

Quality Assurance Plan

WOSCAP

Whole of Society for
Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding

Deliverable 1.2

(Version 1; 30 July 2015)



Universiteit Utrecht

Prof. dr. ir. Georg Frerks & Toon Dirx MA

Horizon 2020 | BES-12-2014/2015



Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----------|
| 1. Introduction | 3 |
| 2. Quality Control at the Level of Deliverables | 3 |
| 3. List of Deliverables | 3 |
| 4. Checklist Quality Assurance | 4 |
| 5. Communication | 6 |

1. Introduction

Here to its role as Scientific Coordinator, Utrecht University is responsible for quality assurance of the WOSCAP project under its task as Quality Assurance Manager (QAM). Although quality assurance is a joint responsibility of the WP leaders and all involved partners, it is coordinated, supervised and – with regard to certain control tasks – executed by UU. It has the authority for implementing and verifying compliance with the quality assurance and control policies and procedures related to the project.

The Quality Assurance Plan is a document that is submitted to the EU as project **deliverable 1.2** in July 2015. This document contains the list of deliverables that will be reviewed by UU and a draft checklist with criteria for the assessment of the quality of these deliverables. These criteria have been discussed and approved by WOSCAP partners during the Inception Workshop on 22 and 23 June 2015.

2. Quality Control at the Level of Deliverables

The quality control process is reactive and covers the quality control of project deliverables, responding to needs per deliverable or target group. The outcomes of the quality control by UU will be laid down in product quality control reports that – apart from quality control per se – have as their main function to serve as a feedback mechanism to partners to suggest and/or require improvements and adjustments in the products submitted. Apart from its reactive quality assurance task, UU may, on the request of partners or if warranted by the course of the project, play a more proactive quality assurance role by supporting and/or advising partners on their research activities or helping them to deal with specific problems.

3. List of Deliverables

UU will review scoping studies, the theoretical framework paper, the methodology workshops reports, desk review case studies, the case studies, scholarly articles, policy recommendations, working papers and research reports. A detailed list with all deliverables that UU will review under its task as QAM is provided in **table 1**. Please note that the ‘due date’ included in the table is the month in which the deliverable has to be submitted to the EU. Thus, the deliverable needs to be sent to UU before that deadline. These deadlines will be specified in the WP plans, and may be subject to change, if adjustments in the overall planning are decided upon and concurred by the EU.

Table 1 – Deliverables that will be reviewed by the UU per WP

| Deliverable number | Deliverable title | WP number | Lead beneficiary | Type | Due date |
|--------------------|--|-----------|------------------|--------|----------|
| D2.1 | Scoping study Local Ownership | WP2 | LSE | Report | Nov '15 |
| D2.2 | Scoping study Gender | WP2 | ECP | Report | Nov '15 |
| D2.3 | Scoping study Multistakeholder Coherence | WP2 | IRENE | Report | Nov '15 |

| | | | | | |
|-------|--|-----|-------|--------|---------|
| D2.4 | Scoping study ICTs | WP2 | LSE | Report | Nov '15 |
| D2.5 | Scoping study Multi-track Diplo. | WP2 | BF | Report | Nov '15 |
| D2.6 | Scoping study SSR & Civ-mil | WP2 | GPPAC | Report | Nov '15 |
| D2.7 | Scoping study Governance | WP2 | BF | Report | Nov '15 |
| D2.8 | EU Policy briefing | WP2 | IRENE | Report | Nov '15 |
| D2.9 | Theoretical framework paper | WP2 | LSE | Report | Jan '16 |
| D2.10 | Methodology workshops | WP2 | LSE | Other | Jan '16 |
| D3.1 | Desk review case studies | WP3 | UU | Report | Oct '16 |
| D3.2 | Case study report Georgia | WP3 | TSU | Report | Oct '16 |
| D3.3 | Case study report Mali | WP3 | USJPB | Report | Oct '16 |
| D3.4 | Case study report Ukraine | WP3 | IWP | Report | Oct '16 |
| D3.5 | Case study report Yemen | WP3 | PDF | Report | Oct '16 |
| D3.6 | Synoptic report case studies | WP3 | UU | Report | Nov '16 |
| D4.6 | Review of EU policy institutional level | WP4 | IRENE | Report | Nov '16 |
| D4.7 | Best practices report: Local ownership | WP4 | LSE | Report | Nov '16 |
| D4.8 | Best practices report: Multi-stakeholder coherence | WP4 | IRENE | Report | Nov '16 |
| D4.9 | Best practices report: Gender | WP4 | ECP | Report | Nov '16 |
| D4.10 | Best practices report: ICTs | WP4 | LSE | Report | Nov '16 |
| D4.11 | Best practices report: Civ-mil synergies | WP4 | GPPAC | Report | Nov '16 |
| D4.13 | Scholarly article: Multi-track Diplomacy | WP4 | BF | Report | Mar '17 |
| D4.14 | Scholarly article: SSR & civ-mil | WP4 | GPPAC | Report | Mar '17 |
| D4.15 | Scholarly article: Governance Reform | WP4 | BF | Report | Mar '17 |
| D4.16 | Research report | WP4 | UU | Report | Apr '17 |
| D5.5 | Policy Recommendations Paper & engagement strategy | WP5 | IRENE | Report | Jul '17 |
| D6.4 | WOSCAP Working paper 1 | WP6 | GPPAC | Report | Mar '16 |
| D6.5 | WOSCAP Working paper 2-3 | WP6 | GPPAC | Report | Sep '16 |
| D6.6 | WOSCAP Working paper 4-5 | WP6 | GPPAC | Report | Jan '17 |

4. Checklist Quality Assurance

UU suggests to assess the quality of the above-mentioned deliverables by using the criteria as provided in **table 2**. These criteria were discussed and approved by WOSCAP partners during the Inception Workshop on 22 and 23 June 2015. This checklist can be updated if necessary.

Table 2 – Quality Assurance Checklist

| Quality Criteria | Yes or No / Comments |
|------------------|----------------------|
|------------------|----------------------|

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>1. Clarity of Problem Statement / Research Goals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the problem statement, research goal and rationale of the study clear? • Does the author clearly explain how (s)he intends to answer the problem statement? • Has the author shown sufficient familiarity with the current state of academic knowledge or the policy context in which the problem is situated? • Does the author provide a sharply focused and convincing view of how this study will add new insight into the problem? | |
| <p>2. Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the author explained the research methodology and analysis in sufficient detail? • Has the author sufficiently indicated the limitations of the study? | |
| <p>3. Quality of evidence assembled and presented</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the author conducted sufficient literature research of the problem? • Has the author used various sources (e.g. primary data, books, academic journals, policy reports, newspaper and journalistic literature, internet sources etc.)? • What is the quality/relevance of the sources used? • If applicable, has the author conducted sufficient empirical data collection on the topic? • Does the author reflect on both the scope and limits of the data and findings? • Has the complete dataset been uploaded to Dataverse¹ in accordance with the data management plan (metadata, primary data, processed data, analyses, drafts and the final publication)? | |
| <p>4. Analysis, Synthesis & Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the author broken down the problem into its component elements, and dealt with all the points this has raised? • If applicable, has the author derived policy recommendations/advice in line with the evidence presented and relevant to EU policy? • Are the frames and method of analysis employed consistent with the data assembled? • Is the reasoning logical, lucid, coherent, consistent, and convincing? | |
| <p>5. Quality of Writing and Presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General readability – does it read well (sentence formulation, coherence in text, logical sequence etc.)? • Grammatical correctness | |

¹ For more information on the use of Dataverse see the WOSCAP data management plan.

| | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has care been taken in checking spelling, the accuracy of citations, and in presenting a complete bibliographical reference section at the end of the report? • Is there a need for English language editing? | |
| <p>Follow-up</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Can the paper be published with minor revisions? - Does the paper need to undergo major revision? - Does the paper require resubmission to QAM? | |

5. Communication

Communication between authors and QAM will be copied to the respective WP-leader and Project Coordinator.