



6th Output
1st Internal Quality Report

partner in charge **University of Humanities and Economics in Lodz**

date **April 2014**

partner responsible **University of Humanities and Economics in Lodz**

participants* **ISCTE - University Institute of Lisbon , University of Salford, University of Humanities and Economics in Lodz, Università degli Studi Guglielmo Marconi, The Institute for Developmental and Strategic Analysis, Varna Free University "Chernorizets Hrabar", Plantijn Hogeschool, University of Wolverhampton**

type of report **Internal Quality & Evaluation report – partners' feedback from AdminProject and e- mail questionnaires**

1. Objectives and general description of the activity

This report was built on the feedback given by partners using the Evaluation Questionnaire n° 2. The data was collect in the AdminProject tool but also by email. This need to use the email along with the AdminProject was due to the fact that the data collected on the AdminProject did not provide all the information that we need to produce this report.

The objective of this activity was to evaluate the progress of the project, identify problems in project implementation and suggest possible solutions in order improve project performance and quality.

2. Activity implementation

The questionnaires were displayed on the AdminProject tool and an email was sent to all the partners asking them to answer the questionnaire during the following 15 days. Once we started analyzing the data we verify that due to limitations of the AdminProject we will not be able to have the information to provide a report with the quality that we wanted. Therefore, we decided to send the email version of the questionnaire and send it to the partners in order to have their feedback again. These situations lead to a delay in receiving the answers. In order to correct this deviation we had to make the report in short period of time and, at the same time maintain the quality of the analyses.



With the support of the [Lifelong Learning Programme](#) of the European Union.

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This communication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

3. Data Analysis

3.1. Part 1 - Please rate the following aspects related to the progress of the project.

	1 – Agree	2 – Don't know	3 – Disagree
The objectives of the project are clear to me	8/9 (88,9%)	1/9 (11,1%)	0/9 (0%)
The coordination approach is appropriate	9/9(100%)	0/9 (0%)	0/9 (0%)
Coordinator is supporting project partners adequately	8/9(88,9%)	1/9 (11.1%)	0/9 (0%)
Project partners are cooperating on all tasks	3/9 (33.3%)	3/9 (33.3%)	3/9 (33.3%)

Conclusions and suggestions

At this point all partners that answered the questionnaire where satisfied with the leading partner approach and all except one think that its support is being effective. The aspect that is evaluated with as the lowest mark is the cooperation of the partners in the tasks required. Regarding this aspect maybe it would be better for the coordinator to have a better control, be more demanding and rigid with partners in order for them to fully accomplish to their tasks and management obligations.

The project activities have been progressing according to the timetable	7/9 (77,8%)	2/9 (22.2%)	0/9 (0%)
Project partners can learn from project activities	6/9 (66.7%)	3/9 (33.3%)	0/9 (0%)
Project partners can learn from each other	7/9 (77,8%)	1/9 (11.1%)	1/9 (11.1%)
There is a realistic timescale of future activities	5/9 (55.6%)	3/9 (33.3%)	1/9 (11.1%)
The initial time planning of activities needs review	3/9 (33.3%)	2/9 (22.2%)	4/9 (44.4%)
The project budget is well planned	5/9 (55.6%)	4/9 (44.4%)	0/9 (0%)
All partners contribute to the project adequately	5/9 (55.6%)	4/9 (44.4%)	0/9 (0%)
The role of each partner is clear to me	6/9 (66.7%)	1/9 (11.1%)	2/9 (22.2%)
The communication among partners is effective.	5/9 (55.6%)	2/9 (22.2%)	2/9 (22.2%)



Conclusions and suggestions

Although the main answers lead to a positive evaluation of the project there are some points that are relevant for the analyses of the project development. A percentage of 44.4% of persons that answered the questionnaire believe that there is a need to review the timetable of the activities. In our point of view this is very positive because we think that this reflects their knowledge of the project aims and tasks. In fact, due to the development of the platform and the adjustment of the timing to implement the workshop (to be in line with academic calendar) we will need to make adjustments to this specific activity. Some problems with cooperation and communication and the budget distribution also need to be revised. This situation could be related to fact that some partners think that not all off the involved in the partnership are contributing in the same way. We suggest that this situation needs to be taken into account by the leading partner.

3.2. General comments regarding project progress and implementation, suggestions for improvements.

Summary of most important comments from partners

"We believe that the project will contribute a lot to the cooperation between the HEIs and the business and all of the parties involved will benefit from it (Students, Professors and the companies.)"

"The project is very interesting; We have difficulties in involving the companies. I like project management and overall feeling among partnership. There is just the time given for the collection of the questionnaires that was too short."

"Communication and cooperation among partners need improvement;"

"I feel like I know what is going on in my own work-package but do not have a clear idea of what is happening in other parts of the project. I believe that it would be useful to have an e-mail detailing what has been going on each 2 weeks."

"Overall, I think everything is progressing really well. Perhaps it will be better to know more about partners that we are working with for each WP- although it has been made clear on the first meeting, but since we were just met once, some reminder works better during the second meeting."

Conclusions and suggestions

The comments above are related with the evaluation provided and therefore the main future suggestions are:

- a. To improve communications among partners and give regular feedback on their role and tasks development. This will give a better idea of the stage we are in and of the work that is being developed by other partners. We also believe that this could lead to avoid the idea that some partners are doing more than others and that others are not doing what they are supposed to do;
- b. To discuss and find strategies to better involve companies. This involves reinforcement of the dissemination strategies among the companies by presenting the project and its benefits.



With the support of the *Lifelong Learning Programme* of the European Union.

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This communication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.



3.3. Part 2 - Please rate the following aspects related to the WPs progress

In this part of the questionnaire, partners were asked to select the WP that they are leading. The aggregated responses are shown below:

WP 1	WP 2	WP 3	WP 4	WP 5	WP 6	WP 7	WP 8	WP 9	WP 10
1/9	2/9	2/9	1/9	1/9	1/9	0/9	0/9	0/9	1/9
(11.1%)	(22.2%)	(22.2%)	(11.1%)	(11.1%)	(11.1%)	(0%)	(0%)	(0%)	(11.1%)

Conclusions and suggestions

The fact that we didn't have any person choosing WP7, WP8 and WP9 could be related to the fact that not all the partners answered the questionnaire. Therefore we will be changing the approach in the application the questionnaires. The preferential approach will be to apply the questionnaires in loco at the partners meetings, when this is not possible the survey will be done by email in order to have a better perspective of the number of partners that answer the questionnaire.

On other side we have WP that have two persons answering. This happens because two persons from the same institutions answered the questionnaire.

3.4. Choose the option that suits your opinion (optional question)

	1 – Agree	2 – Don't know	3 – Disagree
This WP is/was progressing according to the timetable	9/9 (100%)	0/9 (11.1%)	0/9 (0%)
All Partners declare that all tasks in their WPs' were progressing according to the timetable			
Timescale for this WP is/was realistic	8/9 (88,9%)	0/9 (0%)	1/9 (11.1%)
<p>WP 5 (disagree – “some of time allocated to task is a bit too short”).</p> <p>Observations This WP was the “Teaching Learning case study –Students” and the since we wanted to reach a higher number of students answering the questionnaire the partners in charge felt that we should have had more time to collect the data and make the reports.</p>			
There are/were no complications with this WP	8/9 (88,9%)	0/9 (11.1%)	1/9 (11.1%)
WP 3 – Partners in charge of WP5, “European Business Case”, disagrees: “we have problems in involving the companies, in particular the French ones”).			



With the support of the *Lifelong Learning Programme* of the European Union.

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This communication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

I have/had a clear strategy for leading this WP and I know my responsibilities.	9/9 (100%)	0/9 (0%)	0/9 (0%)
<p>WP 5 – “Clear strategy, ... in relation to writing the national report, due to having 2 partners in the UK – not really sure who is supposed to complete all the national report and not only in relation to WP 5”</p> <p>Observations This situation happened because, initially, there was supposed to be 3 different questionnaires – companies, students and professors, but then we decided with the leading partners of WP3, WP4 and WP5 that it would make more sense to have only one questionnaire that applies to all the stakeholders. At the Salford meeting this situation was clarified and we decided that the same partner will be making all the national reports (could be single report of all the data).</p>			
I regular communicate / communicated with other partners in this WP and provide/provided all information and support	9/9 (100%)	0/9 (0%)	0/9 (0%)
<p>Observations Despite the fact that this type of answer lead to the conclusion that the communication is effective on the first part of these questionnaire partners refer to need to improve the communication. Maybe everyone is feels that they communicate with others but others don't communicate with them as often. Since communication is a very important issue we should be very attentive to this.</p>			
The partners involved in this WP cooperate/cooperated effectively and provide/provided necessary contribution	8/9 (88,9%)	0/9 (0%)	1/9 (11,1%)
<p>WP 1 and WP6 (disagree – “to improve the management of the project it would be necessary that the partners send the documents on time (timesheet, staff costs statement, etc)”.</p> <p>Observations The partner that refers this fact is the coordinator and responsible for all the management activities. To fulfil with all the requirements of the EC it is very important that partners comply with all schedule on administrative procedures. To solve this problem it's important that some partners change their behavior related to management procedures but also that the coordinator to be more rigid when it comes to deadlines.</p>			
The project coordinator provides/provided support	9/9 (100%)	0/9 (0%)	0/9 (0%)
The budget of this WP is/was well planned	8/9 (89,9%)	0/9 (0%)	1/9 (11,1%)
<p>Partner from Slovenia – (disagree – “in WP 1 is budget low. In the WP 3, 4, 5 is the provided budget for work category “researcher” extremely low, considering the work tasks in these packages”).</p> <p>Observations: This could be discussed with the leading partner at the 3rd project meeting.</p>			



Comments – please comment on the progress of the WP you are leading, encountered problems, suggested improvements and other issues related to your WP

“WP 3 is going well. It has been hard to run the workshop Partners Meeting without having access to the Platform and I believe this had an effect on the productivity of the meeting in Salford. However we tried our best with the tolls that we had and hopefully we were able to obtain the results that we needed for the project.”

“Will communicate more with partners and also with project coordinators next time around.”

4. Activity Evaluation

AHE as the leader of WP2 (Quality and evaluation), responsible for carrying out the evaluation survey, has not received replies from some WP leaders (WP7, WP 8, WP 9).

Moreover, we have noticed that some partners were not fully aware of the WP that they are leading. Suggestion: discussion on division of tasks and responsibilities is needed as soon as possible. Problems encountered during the evaluation session: long time of filling in questionnaires by Partners, technical problems with downloading appropriate data from the AdminProject platform mistakes in Partners' responses – some project's Partners don't know which exactly WP they are responsible of.

5. Future commitments and task (when applicable)

AHE is planning to improve the Evaluation questionnaire no 2 (the one used for the purpose of this evaluation session). We have realized that it was very difficult to receive the required feedback from partners, therefore we are planning to simplify the questionnaire and change the surveying approach. The preferential approach will be to apply the questionnaires in loco at the partners meetings, when this is not possible the survey will be done by email in order to have a better perspective of the number of partners that answer the questionnaires.

6. Recommendations (when applicable)

The suggestions are included along the report are presented to the project coordinator.



With the support of the Lifelong Learning Programme of the European Union.

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This communication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.