

## Action Plan Integrity

<b>Short description</b>	This activity consists of a structured group work within the Community of Practice to review the integrity of the Action Plan for monitoring and reflective discussion purposes. Participants collectively analyse the plan across three key dimensions—exposure, adherence, quality, and participants’ responsiveness—in order to identify progress, challenges, and necessary adjustments.
<b>Objectives</b>	This activity aims to: monitor whether activities were implemented as planned (exposure); assess the significance and alignment of activities with intended goals (adherence); evaluate the quality of implementation (quality); analyse participation levels and acceptance among participants (participants’ responsiveness); and support reflective discussion and informed adaptation of the Action Plan
<b>Duration</b>	45 – 60 minutes
<b>Social form</b>	Small-group work (3 – 4 participants per group) followed by a short plenary discussion for synthesis and agreement.
<b>Materials and organisation</b>	Version of the agreed Action Plan; one action plan integrity review template structured around the four domains per group; and a flipchart.
<b>Preparation</b>	Share the Action Plan and relevant monitoring data (if available) in advance; prepare the integrity review template with the four domains clearly defined; assign each group a set of activities or one priority action to analyse; clarify that the activity focuses on learning, improvement, and accountability, not performance control.

### Step-by-step description

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Presentation of the purpose of the activity explaining the four integrity domains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exposure: Was the activity implemented as planned (periodicity and duration)?</li> <li>Adherence: To what extent did the activity remain aligned with its intended purpose and significance?</li> <li>Quality: How well was the activity implemented?</li> <li>Participants' responsiveness: How many participants were involved, and what was their level of engagement and acceptance?</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Group-work: integrity analysis. Each group reviews the assigned activities using the four domains, discussing evidence such as participation records, observations, or feedback. Groups summarise strengths, challenges, and propose concrete</li> </ol>
--	---

*The European Commission's support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents, which reflect the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.*

	<p>adjustments (e.g. changes in duration, format, facilitation, or target group).</p> <p>3. Plenary discussion and alignment: groups share key findings. The Community of Practice agrees on refinements to the Action Plan and monitoring priorities.</p>
--	--

## Variations and differentiation

The activity can be also conducted online, using an online platform as the Microsoft Team (or Zoom), and combining small group work in virtual break-out rooms. You can use collaborative digital tools – as a Padlet or Miro – as a way to discuss refinements and the impact of the activities.

## Practical notes

For preparing the integrity review template you can use one of the multiple illustrations available online as those adapted from Roberts and colleagues (2017). Here is an example created by the AI:

### Action Plan Integrity Review Template

Activity / Action reviewed: \_\_\_\_\_

Period under review: \_\_\_\_\_

Group / Institution: \_\_\_\_\_

### Integrity Review – Checklist and Evidence

Integrity domain	Key guiding questions	Rating	Evidence / notes	Adjustment needed?
<b>Exposure</b> ( <i>implementation as planned</i> )	Was the activity implemented according to the planned periodicity and duration?	<input type="checkbox"/> Fully <input type="checkbox"/> Partially <input type="checkbox"/> Not implemented		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Adherence</b> ( <i>significance and alignment</i> )	To what extent did the activity remain aligned with its intended objectives and significance?	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Moderate <input type="checkbox"/> Low		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Quality</b> ( <i>quality of implementation</i> )	How well was the activity implemented (organisation, facilitation, materials, methods)?	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Moderate <input type="checkbox"/> Low		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Participants' responsiveness</b> ( <i>engagement and acceptance</i> )	How many participants were involved, and what was their level of engagement and acceptance?	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Moderate <input type="checkbox"/> Low		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

## References | Sources

Roberts, G., Vaugh, S., Beretvas, N. & Wong, V. (2017). *Treatment Fidelity in studies of educational intervention*. Routledge.

The European Commission's support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents, which reflect the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.