



**Summary-Consensus Report of Framework Plan review:
July 15, 2016**

Date: July 2016

Author: Professor Gaspar Ros Berruezo, University of Murcia (Leader of QA team)

The first stage of DARE project (Institutional Building) is aimed at developing outreach programs for enabling people with disabilities, women and ethnic minorities to access HEI in Georgia and Israel. WP1 & WP 2.1 focus on the process of analyzing the needs of these target groups (Comparative Framework), and the development of support services for them (Portfolio/Framework Plan). Each Israeli and Georgian partners sent their FWPs Quality Assurance team for review. The QA team, which is comprised of European, Israeli and Georgian partners, reviewed the different FWPs using Key Performance Indicators (KPI). This task is part of the internal Quality Assurance Plan (QAP) which was developed from March to May, 2016 and then presented at the 2nd consortium meeting in Achva Academic College in June 2016 (20-24). The current document summarizes the main findings of the evaluation process and makes comments and suggestions on the individual FWP presenting as a consensus report.

The evaluation process included forming the criteria to evaluate the different FWPs. After the QA team agreed over these standards, the FWPs were distributed to all QA members for review. All feedbacks were collected by Prof. Ros in order to analyze them and provide the herein evaluation report for DARE's project manager.

Abbreviations of the higher education institutions (HEI)

Israelis		Georgina	
University of Haifa	UH	Iakob Gogebashvili Telavi State University	TSU
Gordon Academic College of Education	GC	Sokhumi State University	SSU
Achva Academic College	AC	Ilia State University	ISU
Sapir Academic College	SC	Shota Meskhia State Teaching University of Zugdidi	ZSU

Findings

- Table 1 summarizes the criteria used to evaluate the different FWPs
- Table 2 Table 2 the mapping of the reviews performed by the QAPLF (abbreviations are as footnote).
- Table 3 gives an overview of planed programs/activities as described by the HEIs for item 7 (colored area means that are accomplished by the HEI at the top of the column).



**Summary-Consensus Report of Framework Plan review:
July 15, 2016**

Table 1. *List of criteria to evaluate FWPs*

Item #1	Are target groups clearly identified? List of targeted groups
Item #2	Are people in charge clearly identified?
Item #3	Are challenges and barriers clearly identified?
Item #4	Are there any regulations to support the proposed FWP? National, University,...
Item #5	Are these support services new or an improvement of an already existing ones? How many and list.
Item #6	Is there an strategic approach?
Item #7	Is there a lists of reachable and coherent activities?
Item #8	Is there an achievable frame of time?
Item #9	Is there a measurement method for the outcomes?
Item #10	Is there a expected impact estimation?

Table 2.- *Mapping the reviewed FWP*

	Target groups	Responsible people	Challenges	Policy	Activities, new or improvement	Strategy	Activities	Time frame	Outcomes evaluation	Impact estimation
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
ISRAEL										
HU	M D W	Y	Y	N U	N			Y		
SC	M D	Y	Y	N U	I			Y		
AC	D	N	(Y) N	?	I			N (Y)		
GC	M W	N	Y	N U	N I			Y		
GEORGIA										
SSU	M D	N	(Y) N	N U (P)	N (5) I (2)	Y (?)		N		
TSU	M D	N	Y	N U (P)	N (5) I (4)	Y (?) N		N		
ISU	M W	N	Y	N U (P)	N	Y		N		
ZSU	M D W	Y	Y	N	N	Y		Y		



**Summary-Consensus Report of Framework Plan review:
July 15, 2016**

	M=Minorities	Y= Yes	Y= Yes	N= National	N= New	Y= Yes				
	D=Disabilities	N= None	N= None	U= University	I= Improvement	N= None				
	W= Women									

Table 3. Summary of planned activities

Activities	ISRAEL				GEORGIA				Further description is needed
	HU	SC	AC	GC	SSU	TSU	ISU	ZSU	
1.- Reducing “drop out” rates program (OMETZ)	■							■	
2.- Druze man	■								
3.- Day care	■								
4.- Students Support Services (SSS)	■							■	
5.- Adapted courses and assessments for:									
Preparatory courses (ex.- reading comprehension, maths, english,...).		■		■	■				
Additional courses				■					
30+ programme				■					
6.- “Simulation Center” (learning in class & on-line, record lectures)			■						■
7.- Regular courses		■							
8.- Training “clinic” (occupational center)		■							
9.- Preparatory courses for “National Exam” (for high school students)						■			
10.- “Ambassador students program”: marketing the University to ethnic minorities							■		
11.- Language competition (12 grade students)							■		
12.- “Students for students” program							■		
13.- Friend school project (Open days)+							■		
14.- Internship program for students with disabilities	■							■	
15.- Open a training clinic to prepare students for job employment		■							
16.- Develop a platform for distance learning in the form of virtual courses and video clips for academic assistance tools (Bedouin student's)		■							



**Summary-Consensus Report of Framework Plan review:
July 15, 2016**

Comments

- Although the Georgian FWP are rich and well planned, they do not address people with disabilities, which is one of DARs target group. ISU, Zugdidi, TeSaU and SSS developed programs for ethnic minorities such as (“students 4 students” program; “ambassador students” program, Preparatory courses etc.) leaving out the students with disabilities from their FWP.
- Sapir Academic College focused on people with disabilities as well as ethnic minority (Bedouin student's). A frame time-table is set for those 3 year activities program.
- Gordon Academic College planned a very comprehensive program for women over the age of 30 do not address people with disabilities.
- Achva Academi College should provide further details on their simulation centre.
- Partners should suggest an internal assessment plan to evaluate their student support services

Suggestions

- Each Georgian and Israeli partners need to further develop and **refine** their **framework plan** as to cover at least one more target group (people with disabilities/ethnic minority).
- Each Georgian and Israeli should clearly identify the link between equipment and other infrastructures and the needs to improve or create a new support service or activity per target group (disabilities, minorities and women), addressing the special requirements of the new acquisitions.
- Each Georgian and Israeli partners need to suggest a self-evaluation tools for the assessment of their own support services.
- According to the original proposal (WP 2.1.1) the schedule for developing the Portfolio/Framework plan is as follows:

Expected Deliverable/Results/Outcomes	Work Package and Outcome ref.nr	2.1.1	
	Title	Portfolio of Student Support Services to be reinforced by partner HEIs in IL and GE	
	Type	<input type="checkbox"/> Teaching material <input type="checkbox"/> Learning material <input type="checkbox"/> Training material	<input type="checkbox"/> Event <input type="checkbox"/> Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service/Product
	Description	Each HEI will define the support services that need to be reinforced defining the specific conditions for service provision, for example the center to help students writing and submitting academic papers. Therefore, the main task herein will be the preparation of initial plans for the implementation and establishment of Student Support Services at institutional level. The portfolio will serve as an operational manual for institutional building.	
	Due date	30-04-2016	
	Languages	Georgian and Hebrew	



**Summary-Consensus Report of Framework Plan review:
July 15, 2016**

Target groups	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Teaching staff <input type="checkbox"/> Students <input type="checkbox"/> Trainees <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Administrative staff <input type="checkbox"/> Technical staff <input type="checkbox"/> Librarians <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other		
	<i>If you selected 'Other', please identify these target groups. (Max. 250 characters) Specialists within administration of HEIs to assist DARE vulnerable groups.</i>		
Dissemination level	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Department / Faculty <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Institution	<input type="checkbox"/> Local <input type="checkbox"/> Regional	<input type="checkbox"/> National <input type="checkbox"/> International

According to the original proposal, the deadline for developing the FWP is April 30, 2016. In the Israeli case, the FWPs need some more work to be done to include more than one target group, which can quite easily be performed. In the Georgian case, the need to develop programs for people with disabilities is crucial and needs to be addressed ASAP. I recommend approaching ALL Georgian partners (Skype or video conference would be better) to understand why this is the case (maybe there is a cultural/social factor here that needs to be taken into account). Then to explain the situation and jointly think of a strategy that would enable them to develop activities for people with disabilities according to their resources and capacities. One last point, the running of support services (according to the proposal) would be on the third year of the project, which means that we still have the time for working on the FWPs and considering carefully the apt support services for target group.