



**doing it
together
science**

Grant agreement no. 709443

DITOs

Doing It Together science

Coordination & Support Action

D6.4 Self-Assessment Plan

Work Package: 6

Due date of deliverable: Month 6

Actual submission date: 30 / 11 / 2016

Start date of project: June 01 2016

Duration: 36 months

Lead beneficiary for this deliverable: Christian Nold (UCL)

Contributors: Artemis Skarlatidou (UCL), Cindy Regalado (UCL) Jörg Irran (eutema)
Pauline Appels (WS), Gaia Agnello (ECSA)

Reviewer: Judy Barrett (UCL)

Project co-funded by the European Commission within the H2020 Programme (2014-2020)		
PU	Public	
CO	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	X
EU-RES	Classified Information: RESTREINT UE (Commission Decision 2005/444/EC)	
EU-CON	Classified Information: CONFIDENTIEL UE (Commission Decision 2005/444/EC)	
EU-SEC	EU-SEC Classified Information: SECRET UE (Commission Decision 2005/444/EC)	



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 709443

Disclaimer

The content of this deliverable does not reflect the official opinion of the European Union. Responsibility for the information and views expressed herein lies entirely with the author(s).

All 'Doing It Together science' (DITOs) consortium members are also committed to publish accurate and up to date information and take the greatest care to do so. However, the DITOs consortium members cannot accept liability for any inaccuracies or omissions nor do they accept liability for any direct, indirect, special, consequential or other losses or damages of any kind arising out of the use of this information.

Copyright Notice



This work by Parties of the DITOs Consortium is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Acknowledgement



The DITOs project has received funding from the European Union Horizon 2020 programme under grant number 709443.

Reference

Please cite this work as:

DITOs Consortium, 2016. *Doing It Together science: Self-Assessment Plan* UCL, London.

Document Identification Sheet

Project ref. no.	709443
Project acronym	DITOs
Project full title	Doing It Together Science
Document name	DITOs-D6.4-20161130.pdf
Security (distribution level)	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)
Contractual date of delivery	Month 6, 30.11.2016
Actual date of delivery	30.11.2016
Deliverable number	D6.4
Deliverable name	Self-Assessment Plan
Type	Report
Status & version	Version 1.0
Number of pages	10
WP / Task (responsible)	WP6 / T4 (UCL)
Author(s)	UCL: Christian Nold
Other contributors	UCL: Artemis Skarlatidou, Cindy Regalado eutema: Jörg Irran WS: Pauline Appels ECSA: Gaia Agnello
Project Officer	Colombe Warin
Abstract	This document covers procedures for peer reviews of Deliverables, the meeting of numerical targets for technical performance and user engagement, outcomes of satisfaction questionnaires, management board approvals, and critical assessment of the results of field trials.
Keywords	citizen science, DITOs, self-assessment, evaluation.
Sent to peer reviewer	20/10/16
Peer review completed	26/10/16
Supervisory Board approval version 1.0	06/11/16

Table of Contents

1	Version Log	5
2	Definitions and Acronyms	5
3	Executive Summary	6
4	Introduction	6
5	Procedures for Review of Deliverables	6
6	Procedures for meeting numerical Targets for Technical Performance and User Engagement	7
6.1	Events Diary Protocol	7
7	Technical Performance	8
8	Procedures for Outcomes of satisfaction Questionnaires	8
9	Procedures for Management Board Approvals	8
10	Procedures for critical assessment of the results of field trials/events	9
11	Procedure for implementing and monitoring data management	9
12	Procedure for monitoring data protection and ethics	9
13	Conclusion	10

1 Version Log

Version	Date	Released by	Nature of Change
DRAFT	10/10/2016	Christian Nold (UCL)	Initial Draft for discussion
DRAFT	20/10/16	Christian Nold (UCL)	For review
1.0	30/11/16	Christian Nold (UCL)	Final version

2 Definitions and Acronyms

Acronyms	Definitions
CSA	Communication and Support Action
DITOs	Doing It Together science
DoA	Description of Action (as defined in the project grant agreement)
EC	European Commission
ECSA	European Citizen Science Association / Verein der Europäischen Bürgerwissenschaften
eutema	EUTEMA GMBH
H2020	Horizon 2020 Programme
KI	Kersnikova Institute
KPI	Key Performance Indicator
Meritum	Centrum Szkolen I Rozwoju Osobistego Meritum
MP	Medialab Prado, Madrid
QA	Quality Assurance
RBINS	Institut Royal des Sciences Naturelles de Belgique
RRI	Responsible Research and Innovation
Tekiu	Tekiu Limited
UCL	University College London
UNIGE	Universite de Geneve
UPD	Universite Paris Descartes
WS	Waag Society

3 Executive Summary

The 'DITOs Self-Assessment Plan' is Deliverable 6.4 (D6.4) from the coordination and support action (CSA), Doing It Together science (DITOs), grant agreement (GA) 709443.

The plan ensures the quality of the project's tasks and deliverables by defining the following procedures.

- Thorough review of deliverables by peers, internal appraisers and external authorities (selected from the project advisory boards).
- Regular monitoring and appraisal of event and engagement statistics and subsequent actions to be taken.
- Satisfaction questionnaire evaluation in line with deliverable D5.1, 'DITOs Evaluation Framework'.
- Decision-making, issue resolution and implementation of project standards via management boards.

Other issues such as field trials, data management, data protection and ethics are addressed in separate project deliverables (D5.1, D6.3, D7.2 and D7.1 respectively) so are excluded from the scope of this document.

4 Introduction

This deliverable outlines the procedures for improving the quality of work via self-assessment. As outlined in the project handbook D6.1, Quality Assurance (QA) is the joint responsibility of all the partners. This report thus defines procedures for peer-review that need to be followed by all the partners as well as by the management boards. In this document there are overlaps with the handbook D6.1 and the terms of reference and evaluation deliverable D5.1. This document does not engage with the ethics component of self-assessment, which is dealt with in D7.1. The objective of this deliverable is to articulate the specific procedure for self-assessment.

Self-assessment is a crucial aspect of the DITOs project, feeding into the overall project aims of setting up a reflective citizen science network for Europe. Self-assessment and development planning processes need to be comprehensive, thorough and consultative. The structure for this self-assessment plan is based on relevant evaluation and impact assessment theories and practices (Learning and Skills Council, 2003). Quality of work is assessed against the evaluation criteria laid down in the handbook D6.1 and terms of reference and evaluation deliverable D5.1. Rigorous self-assessment will enable the consortium to identify strengths and weaknesses in the provision, to plan actions to improve the quality of provision, to raise standards and to increase the overall effectiveness of the project.

5 Procedures for Review of Deliverables

Deliverables are important outputs of the DITOs project to be issued according to the schedule included in the Grant Agreement Description of Action (DoA), where the respect of the due date and expected technical and quality standards are contractually required. These deliverables are analysed by EC reviewers and constitute a major basis for project assessment and financing approval by the EC.

For high level self-assessment, a spreadsheet of objectives has been drawn up of all the objectives in the DoA.

In order to assure an effective and high technical and quality production of project deliverable in good time, the project consortium has agreed on the following terms.

1. The Work Package Leader (WPL) is responsible for ensuring:
 - a. that the deliverable fulfils the objectives listed as milestones;
 - b. alerting the Project Coordinator in case of delay or default in the performance of the deliverable;
 - c. identifying suitable internal and external reviewers (i.e. nominated person from the Advisory Board) for each deliverable.
2. Eight weeks before the deadline: A draft plan (table of contents and rough overview of main detail) will be provided by the Deliverable Leader to rest of the consortium (published via basecamp).
3. Eight weeks before the deadline: The Deliverable Leader confirms the reviewer's name for this deliverable.
4. Six weeks before the deadline: Initial draft will be provided by the Deliverable Leader to rest of the consortium (published via basecamp) for internal review.
5. Four weeks before the deadline: A revised draft will be provided by the Deliverable Leader to the nominated advisory board member for review and their comments (published via email).
6. Two weeks before: Version I will be provided to Project Secretariat for final review, changes and submission to the EC.

6 Procedures for meeting numerical Targets for Technical Performance and User Engagement

In order to assure to meet the numerical targets for technical performance and user engagement, the project consortium has agreed on the following terms:

The Project Coordinator (UCL) will insure the adoption and continued use of the online events diary template tool for the continuous reporting of events, technical performance and user engagement. This system provides a transparent way for all the consortium partners to see that the targets are being met. It allows the statistical analysis of the data at regular intervals and the continuous reporting of the data.

6.1 Events Diary Protocol

1. During the weekly consortium meetings, each partner will provide an update on the previous week's activities. These are subject to peer review by the rest of the consortium teams.
2. Monthly meetings will take place online between the UCL evaluation team and relevant activity partner organisation to discuss the status of the Events diary and verify that all the promised events have been carried out and reported. This also includes the formative evaluation of partners in using

interview guide template (see 5.1 Section 4.5.4).

3. Before each PSB meeting, the team will carry out statistical analysis of the Events diary to produce data visualisations for use within the consortium. The aim of the visualisation is to ensure that the promised numerical targets and gender breakdown are being met by the project. Any discrepancies are discussed in the PSB meeting with appropriate remedial actions being scheduled.

7 Technical Performance

Before each PSB meeting, the WP 3 team will carry out statistical analysis of the online and social media impact of the project including number of tweets, number of new followers to produce data visualisations for use within the consortium. The aim of the visualisation is to ensure that the promised numerical targets are being met by the project. Any discrepancies are discussed in the PSB meeting with appropriate remedial actions being scheduled.

The following specific information will be gathered on the technical performance on the website and social media as defined in deliverable D3.1 (DITOs web). Here we provide summaries of the key indicators.

1. Website: On the DITOs website the project will monitor the number of visitor, their actions, user countries, and other statistics that are listed in D3.1.
2. LinkedIn: the number of people registered in the DITOs group, and the number of messages that were submitted to the group.
3. Instagram: the number of submission to the group, views and likes.
4. YouTube: the number of submission to the group, views and likes.
5. Twitter: amount of tweets, tweet impressions, followers.
6. Facebook: likes, reach of page and messages.

8 Procedures for Outcomes of satisfaction Questionnaires

In order to assure to monitor the outcomes of satisfaction questionnaires, the project consortium has agreed on the following terms:

1. Regular online meetings will take place between the UCL evaluation team and each individual partner organisation at least once a month. They will be a one-on-one formative evaluation (D5.1 section 4.5.4) using interview guide template (D5.1 section 5.3).
2. Results from the formative evaluation are analysed and discussed in preparation for deliverables for WP1, WP2 and WP5 in months 6, 15, and 36.

9 Procedures for Management Board Approvals

In order to assure proper management board approval, the project consortium has agreed on the following terms:

The Project Management Board (PMB) performs the day-to-day monitoring of project progress, implements decisions made by the PSB and informs the PSB of progress, issues and risks. The PMB includes the Project Coordinator and the member appointed by the PSB to represent each partner.

The PMB every six months meets physically at the same time and place as the Supervisory Board meeting or at any other time upon written request of any member of the PMB. The Project Coordinator is responsible for giving a 14 days' notice for an ordinary PMB and 7 days' notice for an extra ordinary PMB. All partners should be represented and/or may appoint a substitute or a proxy to attend and vote (if necessary) at any meeting. The PM can only take place if $\frac{2}{3}$ of the PMB members are present or represented (quorum).

The agenda of the PMB should be circulated at least 7 days before the PMB meeting; any agenda item that requires a decision is identified as such on the agenda. During the meeting all members can unanimously agree to add a new item to the original agenda. Decisions are taken by a majority of $\frac{2}{3}$ of the votes cast.

The Project Coordinator (or chairperson of the PMB) sends the draft minutes within 5 business days of the meeting. The draft minutes are also available on the project's Google Drive folder during and immediately after the meeting. Any member has a right to veto during the meeting only and within 15 days after the draft minutes of the meeting are sent. Minutes of PMB meetings, once accepted, shall be sent by the Coordinator to the PSB Members for information. PMB decisions are binding once the relevant part of the Minutes has been accepted.

10 Procedures for critical assessment of the results of field trials/events

In order to assure critical assessment of classes of repeated events such as BioBlitzes (discussed in D.1.1 and D2,1), the consortium has agreed a series of procedures for debriefing after each event. These procedures are outlined in the document D5.1 'Terms of reference and evaluation Templates'. In order to avoid duplications please refer to this deliverable.

11 Procedure for implementing and monitoring data management

Every six months, at a consortium meeting, a check will be carried out with all the partners that the deliverable D6.1, 'Data Management Plan' is being followed. Any issues will be logged and any amendments to the plan such any changes in the types of data being collected will be noted, and updated within the 'Data Management Plan'. Any remaining issues will be presented at the next Project Management Board meeting for resolution.

12 Procedure for monitoring data protection and ethics

Every six months, at a consortium meeting, a check will be carried out with all the partners are conforming to consent procedures laid down in 'Ethics' D7.1 as well as data 'Data Protection Plan' D7.2. Any issues will be logged and presented at the next Project Management Board meeting for resolution.

13 Conclusion

Through the procedures defined here and in other project deliverables mentioned in this document, the consortium will work together to produce a quality set of tasks and deliverables.

It will be the responsibility of each work package leader to ensure that those working on the work package follow the procedures; the coordinator (UCL) will ensure the dissemination of these procedures to the work package leaders.

As the project is itself a study on the methodology of citizen science, this self-assessment plan will be subject to change and improvement as the project progresses and the project's own evaluation processes produce further critical feedback.

Bibliography

Learning and Skills Council, 2003. *Self-assessment and development planning: meeting the challenges and gaining the benefits*, London: Learning and Skills Council.