  |
| 4.6 Dissemination.....                      | 8  |
| 5.0 Quality Roles and Responsibilities..... | 9  |
| 6.0 Project Deliverables.....               | 10 |

**Author: Claire Walker, Project Co-ordinator**  
IET  
[claire.walker@open.ac.uk](mailto:claire.walker@open.ac.uk)  
Ext: 59754

*A quality plan is a defined set of co-ordinated activities that verify delivery of the project's products as fit for purpose. It is provided by the project manager and based on the customers' quality expectations and acceptance criteria. The quality plan should contain the quality expectations, quality criteria, quality methods and quality responsibilities.*



## 1.0 Document Control

|                             |                               |                         |          |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|----------|
| <b>Document Identifier:</b> | OER Research Hub Quality Plan | <b>Date due:</b>        | 31/03/13 |
| <b>Class Deliverable:</b>   | OER Research Hub WP1          | <b>Submission date:</b> |          |
| <b>Project start date:</b>  | 1 September 2012              | <b>State:</b>           | Draft    |
| <b>Project duration:</b>    | 24 months                     |                         |          |

## 1.1 Version History

| Date       | Version | Stage         | Summary of changes                  |
|------------|---------|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| 18/03/2013 | v0.1    | Initial draft | Initial draft by Claire Walker      |
| 10/04/2013 | v0.2    | Revised draft | v0.2 draft revised by Claire Walker |
| 23/04/2013 | V0.3    | Revised Draft | GEC                                 |
| 04/07/2013 | V1.0    | Final version | Approved by Patrick McAndrew        |

## 1.2 Changes Forecast

The Quality Plan will be revised prior to the start of each Project Stage. The next planned update will be with Stage 4 deliverables on 30 September 2013.

## 1.3 Distribution

| Name                    | Organisation/Role                        |
|-------------------------|--|
| <b>Author(s):</b>       |  |
| Claire Walker           | Project Co-ordinator                     |
| <b>Reviewers:</b>       |  |
| Gary Elliott-Cirigottis | Business Improvement & Programme Manager |
| Leigh-Anne Perryman     | Research Associate                       |
| Simone Arthur           | Fellowships & Collaboration Manager      |
| <b>Approvers:</b>       |  |
| Project Board           |  |



Patrick McAndrew

Principal Investigator

## 1.4 Related Documents and Forms

| Item | Description of Document                         |
|------|---|
| 1    | Project Proposal                                |
| 2    | Stakeholder Engagement Strategy                 |
| 3    | Evaluation Framework                            |
| 4    | Work Package Descriptions                       |
| 5    | Individual Collaboration Frameworks (proformas) |
| 6    | Evidence Hub Development Plan                   |
| 7    | Ethics Manual                                   |

## 2.0 Purpose of Document

The purpose of this Quality Plan is to describe the Quality Objectives of the Open Educational Resources Research Hub (OERRH) Project; to describe what deliverables are to be produced by the OERRH Project and how they will be created, reviewed and approved; and also to describe what extra reviews need to be performed to ensure the quality of the Project Management processes.

**The quality of the OERRH Project and its deliverables is the responsibility of everyone in the OERRH Project Team.**

This Quality Plan contains:

- Project Quality Objectives
  - Overall quality objectives of the OERRH Project
- Quality Assurance Checkpoints
  - Checkpoints that are added to the OERRH Project Plan to perform reviews in order to ensure the quality of the management processes. All Quality Records from these reviews will be filed on the OERRH Project Team fileshare.



- 
- Quality Roles and Responsibilities
    - Roles and related OERRH Project Quality responsibilities of all key stakeholders.
  - Project Deliverables
    - All types of OERRH Project Deliverables along with defect detection techniques to be applied. All Quality Records from these reviews will be filed on the OERRH Project Team fileshare. Names of the owners, reviewers and approvers of each deliverable are identified in the OERRH Deliverables Register. Deliverables will not be considered as complete until all rework from the review has been incorporated in a final version of the deliverable.

### 3.0 Quality Objectives

The Quality Objectives of the OERRH Project are:

- To ensure that the OERRH Project strives to meet the IET Research and Scholarship Portfolio objectives of 'developing and extending our international reputation for cutting edge research and scholarship in open learning and pedagogy'
- To satisfy the quality needs of the Hewlett Foundation
- To have no critical or high severity incidents as a result of collaborations research, fellowships, and Evidence Hub (EH) implementations
- To have minimal low severity incidents as a result of collaborations research, fellowships, and EH implementations
- To achieve a smooth management of the project
- To exceed Hewlett Foundation quality expectations as a result of the quality and amount of research
- To deliver the Project which meets agreed Hewlett Foundation requirements
- To deliver the Project in line with agreed cost plans
- To deliver the Project in line with schedule commitments
- To minimise any rework to approved deliverables
- To identify issues and risks as early as possible in the Project lifecycle
- To have no deviations from any IET Research & Scholarship Portfolio standards and processes
- To have no deviations from any Research methods, standards, ethics and processes



The objectives of this OERRH Quality Plan are:

- To define all OERRH Project Quality Processes and Reviews
- To ensure that all OERRH Project deliverables adhere to quality processes
- To define all OERRH Quality Records
- To ensure that the OERRH Project Team are aware of when and how quality activity is to be performed for each deliverable
- To ensure that all IET Research & Scholarship Programme processes are adhered to by the OERRH Project
- To ensure that OERRH Quality responsibilities are understood by each key OERRH Project Stakeholder

The detailed tasks and their schedule to achieve these objectives appear within the OERRH Project Plan.

## 4.0 Quality Assurance Checkpoints

### 4.1 Project Governance

| Checkpoint  | Quality Review Technique  | Participants (owner is <u>underlined</u> )                                      | Quality Record Produced   |
|---|---|---|---|
| End of Project Initiation                                       | Review that all startup activities are completed  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Project Manager (PM)</u></li> </ul> | Meeting minutes and formal record of baseline levels (Research methods, budget, plan) |
| Work Package Leaders (WPL) Meeting<br>(monthly progress review) | Review of WP deliverables and schedules against plans, milestone chart, Risks & Issues Log                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>WPL</u></li> </ul>                  | WP reports<br>WPL meeting minutes   |
| Project Board (PB) Meeting<br>(end of each stage)               | Review of stage deliverables and schedules against proposal, plans, milestone chart, Risks & Issues Log, budget | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>PB members</u></li> </ul>           | PB meeting minutes  |



| Checkpoint   | Quality Review Technique   | Participants (owner is <u>underlined</u> )  | Quality Record Produced               |
|--|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| Immediately prior to release of an external deliverable  | External Deliverable Acceptance Review   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Deliverable Owner</u></li> <li>• Project Co-ordinator (PC)</li> </ul> | Updated Deliverables Register         |
| Hewlett Report (quarterly progress report to funder)     | Review project progress against Project Proposal, project plan and budget  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Principal Investigator (PI)</u></li> <li>• PC</li> </ul>              | Hewlett Report                        |
| Budget monitoring (monthly)                              | Reconciliation against FRODO (commitments against actual spend)  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>PC</u></li> </ul>   | Updated Budget Monitoring Spreadsheet |
| Stage Boundary   | Review of stage plan, milestone chart, Risks & Issues Log for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use by Project Team</li> <li>• Accuracy</li> <li>• Completeness</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>PC</u></li> </ul>   | PM Log completed<br>Updated documents |
| Risk & Issues monitoring (weekly following team meeting) | Review Risks & Issues Log against progress, issues raised, short-term horizon scan   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>PC</u></li> </ul>   | Updated Risk & Issues Log             |

## 4.2 Research Evaluation

| Checkpoint                  | Quality Review Technique   | Participants (owner is <u>underlined</u> )  | Quality Record Produced |
|-----------------------------|--|---|-------------------------|
| Researcher meeting (weekly) | Review research progress against Collaboration Research Frameworks | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Collaboration owners</u></li> <li>• PI</li> <li>• Co-Investigator (Co-I)</li> <li>• Collaborations &amp; Fellowships Manager (CFM)</li> <li>• PC</li> </ul> | Meeting minutes         |



| Checkpoint   | Quality Review Technique                              | Participants (owner is <u>underlined</u> )  | Quality Record Produced |
|--|---|---|-------------------------|
| Hypotheses/data check<br><br>(quarterly check from month 12) | Review each hypothesis against data collected to date | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Co-I</u></li> <li>• Project Team</li> </ul> | Hypotheses Health Check |

### 4.3 Collaborations

| Checkpoint   | Quality Review Technique   | Participants (owner is <u>underlined</u> )  | Quality Record Produced       |
|--|--|---|-------------------------------|
| End of Stage 2   | Review all Individual Collaboration Research Frameworks (proformas) for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use by Project Team</li> <li>• Accuracy</li> <li>• Completeness</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>CFM</u></li> </ul>                        | Updated version of Frameworks |
| Collaboration progress check<br><br>(monthly check from month 9) | Review each collaboration against the proposal, plans, travel forms  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>CFM</u></li> <li>• Researchers</li> </ul> | Collaboration Health Check    |

### 4.4 Fellowships

| Checkpoint  | Quality Review Technique   | Participants (owner is <u>underlined</u> )  | Quality Record Produced      |
|---|--|---|------------------------------|
| Fellowship Programme progress check<br><br>(monthly from month 9) | Review the Fellowship programme against the proposal, plans, budget  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>CFM</u></li> <li>• Researchers</li> <li>• PC</li> </ul> | Fellowship Report            |
| Individual Fellowship progress check<br><br>(mid-Fellowship)      | Meeting with individual Fellow to discuss progress against Fellow's proposal   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Researcher</u></li> <li>• CFM</li> </ul>                | Minutes of meeting           |
| Individual Fellowship output check                                | Output review against Fellowship proposal for <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accuracy</li> <li>• Completeness</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Researcher</u></li> <li>• CFM</li> </ul>                | Individual Fellowship Report |



| Checkpoint | Quality Review Technique  | Participants (owner is <u>underlined</u> ) | Quality Record Produced |
|------------|---|--|-------------------------|
|            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relevance to hypotheses</li> </ul> |  |                         |

## 4.5 Evidence Hub

| Checkpoint               | Quality Review Technique  | Participants (owner is <u>underlined</u> )  | Quality Record Produced |
|--------------------------|---|---|-------------------------|
| End of development stage | Review of system prototype against project proposal, EH development plan, paper prototype | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Developer</u></li> <li>RAssoc.</li> </ul> | Development Report      |
| Post re-launch           | Review of EH against project proposal   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Developer</u></li> <li>RAssoc.</li> </ul> | EH Evaluation Report    |

## 4.6 Dissemination

| Checkpoint     | Quality Review Technique  | Participants (owner is <u>underlined</u> )                   | Quality Record Produced       |
|----------------|---|--|-------------------------------|
| Stage Boundary | Review dissemination activities against objectives and Dissemination Strategy | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>CFM</u></li> </ul> | Dissemination Report          |
| Stage Boundary | Stakeholder engagement strategy review  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>SA</u></li> </ul>  | Stakeholder Engagement Report |





## 5.0 Quality Roles and Responsibilities

| Name                    | Role   | Responsibility and authority   |
|-------------------------|--|--|
| Eileen Scanlon          | Associate Director<br>(Research & Scholarship)     | Sets Overall Programme quality objectives, agrees Programme quality costs, manages escalated quality issues  |
| Patrick McAndrew        | Learning In An Open World<br>(LIOW) Programme Lead | Sets LIOW Projects quality objectives, agrees OERRH Project quality costs, manages escalated quality issues  |
| Gary Elliott-Cirigottis | IET Quality Assurance                              | Sets Unit and Programme Quality standards and objectives<br>Provides advice & guidance on OU Quality Practices   |
| Will Woods              | IT Operations Manager                              | Quality of skill level of Software Development (SD) resource assigned to OERRH Project<br>Sets IET SD standards and quality objectives                               |
| Patrick McAndrew        | OERRH Principal Investigator                       | Sets OERRH Project quality objectives, agrees all WP quality costs, manages escalated quality issues   |
| Martin Weller           | OERRH Co-Investigator                              | Sets OERRH Project Research quality objectives, agrees WP2&3 quality costs, manages escalated quality issues   |
| Patrina Law             | OERRH Programme Manager                            | Sets quality objectives for all collaborations, fellowships and dissemination for OERRH project  |
| Simone Arthur           | OERRH Collaborations & Fellowships Manager         | Overview and monitoring of quality of all collaborations, fellowships and dissemination for OERRH project  |
| Rob Farrow              | OERRH Research Associate                           | Quality of EH, and collaborative research and data from allocated collaborations and fellowships   |
| Leigh-Anne Perryman     | OERRH Research Associate                           | Quality of project & research evaluation, collaborative research and data from allocated collaborations and fellowships  |
| Beck Pitt               | OERRH Research Assistant                           | Quality of collaborative research and data from allocated collaborations and fellowships   |
| Bea de los Arcos        | OERRH Research Assistant                           | Quality of collaborative research and data from allocated collaborations and fellowships   |
| Gary Elliott-Cirigottis | OERRH Project Manager                              | Sets quality objectives of OERRH project management aspects  |
| Claire Walker           | OERRH Project Co-ordinator                         | Overview and monitoring of quality of OERRH project management aspects   |
| TBC                     | OERRH Developer                                    | Quality of skill level of Test resource assigned to OERRH Project<br>Sets Test standards and quality objectives<br>Handles all OERRH Test resource management issues |



|                                   |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| <i>IET Project Support Office</i> | <i>Provides support for checking quality of OERRH project deliverables as required</i> |
| OERRH Work Package Leaders Group  | Monitors quality of OERRH project deliverables   |
| OERRH Project Board               | Monitors quality of OERRH project  |
| <i>OERRH Advisory Board</i>       | <i>Provides expert advice to Project Board &amp; PI on quality issues as requested</i> |

## 6.0 Project Deliverables

All external deliverables will be released on open license (CC-BY) via the OERRH Project and will follow standard IET Programme processes.

| Deliverable Type |  | Timing of Quality Activity                                 | Quality Review Technique | Participants   | Quality Record  | Relevant Standards                             |
|------------------|--|--|--------------------------|--|-----------------|--|
| --               | Project Proposal                               | Prior to Project Start-up, before obtaining plan approvals | Reviews                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bid submission team</li> </ul>          | E-mail feedback | OU standards                                   |
| D1.1             | Project Handbook<br><i>(external)</i>          | Project Initiation Stage, after obtaining plan approvals   | Reviews                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PM</li> <li>Project Team</li> </ul>     | E-mail feedback | OU-PM standards (based on PRINCE2 methodology) |
| D1.2.1 - 1.2.9   | Hewlett Quarterly Reports<br><i>(external)</i> | Every 3 months   | Reviews                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PI</li> <li>PM</li> </ul>               | E-mail feedback | Hewlett reporting standards                    |
| D1.3.1 – 1.3.4   | Financial Information Reports                  | Every 6 months   | Reviews                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PI</li> <li>PM</li> </ul>               | E-mail feedback | OU standards<br>Hewlett reporting standards    |
| D1.4             | Ethics Manual<br><i>(external)</i>             | Month 6, prior to research visits                          | Reviews                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RAssoc.</li> <li>Researchers</li> </ul> | E-mail feedback | BERA standards<br>OU standards                 |
| D1.5.1 – 1.5.2   | Hewlett Annual Report<br><i>(external)</i>     | Every 12 months  | Reviews                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PI</li> <li>PM</li> </ul>               | E-mail feedback | Hewlett reporting standards                    |



| Deliverable Type |   | Timing of Quality Activity                               | Quality Review Technique | Participants   | Quality Record       | Relevant Standards |
|------------------|---|--|--------------------------|--|----------------------|--------------------|
| D2.1             | Research Framework<br><i>(external)</i>                                       | Month 6, prior to research visits                        | Reviews                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Co-I</li> <li>• Researchers</li> </ul>                          | E-mail feedback      | OU standards       |
| D2.2.8 – 2.2.8   | Individual Collaboration Research Frameworks – proformas<br><i>(external)</i> | Month 6, prior to research visits                        | Reviews                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Co-I</li> <li>• CFM</li> <li>• Researchers</li> </ul>           | E-mail feedback      | OU standards       |
| D2.3.1 – 2.3.8   | Research Findings Reports<br><i>(external)</i>                                | Quarterly from month 9, following initial data gathering | Reviews                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Co-I</li> <li>• PI</li> <li>• Researchers</li> </ul>            | E-mail feedback      | OU standards       |
| D3.1             | Linked Fellowship Identification  | Month 9, following call for Fellows                      | Panel discussion         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PI</li> <li>• Co-I</li> <li>• RAssoc.</li> <li>• CFM</li> </ul> | Minutes from meeting | OU standards       |
| D3.2             | Fellowship Development Programme  | Month 9, following call for Fellows                      | Panel discussion         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PI</li> <li>• Co-I</li> <li>• RAssoc.</li> <li>• CFM</li> </ul> | Minutes from meeting | OU standards       |
|                  |   | Months 12 & 24, following Fellowship completion          | Reviews                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CFM</li> </ul>  | Report               | OU standards       |
| D3.3.1 – 3.3.6   | Fellowship Output Report<br><i>(external)</i>                                 | Quarterly from month 9                                   | Reviews                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CFM</li> </ul>  | Email feedback       | OU standards       |
| D4.1             | Evidence Hub (EH) Development Plan<br><i>(external)</i>                       | Month 5, following review of OLnet EH                    | Reviews                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RAssoc.</li> </ul>  | Email feedback       | OU standards       |



|      |   |          |   |   |                                   |   |
|------|---|----------|---|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| D4.2 | EH Developmental Testing                  | Month 8  | Software testing                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developer</li> <li>• RAssoc.</li> </ul>  | Report                            | OU standards                            |
| D4.3 | EH Paper Prototyping<br><i>(external)</i> | Month 9  | Software testing                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developer</li> <li>• RAssoc.</li> </ul>  | Report                            | OU standards                            |
| D4.4 | EH System Prototype<br><i>(external)</i>  | Month 12 | Software testing & automated validation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developer</li> <li>• RAssoc.</li> </ul>  | Report                            | OU standards (IET software QA Guidance) |
|      |   | Month 12 | Code reviews                            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developer</li> <li>• RAssoc.</li> </ul>  | Walk-through, log of items raised | OU standards (IET software QA Guidance) |
|      |   | Month 12 | Security reviews                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developer</li> <li>• RAssoc.</li> </ul>  | Walk-through, log of items raised | OU standards (IET software QA Guidance) |
|      |   | Month 12 | Branding reviews                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developer</li> <li>• RAssoc.</li> </ul>  | Walk-through, log of items raised | OU standards (IET software QA Guidance) |
|      |   | Month 12 | Developer documentation reviews         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developer</li> <li>• RAssoc.</li> </ul>  | Walk-through                      | OU standards (IET software QA Guidance) |
|      |   | Month 12 | Support reviews                         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developer</li> <li>• RAssoc.</li> </ul>  | Walk-through, log of items raised | OU standards (IET software QA Guidance) |
| D4.5 | EH User/ Accessibility Testing            | Month 13 | User testing                            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developer</li> <li>• RAssoc.</li> <li>• LTD team</li> <li>• Nominated users</li> </ul> | Log of items raised               | OU standards                            |
|      |   | Month 13 | Accessibility testing                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developer</li> <li>• RAssoc.</li> </ul>  | Log of items raised               | OU standards                            |



|                |  |   |                  |   |                                     |                             |
|----------------|--|---|------------------|---|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
|                |  |   |                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LTD team</li> <li>Nominated users</li> </ul> |                                     |                             |
| D4.6           | EH Re-Launch<br><i>(external)</i>                                    | Month 15, following amendments after testing & re-testing | Reviews          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developer</li> <li>RAssoc.</li> </ul>        | Report, log of items raised         | OU standards                |
| D5.1           | Evaluation Framework<br><i>(external)</i>                            | Month 6, prior to research visits                         | Reviews          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RAssoc.</li> </ul>                           | Email feedback                      | OU standards                |
| D5.2.1 – 5.2.6 | Collaboration Evaluation Reports<br><i>(external)</i>                | Quarterly from month 9                                    | Reviews          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RAssoc.</li> </ul>                           | Email feedback                      | OU standards                |
| D6.1.1 – 6.1.4 | Dissemination & Stakeholder Engagement Strategy<br><i>(external)</i> | Month 6   | Reviews          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CFM</li> </ul>                               | Email feedback                      | OU standards                |
|                |  | Month 12, 18, 24  | Reviews          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CFM</li> </ul>                               | Email feedback                      | OU standards                |
| D6.2           | Project Website, Blog, dissemination forum<br><i>(external)</i>      | Month 4   | Software testing | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PM</li> </ul>                                | Email feedback, log of items raised | OU standards                |
| D6.3           | Dissemination Evaluation Framework<br><i>(external)</i>              | Month 9   | Reviews          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CFM</li> </ul>                               | Email feedback                      | OU standards                |
| D6.4.1 – 6.4.2 | Interim Analysis Reports<br><i>(external)</i>                        | Annually, month 12 & 24                                   | Reviews          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CFM</li> </ul>                               | Email feedback                      | Hewlett reporting standards |

