



External Evaluation Report

Universities – Companies Crowdsourcing

Reference: AGREEMENT NUMBER 539312-LLP-1-2013-1-PT-ERASMUS-EKA

Rita Barros

External Consultant

May of 2014



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.

1. Overview

This report aims to evaluate the work developed during the six first months of the project. It is expected to evaluate the outputs produced during this time and the quality of the partnership and communication between partners. By doing this evaluation it is expected to give feedback to the coordinator in order to provide the opportunity to improve the project quality.

2. Methodology

The evaluation was based on information's collected with the coordinator of the project in terms of internal affairs and questionnaires done with target groups that answer the assessment: students, companies and professors. We aim to understand the quality of work produced during the first months of the project developing and to give feedback about the first products in the stakeholders' vision. To analyse the questionnaires responses it was used the SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences - version 19.0) and to evaluate the interviews with the coordinator it was used a quality approach.

3. Results

a) Project outputs

Nº of output	Description	Delivery date	Evaluation
Nº 8	Business questionnaire	Oct. 2013	Done according with the project planning
Nº 9	National Model Report – Companies	Mar. 2014	It was finished later than expected, because people take more time to collect the answers
Nº 10	European cooperation ICT model between companies/ HEI's – Companies vision	Apr.2014	Consequently the European report was delivered one month later than expected
Nº 11	Professors questionnaire	Oct. 2013	Done according with the project planning
Nº 12	National Model Report – Professors	Mar. 2014	It was finished later than expected, because people take more time to collect the answers

Nº 13	European cooperation ICT model between companies/ HEI's – Professors' vision	Apr.2014	Consequently the European report was delivered one month later than expected
Nº 14	Students questionnaire	Oct. 2013	Done according with the project planning
Nº 15	National Model Report - Students	Mar. 2014	It was finished later than expected, because people take more time to collect the answers
Nº 16	European cooperation ICT model between companies/ HEI's – Students' vision	Apr.2014	Consequently the European report was delivered one month later than expected
Nº 17	Crowdsourcing and Open Innovation Platform	Apr. 2014	At this stage is not possible to evaluate this output.

B) Sample description

B.1) Companies

Gender

N	Valid	154
	Missing	2
Mode		1

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	masculine	115	73.7	74.7	74.7
	feminine	39	25.0	25.3	100.0
	Total	154	98.7	100.0	
Missing	999	2	1.3		
Total		156	100.0		

We had 73,4% men respondents from companies and only 25% women.

Age

N	Valid	155
	Missing	1

Median	3.00
Mode	3

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	until 24 years	4	2.6	2.6	2.6
	Between 25 and 34 years	39	25.0	25.2	27.7
	Between 35 and 44 years	63	40.4	40.6	68.4
	Between 45 and 54 years	34	21.8	21.9	90.3
	Between 55 and 64 years	13	8.3	8.4	98.7
	More than 65 years	2	1.3	1.3	100.0
	Total	155	99.4	100.0	
Missing	999	1	.6		
Total		156	100.0		

The most representative group have between 35 and 44 years old.

B.2) Student

Gender

N	Valid	559
	Missing	181
Mode		1

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	masculine	392	53.0	70.1	70.1
	feminine	167	22.6	29.9	100.0
	Total	559	75.6	100.0	
Missing	999	180	24.4		

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	masculine	392	53.0	70.1	70.1
	feminine	167	22.6	29.9	100.0
	Total	559	75.6	100.0	
Missing	999	180	24.4		
Total		739	100.0		

Once again we had more respondents from masculine gender than from feminine.

Age

N	Valid	560
	Missing	180
Median		2.00
Mode		1

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Until 24 anos	236	31.9	42.1	42.1
	Between 25 and 34 years	172	23.3	30.7	72.9
	Between 35 and 44 years	87	11.8	15.5	88.4
	Between 45 and 54 years	55	7.4	9.8	98.2
	Between 55 and 64 years	9	1.2	1.6	99.8
	More de 65 years	1	.1	.2	100.0
	Total	560	75.8	100.0	
	Missing	System	179	24.2	
Total		739	100.0		

Most respondents had less than 34 years old (55,2%)

B.3) Professors

Gender

N	Valid	81
	Missing	20
Mode		1

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	masculine	78	94.0	96.3	96.3
	feminine	3	3.6	3.7	100.0
	Total	81	97.6	100.0	
Missing	999	2	2.4		
Total		83	100.0		

Professors are almost all from masculine gender.

Age

N	Valid	82
	Missing	19
Median		4.00
Mode		4

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Between 25 a 34 years	1	1.2	1.2	1.2
	Between 35 a 44 years	27	32.5	32.9	34.1
	Between 45 a 54 years	40	48.2	48.8	82.9
	Between 55 a 64 years	7	8.4	8.5	91.5
	More than 65 years	7	8.4	8.5	100.0
	Total	82	98.8	100.0	
Missing	999	1	1.2		
Total		83	100.0		

Most professors are between 45 and 54 years old.

C) Stakeholders' evaluation

Stakeholders had to answer the following questions:

In order to develop an External Quality Monitoring Report about this assessment we would like you to ask to the following questions:

	Evaluation	I strongly disagree	I disagree	I agree	I strongly agree
9.1	The questionnaire objectives were clear.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9.2	The questionnaire questions were relevant considering the objectives.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9.3	The language used in the questionnaire was adequate to me.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9.4	I will follow the project: Universities – Companies Crowdsourcing.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9.5	I found the assessment interesting.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9.6	I fill in the questionnaire because I trust in the person who sends it.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9.7	The way I was contacted was professional.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9.8	I feel that the assessment was prepared thinking in me and other people with my profile.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9.9	I will share the questionnaire with other colleagues in order to spread the project idea.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9.10	Other:				

The questionnaire objectives were clear.

Companies			Professors			Students		
N	Valid	155	N	Valid	98	N	Valid	557
	Missing	1		Missing	3		Missing	183
Mean		3.01	Mean		2.97	Mean		2.96
Median		3.00	Median		3.00	Median		3.00
Mode		3	Mode		3	Mode		3
Std. Deviation		.664	Std. Deviation		.649	Std. Deviation		.592
Variance		.441	Variance		.422	Variance		.351
Minimum		1	Minimum		1	Minimum		1
Maximum		4	Maximum		4	Maximum		4

By analysing the results we can conclude that questionnaire objectives were clearer to companies than to professors and students. Nevertheless the three stakeholders agree with the question, but some of them may disagree about the clearness of the objectives.

The questionnaire questions were relevant considering the objectives.

Companies			Professors			Students		
N	Valid	155	N	Valid	98	N	Valid	554
	Missing	1		Missing	3		Missing	186
Mean		3.01	Mean		3.00	Mean		3.02
Median		3.00	Median		3.00	Median		3.00

Mode	3	Mode	3	Mode	3
Std. Deviation	.614	Std. Deviation	.609	Std. Deviation	.527
Variance	.376	Variance	.371	Variance	.278
Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	1
Maximum	4	Maximum	4	Maximum	4

By analysing the results we can conclude that questions were relevant considering the objectives for all the three groups. The three groups tend to agree and strongly agree.

The language used in the questionnaire was adequate to me.

Companies			Professors			Students		
N	Valid	154	N	Valid	98	N	Valid	553
	Missing	2		Missing	3		Missing	187
Mean		3.14	Mean		3.06	Mean		3.03
Median		3.00	Median		3.00	Median		3.00
Mode		3	Mode		3	Mode		3
Std. Deviation		.627	Std. Deviation		.715	Std. Deviation		.638
Variance		.393	Variance		.512	Variance		.407
Minimum		1	Minimum		1	Minimum		1
Maximum		4	Maximum		4	Maximum		4

By analysing the results we can conclude that language was adequate to the three groups but companies tend to strongly agree with this question.

I will follow the project: Universities – Companies Crowdsourcing.

Companies			Professors			Students		
N	Valid	155	N	Valid	92	N	Valid	552
	Missing	1		Missing	9		Missing	188
Mean		2.99	Mean		2.92	Mean		2.89
Median		3.00	Median		3.00	Median		3.00
Mode		3	Mode		3	Mode		3
Std. Deviation		.669	Std. Deviation		.759	Std. Deviation		.587
Variance		.448	Variance		.577	Variance		.345
Minimum		1	Minimum		1	Minimum		1
Maximum		4	Maximum		4	Maximum		4

By analysing the results we can assume that they all are intentions of following the project but we can't be sure because a considerable number of them disagree of this question. Students are the less convince to follow the project which should be taken in account when the dissemination of the platform.

I found the assessment interesting.

Companies	Professors	Students
-----------	------------	----------

N	Valid	155	N	Valid	97	N	Valid	555
	Missing	1		Missing	4		Missing	185
Mean		3.01	Mean		2.78	Mean		2.91
Median		3.00	Median		3.00	Median		3.00
Mode		3	Mode		3	Mode		3
Std. Deviation		.655	Std. Deviation		.767	Std. Deviation		.603
Variance		.428	Variance		.588	Variance		.364
Minimum		1	Minimum		1	Minimum		1
Maximum		4	Maximum		4	Maximum		4

By analysing the results we can see that professors are the group considering the assessment less interesting when comparing with companies. This is probably because professors are more exposed to this kind of assessments.

I fill in the questionnaire because I trust in the person who sends it.

Companies			Professors			Students		
N	Valid	155	N	Valid	95	N	Valid	550
	Missing	1		Missing	6		Missing	190
Mean		3.20	Mean		3.16	Mean		2.95
Median		3.00	Median		3.00	Median		3.00
Mode		3	Mode		3	Mode		3
Std. Deviation		.649	Std. Deviation		.748	Std. Deviation		.676
Variance		.421	Variance		.560	Variance		.456
Minimum		1	Minimum		1	Minimum		1
Maximum		4	Maximum		4	Maximum		4

By analysing the results we can conclude that for companies and professors it is very important who contact them to engage in this type of projects. To students this is less important.

The way I was contacted was professional.

Companies			Professors			Students		
N	Valid	155	N	Valid	96	N	Valid	554
	Missing	1		Missing	5		Missing	186
Mean		3.26	Mean		3.19	Mean		3.07
Median		3.00	Median		3.00	Median		3.00
Mode		3	Mode		3	Mode		3
Std. Deviation		.508	Std. Deviation		.685	Std. Deviation		.549
Variance		.258	Variance		.470	Variance		.301
Minimum		2	Minimum		1	Minimum		1
Maximum		4	Maximum		4	Maximum		4

The three groups of respondents considered that the contact was professional and seems to be happy with the way they were involved in the assessment.

I feel that the assessment was prepared thinking in me and other people with my profile.

Companies			Professors			Students		
N	Valid	155	N	Valid	95	N	Valid	553
	Missing	1		Missing	6		Missing	187
Mean		2.83	Mean		2.72	Mean		2.83
Median		3.00	Median		3.00	Median		3.00
Mode		3	Mode		3	Mode		3
Std. Deviation		.701	Std. Deviation		.767	Std. Deviation		.668
Variance		.491	Variance		.589	Variance		.446
Minimum		1	Minimum		1	Minimum		1
Maximum		4	Maximum		4	Maximum		4

Although the respondents felt as the questionnaire was done thinking in their profile we can assume that a great number of them disagree with this question. It is probably because the questionnaire was made to be common to the three groups.

I will share the questionnaire with other colleagues in order to spread the project idea.

Companies			Professors			Students		
N	Valid	155	N	Valid	93	N	Valid	547
	Missing	1		Missing	8		Missing	193
Mean		2.63	Mean		2.70	Mean		2.66
Median		3.00	Median		3.00	Median		3.00
Mode		3	Mode		3	Mode		3
Std. Deviation		.845	Std. Deviation		.857	Std. Deviation		.728
Variance		.715	Variance		.734	Variance		.529
Minimum		1	Minimum		1	Minimum		1
Maximum		4	Maximum		4	Maximum		4

By analysing the results we can say that respondents aren't motivated to share the questionnaire with other colleagues as the project team would like.

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

The outputs are being done according with the original plan and even with a small delay (one month delayed) I believe that the partnership will be capable of accomplished the main deadlines. Partners are work as a team and it seems that the entire are committed with project results.

Regarding the first project' products we can say that results were good in terms of satisfaction but we recommend the following points to the future:

- 1) The future contacts should be made for people that stakeholders respect in order to have more people who engage in the platform;
- 2) The project team should prepare specific messages according with each stakeholder in order to involved them in the platform;
- 3) It seems that stakeholders are not available to spread the platform among their peers which should be analysed by the project team.