Co-funded by the European Union

Project title: "STEAME for Saving Life: Guidelines for developing and implementing Disaster Risk Reduction Education in Elementary School Curriculum"
Project Acronym: STEAME-DRREC
Reference number: 2023-2-CY01-KA210-SCH-000169945
Implementation period: 31 August 2024 – 30 August 2026

STEAME-DRREC

STEAME for Saving Life: Guidelines for developing and implementing Disaster Risk Reduction Education in Elementary School Curriculum

Quality Assurance and Evaluation Plan

(Updated: 23 October 2024)

This Quality Assurance and Evaluation Plan establishes the processes that the STEAME-DRREC consortium will apply from the beginning to the completion of the project to monitor progress, assess the quality of activities and results, identify risks, and implement timely corrective and preventive measures. It will serve as a working management instrument and will be reviewed as project needs evolve. It complements the approved application, the implementation timetable, the dissemination arrangements and the planned contingency and quality assurance evaluation report (D3). The project will develop and pilot inclusive, cross-curricular Disaster Risk Reduction Education (DRRE) resources for elementary schools through STEAME (Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts, Mathematics and Entrepreneurship), inquiry-based, context-based and problem-solving approaches. Quality will be judged by scientific accuracy, pedagogical relevance, age appropriateness, inclusion, usability, implementation feasibility and demonstrable benefits for teachers and students.

Project objectives and expected results

- O1 – Guidelines for a dynamic and adaptive framework of Disaster Risk Reduction Education Curricula, including O1/A1 analysis of existing practice and O1/A2 methodological guidelines.
- O2 – STEAME-DRRE activities for elementary students in grades 1–6, with at least 20 activities for grades 1–3 and at least 20 for grades 4–6 in the final tested set.
- O3 – Guidelines, modules and implementation of a training programme for elementary-school teachers.
- O4 – Pilot testing in Greece and Cyprus, evaluation and refinement of the guidelines, activities and supporting materials.
- O5 – Dissemination of the project and its results, including events, website, social

media and publications.

• O6 – Project management, coordination, meetings, progress monitoring and reporting.

Supporting results will include D1 Digital Reference Collection; D2 Dissemination Plan and Implementation Results; D3 Contingency Plan and Quality Assurance Evaluation Report; and D4 Exploitation Plan with a webspace for continued sharing and support.

Quality assurance principles and methodology

• Step 1 – Quality planning: partners will confirm responsibilities, expected outputs, review criteria, reporting arrangements and key milestones at the kick-off stage.

• Step 2 – Quality framework: the consortium will adopt common templates, scientific and pedagogical review criteria, feedback tools, document versioning and evidence-retention practices.

• Step 3 – Continuous quality control: output leaders and reviewers will check work in progress and draft results, not only completed deliverables.

• Step 4 – Corrective and preventive action: shortcomings will be recorded, assigned to an owner, corrected within an agreed deadline and checked for closure.

Evaluation will combine formative assessment during development, post-activity feedback, pilot testing, quantitative monitoring and a final summative review. Feedback from students, teachers, partners and relevant external scientific experts will be considered where appropriate.

Governance and responsibilities

Actor	Planned quality assurance responsibilities
CMS – Coordinator	Oversee project-wide monitoring, timetable/Gantt chart, meeting agendas and minutes, partner communication, dissemination monitoring, risk escalation and final reporting. Lead O5 and O6.
SURE – Scientific/output lead	Lead scientific and methodological review for O1, O2 and O4; coordinate pilot evaluation, consolidate feedback and ensure scientific accuracy of DRR content.
Cyprus Pedagogical Institute (CPI)	Lead O3 teacher training; review pedagogical relevance, inclusion and suitability; coordinate Cyprus school and teacher involvement in pilot activities.
Directorate of Primary Education of Kozani (DPEK)	Support teacher training and pilot implementation in Greece; coordinate participating schools, classroom feedback and evidence collection.
All partners	Review relevant drafts, meet agreed deadlines, complete evaluation instruments,

	report risks and contribute to corrective action.
Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Officer	Review inclusion considerations and help ensure materials and participation arrangements address linguistic, cultural, disability-related and other barriers.

Evaluation activities and instruments

Evaluation action	Timing	Evidence / method	Lead
Initial needs and risk review	Kick-off and early implementation	Partner discussion; needs review; initial risk register	CMS with all partners
Progress and partnership review	At each project meeting; periodic online checks	Gantt status; minutes; action list; short partner feedback	CMS / output leads
Draft output quality review	At each draft and before approval	Peer-review checklist; scientific/pedagogical comments; revision log	Relevant output lead
Teacher training evaluation	During and after O3 training	Attendance; participant questionnaires; learning and usability feedback	CPI with DPEK
School pilot evaluation	During and after O4 pilots	Student/teacher/partner questionnaires; classroom observations; 2–3 case studies and teacher interviews	SURE, CPI, DPEK
Dissemination monitoring	Throughout implementation	Event records; analytics; social media reach; publications	CMS / all partners
Interim quality synthesis	Around midpoint / review milestone	KPI dashboard; risk register; outstanding actions	CMS / quality focal points
Final quality and impact evaluation	Final project stage	Consolidated indicators; pilot evaluation; external expert feedback where available; lessons learned	CMS with all partners

Output-specific quality criteria

Output	Review criteria / acceptance evidence
O1 Guidelines	Coverage of relevant European/global DRR educational practice; reliable references; alignment with elementary curricula; STEAME

	integration; clear guidance; inclusion and adaptability. Peer-reviewed draft and revision record.
O2 Activities	Scientific correctness; clear objectives and instructions; grade differentiation (1–3 and 4–6); accessibility and multicultural suitability; meaningful inquiry/problem solving; workable digital and non-digital tools; final minimum of 40 activities.
O3 Teacher training	Coherent modules and teacher support; practical implementation guidance; training participation and feedback; increased teacher confidence and ability to use DRRE activities.
O4 Pilot testing	Testing in two to three elementary schools per country as proposed; documented teacher/student feedback; functional tools; evidence of learning and inclusion; revised and finalized materials and pilot evaluation report.
O5 Dissemination	Accuracy and consistency of messages; target audience reach; timely website/social updates; event records; visibility and accessible sharing of results.
O6 Management	Timely task completion; effective partner communication; documented decisions; action follow-up; budget and risk oversight.

Quantitative indicators and targets

Indicator	Target / measurement
Overall elementary student participation	Approximately 200–300 students across Greece and Cyprus (project target groups).
Overall teacher participation	Approximately 20 teachers per country (project target groups).
Pilot teacher training participation	More than 30 teachers; attendance and course evaluation.
Pilot learning/performance	More than 100 students and more than 15 teachers attaining good performance (>70%) under the project evaluation approach.
Final educational activities	At least 20 activities for grades 1–3 and 20 for grades 4–6.
Multiplier events	2 events.
Project website	More than 100 visits per month.
Social media	More than 200 views / reactions to project communications as specified in the proposal.
Scientific publications / conference outputs	More than 2.

Final workshop stakeholders	More than 4 stakeholders; wider intended engagement 5–10 per country.
Deliverables	Timely and proper completion of all planned outputs; monitor against the Gantt chart.

Qualitative evaluation and inclusion

Qualitative evaluation will examine whether teachers can adapt the guidelines to everyday teaching; whether students demonstrate improved awareness of hazards, preparedness and climate-related risks; whether digital tools improve learning without excluding participants; and whether activities encourage collaboration, empathy and safe decision-making. Classroom interviews, open-ended questionnaires and case studies will identify improvements not captured by numeric indicators.

Pilot instruments will be age-appropriate, accessible and sensitive to students with fewer opportunities, including linguistic barriers and disabilities. Schools and partners will follow applicable safeguarding, consent and personal-data protection requirements. Reporting will prioritise aggregated or anonymised information; identifiable student information will not be circulated unnecessarily.

Risk management and contingency measures

Risks will be identified at the start, reviewed at each consortium meeting and updated whenever a new issue arises. The register will record likelihood, impact, owner, mitigation, deadline and status. Significant risks will be escalated promptly to CMS and the relevant output lead.

Risk	Preventive / corrective response	Responsible
Delay in deliverable preparation	Monitor Gantt chart; use intermediate deadlines; redistribute support and agree recovery schedule.	CMS / output lead
Scientific inaccuracies or unsuitable DRR advice	Expert review by SURE; check references and age-appropriate safety messaging; revise before publication.	SURE
Insufficient schools, teachers or students	Recruit early through CPI/DPEK; identify alternative participating classrooms and adjust scheduling.	CPI / DPEK
Limited accessibility or participation	Use adaptable methods and differentiated materials; consult EDI officer; revise activities after pilot feedback.	All partners / EDI officer

Digital platform or tool failures	Test tools early; maintain accessible offline alternatives and technical support.	Output lead / CMS
Weak partner communication	Regular online meetings, shared documents, clear minutes and named action owners.	CMS
Low dissemination reach	Monitor analytics; refine channels, stakeholder outreach and event promotion.	CMS / all partners
Disruption to school access or travel	Reschedule, use online coordination and alternative schools/activities where appropriate.	CMS / CPI / DPEK

Reporting, impact and sustainability

Quality findings will be summarised at project meetings and consolidated into interim monitoring records and the final Contingency Plan and Quality Assurance Evaluation Report (D3). Final assessment will compare planned targets with evidenced results, explain deviations, review partner collaboration and evaluate educational benefits for teachers and students. The consortium will also review how O1–O3 resources, the project webspace and the exploitation plan (D4) can support further use beyond the project.