



Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

# **Vocational Training Center for Undergraduate University Students and Teachers in Jordan (VTC)**

WP7: Quality Control and Monitoring

Prepared by  
Dr. Mohammad Al-Smairan

September 2018



Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

## 1.Introduction

Workforce is the most important element of the production, the mainstay of achieving the objectives of the overall development, progress and welfare and provides a decent life for people in any society. The Arab world is characterized by its human resources and in particular a high proportion of young people compared with major regions in the world. Jordan's main wealth is mainly its human resources. With more than 30 universities with more than 250,000 students in Jordan, Jordan is among the highest university student/capita in the world. Although Jordanian universities provide excellent theoretical based education, Jordanian students and graduates have major deficiencies in skills and competencies needed by the market. This makes Jordanian graduates less competitive in regional and global markets.

Vocational education and training is an important element of the nation's education system. Unfortunately, the education system in Jordan and in most of the Arab World does not consider vocational training among its priorities; thus, students are graduated with major deficiencies in skills and competencies that are needed in the market

### 1.1 General objectives

- The general objective of the project is the improvement of vocational education systems in Jordan in line with European standards and Bologna Declaration principles.
- Another target of this project is Building a strong and deep connection between higher education, society and enterprises. Specifics of Target groups like students and teachers in Jordan.

### 1.2 Specific objectives

- 1. Establishing a training center to train skills for graduate / undergraduate university students.
- 2. Building a positive and productive relationship with EU-universities in the academic and cultural fields.
- 3. Transfer the EU-Experience in the areas of technical training, skills development and merge new generations in this experience.
- 4. Establishing a national network specializing in vocational training in Jordan.
- 5. Develop curricula materials in the areas of training and capacity development by majors.
- 6. Provide the student with skills and experiences related to problems that differentially affect people in Jordan and in developing countries.
- 7. Expose trainees to career options related to majors in community development and publication

### 1.3 Expected results

- 1. WP1: PRE: Review, State of the art and Network between partner
- 2. WP2: DEV: Assessment studies for the needs of students
- 3. WP3: DEV: Employment sector database
- 4. WP4: DEV: Purchase of teaching equipment and bibliographic material
- 5. WP5: DEV: Make vocational skill competency development an integrated part in Teaching
- 6. WP6: DEV: Career guidance and outselling programs for the career sector
- 7. WP7: QPLN: Quality control and monitoring
- 8. WP8: DESS: Project Dissemination
- 9. WP9: DESS: Exploitation of results and sustainability
- 10. WP10: MNGT: Coordination and management of the project.



Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

## 2. Quality plan

### 2.1 Introduction

During all the project phases the project partner's control the following:

- - The project phases are strictly directed to project work plan;
- - The input at the different project phases accords with the planned activities;
- - The output/outcomes are in line with the aimed outcomes;

These actions will be done through:

- - The project evaluation by the involved academic staff;
- - The project evaluation by the involved the EU specialists;
  
- - The project evaluation by the members of the steering committee.

#### Tasks

- ✓ Task 7.1. Quality control, monitoring and budgetary control.
- ✓ Task 7.2. Check of courses materials & courses & vocational systems.
- ✓ Task 7.3. Project task supervision, result evaluation and examination of courses results.

### 2.2 Tools

The tools presented in the Annexes are meant to check and measure processes and outputs during the project development and evaluate it at the end. Different categories of tools are devised, in accordance to what is described in the introduction ('internal' monitoring and 'external' evaluation):

- ✓ The Logical Framework Matrix (see original project document) represents a control list to assess any progress and the rate of success of project activities in relation to specific objectives and expected results.
- ✓ Check lists (Annexes A, B and C) are used as preventive actions to ensure smooth development of specific project activities, through the control of any steps needed for the achievement of the results.
- ✓ Evaluation questionnaires (Annexes D, E and F), are used as means to assess the outcomes of specific project activities carried out and to take corrective measures for the critical issues which will be outlined through these tools.

## 3. Monitoring and evaluation process

### 3.1 Introduction

The quality plan and process quality standard are closely related to the monitoring and evaluation strategy: the strategy includes both:

1. an internal monitoring process and
2. an evaluation procedure which will measure the 'external' impact of the project.

Internal project monitoring will concern two levels:

- (i) the management issues and
- (ii) the technical issues.



Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

The evaluation strategy implements therefore the function of internal control of the project that is a process designed to provide reasonable assurance of the achievement of objectives with regards to:

- (a) effectiveness and efficiency of operations,
- (b) reliability of financial reporting, and
- (b) compliance with applicable laws and regulations.

It implies adequate allocation of tasks and duties within the partner organizations and regular checks.

### 3.2 The tools

The evaluation strategy will include appropriate tools, devised to assess on an ongoing basis project relevance, efficiency and impact:

- (1) to measure progress throughout its life cycle,
- (2) to determine if the project responds to main target groups' needs,
- (3) to measure the level of satisfaction of beneficiaries of project activities,
- (4) to determine how project impacts on social communities,
- (5) to evaluate unexpected results and control all processes.

The tools will be delivered to the appropriate target groups over the project duration, according to the activity schedule.

The tools presented in the Annexes are meant to check and measure processes and outputs during the project development and evaluate it at the end. Different categories of tools are devised, in accordance to what is described in the introduction ('internal' monitoring and 'external' evaluation):

- ✓ The **Logical Framework Matrix** (see **original project document**) represents a control list to assess any progress and the rate of success of project activities in relation to specific objectives and expected results.
- ✓ **Check lists** (**Annexes A, B and C**) are used as preventive actions to ensure smooth development of specific project activities, through the control of any steps needed for the achievement of the results.
- ✓ **Evaluation questionnaires** (**Annexes D, E and F**), are used as means to assess the outcomes of specific project activities carried out and to take corrective measures for the critical issues which will be outlined through these tools.

Two annual progress report, one interim report (at the end of the first contractual one and half year) and one final report will be written and sent to EACEA, including a narrative section in which the advancement within the different tasks, any problems within the partnership, the communication and visibility actions launched, the interchange of knowledge and experience will be described. Moreover, any modification to the initial planning will be mentioned and reasons for changes or delays will be given, as well as the measures adopted for facing difficulties or delays will be mentioned. Also the degree of achievement of programme indicators, strategic indicators and specific project indicators will be measured on occasion of the interim and final report.



Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

### **(A) Check list for managing project meetings**

(Dead Sea, Jordan, 23-25.02.2016)

#### **Partner 1**

##### **Preparation**

	<b>Done? (✓)</b>
Clarify the objectives of the meeting	✓
Confirm who will attend/participate and who will chair the meeting	✓
Confirm the date, time and location of the meeting with participants	✓
Prepare a draft agenda and distribute it for comments/additions	✓
Allocate subtasks to be carried out among the human resources in charge	✓
Assemble relevant data/information (including management/monitoring reports) and distribute copies in advance to those attending the review meeting	✓
Organize other logistics for the meeting (e.g. secretarial support, transport, venue, required equipment/materials for presentations, refreshments, etc.)	✓

##### **The meeting**

	<b>Done? (✓)</b>
The available time is effectively managed, based on the agreed agenda/timetable	✓
Each participant is given adequate opportunity to share his/her views (the meeting is not dominated by the loudest/most talkative)	✓
Key issues are clarified	✓
Supporting material is distributed	✓
Disagreements are cordially solved	✓
A problem solving approach is taken	✓
Agreement is reached (by consensus or vote) on key actions that need to be taken	✓
An accurate record of discussions and decisions is taken	✓
Meeting objectives are achieved	✓

##### **Follow-up**

	<b>Done? (✓)</b>
Finalization and dissemination of a record of key decisions taken/agreements reached	✓
Revision to action plan and/or time schedule if/as required	✓



Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

## Partner 2

### Preparation

	Done? (✓)
Clarify the objectives of the meeting	✓
Confirm who will attend/participate and who will chair the meeting	✓
Confirm the date, time and location of the meeting with participants	✓
Prepare a draft agenda and distribute it for comments/additions	✓
Allocate subtasks to be carried out among the human resources in charge	✓
Assemble relevant data/information (including management/monitoring reports) and distribute copies in advance to those attending the review meeting	✓
Organize other logistics for the meeting (e.g. secretarial support, transport, venue, required equipment/materials for presentations, refreshments, etc.)	✓

### The meeting

	Done? (✓)
The available time is effectively managed, based on the agreed agenda/timetable	✓
Each participant is given adequate opportunity to share his/her views (the meeting is not dominated by the loudest/most talkative)	✓
Key issues are clarified	✓
Supporting material is distributed	✓
Disagreements are cordially solved	✓
A problem solving approach is taken	✓
Agreement is reached (by consensus or vote) on key actions that need to be taken	✓
An accurate record of discussions and decisions is taken	✓
Meeting objectives are achieved	✓

### Follow-up

	Done? (✓)
Finalization and dissemination of a record of key decisions taken/agreements reached	✓
Revision to action plan and/or time schedule if/as required	✓



Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

### Partner 3

#### Preparation

	Done? (✓)
Clarify the objectives of the meeting	✓
Confirm who will attend/participate and who will chair the meeting	✓
Confirm the date, time and location of the meeting with participants	✓
Prepare a draft agenda and distribute it for comments/additions	✓
Allocate subtasks to be carried out among the human resources in charge	✓
Assemble relevant data/information (including management/monitoring reports) and distribute copies in advance to those attending the review meeting	✓
Organize other logistics for the meeting (e.g. secretarial support, transport, venue, required equipment/materials for presentations, refreshments, etc.)	✓

#### The meeting

	Done? (✓)
The available time is effectively managed, based on the agreed agenda/timetable	✓
Each participant is given adequate opportunity to share his/her views (the meeting is not dominated by the loudest/most talkative)	✓
Key issues are clarified	✓
Supporting material is distributed	✓
Disagreements are cordially solved	✓
A problem solving approach is taken	✓
Agreement is reached (by consensus or vote) on key actions that need to be taken	✓
An accurate record of discussions and decisions is taken	✓
Meeting objectives are achieved	✓

#### Follow-up

	Done? (✓)
Finalization and dissemination of a record of key decisions taken/agreements reached	✓
Revision to action plan and/or time schedule if/as required	✓



Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

## Partner 4

### Preparation

	Done? (✓)
Clarify the objectives of the meeting	✓
Confirm who will attend/participate and who will chair the meeting	✓
Confirm the date, time and location of the meeting with participants	✓
Prepare a draft agenda and distribute it for comments/additions	✓
Allocate subtasks to be carried out among the human resources in charge	✓
Assemble relevant data/information (including management/monitoring reports) and distribute copies in advance to those attending the review meeting	✓
Organize other logistics for the meeting (e.g. secretarial support, transport, venue, required equipment/materials for presentations, refreshments, etc.)	✓

### The meeting

	Done? (✓)
The available time is effectively managed, based on the agreed agenda/timetable	✓
Each participant is given adequate opportunity to share his/her views (the meeting is not dominated by the loudest/most talkative)	✓
Key issues are clarified	✓
Supporting material is distributed	✓
Disagreements are cordially solved	✓
A problem solving approach is taken	✓
Agreement is reached (by consensus or vote) on key actions that need to be taken	✓
An accurate record of discussions and decisions is taken	✓
Meeting objectives are achieved	✓

### Follow-up

	Done? (✓)
Finalization and dissemination of a record of key decisions taken/agreements reached	✓
Revision to action plan and/or time schedule if/as required	✓





Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

## Partner 5

### Preparation

	Done? (✓)
Clarify the objectives of the meeting	✓
Confirm who will attend/participate and who will chair the meeting	✓
Confirm the date, time and location of the meeting with participants	✓
Prepare a draft agenda and distribute it for comments/additions	✓
Allocate subtasks to be carried out among the human resources in charge	✓
Assemble relevant data/information (including management/monitoring reports) and distribute copies in advance to those attending the review meeting	✓
Organize other logistics for the meeting (e.g. secretarial support, transport, venue, required equipment/materials for presentations, refreshments, etc.)	✓

### The meeting

	Done? (✓)
The available time is effectively managed, based on the agreed agenda/timetable	✓
Each participant is given adequate opportunity to share his/her views (the meeting is not dominated by the loudest/most talkative)	✓
Key issues are clarified	✓
Supporting material is distributed	✓
Disagreements are cordially solved	✓
A problem solving approach is taken	✓
Agreement is reached (by consensus or vote) on key actions that need to be taken	✓
An accurate record of discussions and decisions is taken	✓
Meeting objectives are achieved	✓

### Follow-up

	Done? (✓)
Finalization and dissemination of a record of key decisions taken/agreements reached	✓
Revision to action plan and/or time schedule if/as required	✓



Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

(Leipzig, Germany, 26-29. 10. 2016)

## Partner 1

### Preparation

	Done? (✓)
Clarify the objectives of the meeting	✓
Confirm who will attend/participate and who will chair the meeting	✓
Confirm the date, time and location of the meeting with participants	✓
Prepare a draft agenda and distribute it for comments/additions	✓
Allocate subtasks to be carried out among the human resources in charge	✓
Assemble relevant data/information (including management/monitoring reports) and distribute copies in advance to those attending the review meeting	✓
Organize other logistics for the meeting (e.g. secretarial support, transport, venue, required equipment/materials for presentations, refreshments, etc.)	✓

### The meeting

	Done? (✓)
The available time is effectively managed, based on the agreed agenda/timetable	✓
Each participant is given adequate opportunity to share his/her views (the meeting is not dominated by the loudest/most talkative)	✓
Key issues are clarified	✓
Supporting material is distributed	✓
Disagreements are cordially solved	✓
A problem solving approach is taken	✓
Agreement is reached (by consensus or vote) on key actions that need to be taken	✓
An accurate record of discussions and decisions is taken	✓
Meeting objectives are achieved	✓

### Follow-up

	Done? (✓)
Finalization and dissemination of a record of key decisions taken/agreements reached	✓
Revision to action plan and/or time schedule if/as required	✓



Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

## Partner 2

### Preparation

	Done? (✓)
Clarify the objectives of the meeting	✓
Confirm who will attend/participate and who will chair the meeting	✓
Confirm the date, time and location of the meeting with participants	✓
Prepare a draft agenda and distribute it for comments/additions	✓
Allocate subtasks to be carried out among the human resources in charge	✓
Assemble relevant data/information (including management/monitoring reports) and distribute copies in advance to those attending the review meeting	✓
Organize other logistics for the meeting (e.g. secretarial support, transport, venue, required equipment/materials for presentations, refreshments, etc.)	✓

### The meeting

	Done? (✓)
The available time is effectively managed, based on the agreed agenda/timetable	✓
Each participant is given adequate opportunity to share his/her views (the meeting is not dominated by the loudest/most talkative)	✓
Key issues are clarified	✓
Supporting material is distributed	✓
Disagreements are cordially solved	✓
A problem solving approach is taken	✓
Agreement is reached (by consensus or vote) on key actions that need to be taken	✓
An accurate record of discussions and decisions is taken	✓
Meeting objectives are achieved	✓

### Follow-up

	Done? (✓)
Finalization and dissemination of a record of key decisions taken/agreements reached	✓
Revision to action plan and/or time schedule if/as required	✓



Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

### Partner 3

#### Preparation

	Done? (✓)
Clarify the objectives of the meeting	✓
Confirm who will attend/participate and who will chair the meeting	✓
Confirm the date, time and location of the meeting with participants	✓
Prepare a draft agenda and distribute it for comments/additions	✓
Allocate subtasks to be carried out among the human resources in charge	✓
Assemble relevant data/information (including management/monitoring reports) and distribute copies in advance to those attending the review meeting	✓
Organize other logistics for the meeting (e.g. secretarial support, transport, venue, required equipment/materials for presentations, refreshments, etc.)	✓

#### The meeting

	Done? (✓)
The available time is effectively managed, based on the agreed agenda/timetable	✓
Each participant is given adequate opportunity to share his/her views (the meeting is not dominated by the loudest/most talkative)	✓
Key issues are clarified	✓
Supporting material is distributed	✓
Disagreements are cordially solved	✓
A problem solving approach is taken	✓
Agreement is reached (by consensus or vote) on key actions that need to be taken	✓
An accurate record of discussions and decisions is taken	✓
Meeting objectives are achieved	✓

#### Follow-up

	Done? (✓)
Finalization and dissemination of a record of key decisions taken/agreements reached	✓
Revision to action plan and/or time schedule if/as required	✓



Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

## Partner 4

### Preparation

	Done? (✓)
Clarify the objectives of the meeting	✓
Confirm who will attend/participate and who will chair the meeting	✓
Confirm the date, time and location of the meeting with participants	✓
Prepare a draft agenda and distribute it for comments/additions	✓
Allocate subtasks to be carried out among the human resources in charge	✓
Assemble relevant data/information (including management/monitoring reports) and distribute copies in advance to those attending the review meeting	✓
Organize other logistics for the meeting (e.g. secretarial support, transport, venue, required equipment/materials for presentations, refreshments, etc.)	✓

### The meeting

	Done? (✓)
The available time is effectively managed, based on the agreed agenda/timetable	✓
Each participant is given adequate opportunity to share his/her views (the meeting is not dominated by the loudest/most talkative)	✓
Key issues are clarified	✓
Supporting material is distributed	✓
Disagreements are cordially solved	✓
A problem solving approach is taken	✓
Agreement is reached (by consensus or vote) on key actions that need to be taken	✓
An accurate record of discussions and decisions is taken	✓
Meeting objectives are achieved	✓

### Follow-up

	Done? (✓)
Finalization and dissemination of a record of key decisions taken/agreements reached	✓
Revision to action plan and/or time schedule if/as required	✓



Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

**(B) Check list for reviewing administrative and management records**

**Partner 1**

	<b>Done? (✓)</b>
Are appropriate records being kept, and are they up to date?	✓
Are those responsible for keeping the records clear about their responsibilities and the record keeping procedures/systems?	✓
Are record keeping systems and procedures appropriately documented (i.e. guidelines)?	✓
Is the quality of information periodically checked and verified?	✓
Is an appropriate level/type of training in record keeping systems provided to staff?	✓
Is appropriate technology being used to record, analyze and report information?	✓
Are adequate resources available to support effective record keeping and information management?	✓
Are records and reports securely stored and easily retrieved?	✓
Is the information summarized and reported to the Lead Partner on a regular basis, and is it then made available to the Lead Partner in a clear and usable format?	✓
Is the information presented in a timely manner, and is it used by the partner to help them make informed decisions?	✓



Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

## Partner 2

	Done? (✓)
Are appropriate records being kept, and are they up to date?	✓
Are those responsible for keeping the records clear about their responsibilities and the record keeping procedures/systems?	✓
Are record keeping systems and procedures appropriately documented (i.e. guidelines)?	✓
Is the quality of information periodically checked and verified?	✓
Is an appropriate level/type of training in record keeping systems provided to staff?	✓
Is appropriate technology being used to record, analyze and report information?	✓
Are adequate resources available to support effective record keeping and information management?	✓
Are records and reports securely stored and easily retrieved?	✓
Is the information summarized and reported to the Lead Partner on a regular basis, and is it then made available to the Lead Partner in a clear and usable format?	✓
Is the information presented in a timely manner, and is it used by the partner to help them make informed decisions?	✓



Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

### Partner 3

	Done? (✓)
Are appropriate records being kept, and are they up to date?	✓
Are those responsible for keeping the records clear about their responsibilities and the record keeping procedures/systems?	✓
Are record keeping systems and procedures appropriately documented (i.e. guidelines)?	✓
Is the quality of information periodically checked and verified?	✓
Is an appropriate level/type of training in record keeping systems provided to staff?	✓
Is appropriate technology being used to record, analyze and report information?	✓
Are adequate resources available to support effective record keeping and information management?	✓
Are records and reports securely stored and easily retrieved?	✓
Is the information summarized and reported to the Lead Partner on a regular basis, and is it then made available to the Lead Partner in a clear and usable format?	✓
Is the information presented in a timely manner, and is it used by the partner to help them make informed decisions?	✓





Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

#### Partner 4

	Done? (✓)
Are appropriate records being kept, and are they up to date?	✓
Are those responsible for keeping the records clear about their responsibilities and the record keeping procedures/systems?	✓
Are record keeping systems and procedures appropriately documented (i.e. guidelines)?	✓
Is the quality of information periodically checked and verified?	✓
Is an appropriate level/type of training in record keeping systems provided to staff?	✓
Is appropriate technology being used to record, analyze and report information?	✓
Are adequate resources available to support effective record keeping and information management?	✓
Are records and reports securely stored and easily retrieved?	✓
Is the information summarized and reported to the Lead Partner on a regular basis, and is it then made available to the Lead Partner in a clear and usable format?	✓
Is the information presented in a timely manner, and is it used by the partner to help them make informed decisions?	✓



Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

## Partner 5

	Done? (✓)
Are appropriate records being kept, and are they up to date?	✓
Are those responsible for keeping the records clear about their responsibilities and the record keeping procedures/systems?	✓
Are record keeping systems and procedures appropriately documented (i.e. guidelines)?	✓
Is the quality of information periodically checked and verified?	✓
Is an appropriate level/type of training in record keeping systems provided to staff?	✓
Is appropriate technology being used to record, analyze and report information?	✓
Are adequate resources available to support effective record keeping and information management?	✓
Are records and reports securely stored and easily retrieved?	✓
Is the information summarized and reported to the Lead Partner on a regular basis, and is it then made available to the Lead Partner in a clear and usable format?	✓
Is the information presented in a timely manner, and is it used by the partner to help them make informed decisions?	✓



Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

## Partner 6

	Done? (✓)
Are appropriate records being kept, and are they up to date?	✓
Are those responsible for keeping the records clear about their responsibilities and the record keeping procedures/systems?	✓
Are record keeping systems and procedures appropriately documented (i.e. guidelines)?	✓
Is the quality of information periodically checked and verified?	✓
Is an appropriate level/type of training in record keeping systems provided to staff?	✓
Is appropriate technology being used to record, analyze and report information?	✓
Are adequate resources available to support effective record keeping and information management?	✓
Are records and reports securely stored and easily retrieved?	✓
Is the information summarized and reported to the Lead Partner on a regular basis, and is it then made available to the Lead Partner in a clear and usable format?	✓
Is the information presented in a timely manner, and is it used by the partner to help them make informed decisions?	✓



Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

## Partner 7

	Done? (✓)
Are appropriate records being kept, and are they up to date?	✓
Are those responsible for keeping the records clear about their responsibilities and the record keeping procedures/systems?	✓
Are record keeping systems and procedures appropriately documented (i.e. guidelines)?	✓
Is the quality of information periodically checked and verified?	
Is an appropriate level/type of training in record keeping systems provided to staff?	✓
Is appropriate technology being used to record, analyze and report information?	✓
Are adequate resources available to support effective record keeping and information management?	✓
Are records and reports securely stored and easily retrieved?	✓
Is the information summarized and reported to the Lead Partner on a regular basis, and is it then made available to the Lead Partner in a clear and usable format?	✓
Is the information presented in a timely manner, and is it used by the partner to help them make informed decisions?	✓



Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

**(C) Intermediate evaluation of the project management by the partners**

**Partner 1**

	Completely Negative	Partially Positive	Fully Positive	Exceeded Expectations
Have you been actively involved in the project development?		✓		
Is the project coordination as much incisive as it should be?			✓	
How is communication between partners?			✓	
Are you satisfied with the implementation of the project activities?			✓	
Is the project calendar well structured?		✓		
Is the tasks sharing well distributed among partners?			✓	
Do you receive feedbacks from the coordinator when requested on time?			✓	
How do you rate overall the project management for the period of the last year?			✓	

**Do you have any comments/suggestions?**



Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

## Partner 2

	Completely Negative	Partially Positive	Fully Positive	Exceeded Expectations
Have you been actively involved in the project development?			√	
Is the project coordination as much incisive as it should be?			√	
How is communication between partners?			√	
Are you satisfied with the implementation of the project activities?			√	
Is the project calendar well structured?			√	
Is the tasks sharing well distributed among partners?		√		
Do you receive feedbacks from the coordinator when requested on time?			√	
How do you rate overall the project management for the period of the last year?			√	

**Do you have any comments/suggestions?**



**Partner 3**



Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

	Completely Negative	Partially Positive	Fully Positive	Exceeded Expectations
Have you been actively involved in the project development?		✓		
Is the project coordination as much incisive as it should be?			✓	
How is communication between partners?			✓	
Are you satisfied with the implementation of the project activities?			✓	
Is the project calendar well structured?			✓	
Is the tasks sharing well distributed among partners?			✓	
Do you receive feedbacks from the coordinator when requested on time?				✓
How do you rate overall the project management for the period of the last year?			✓	

**Do you have any comments/suggestions?**



Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

#### Partner 4

	Completely Negative	Partially Positive	Fully Positive	Exceeded Expectations
Have you been actively involved in the project development?		✓		
Is the project coordination as much incisive as it should be?			✓	
How is communication between partners?			✓	
Are you satisfied with the implementation of the project activities?			✓	
Is the project calendar well structured?			✓	
Is the tasks sharing well distributed among partners?			✓	
Do you receive feedbacks from the coordinator when requested on time?				✓
How do you rate overall the project management for the period of the last year?			✓	

**Do you have any comments/suggestions?**





Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

### Partner 5

	Completely Negative	Partially Positive	Fully Positive	Exceeded Expectations
Have you been actively involved in the project development?		✓		
Is the project coordination as much incisive as it should be?		✓		
How is communication between partners?		✓		
Are you satisfied with the implementation of the project activities?		✓		
Is the project calendar well structured?		✓		
Is the tasks sharing well distributed among partners?			✓	
Do you receive feedbacks from the coordinator when requested on time?		✓		
How do you rate overall the project management for the period of the last year?		✓		

**Do you have any comments/suggestions**



Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

## Partner 6

	Completely Negative	Partially Positive	Fully Positive	Exceeded Expectations
Have you been actively involved in the project development?			√	
Is the project coordination as much incisive as it should be?			√	
How is communication between partners?			√	
Are you satisfied with the implementation of the project activities?			√	
Is the project calendar well structured?			√	
Is the tasks sharing well distributed among partners?		√		
Do you receive feedbacks from the coordinator when requested on time?			√	
How do you rate overall the project management for the period of the last year?			√	

**Do you have any comments/suggestions?**



Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

### Partner 7

	Completely Negative	Partially Positive	Fully Positive	Exceeded Expectations
Have you been actively involved in the project development?		✓		
Is the project coordination as much incisive as it should be?			✓	
How is communication between partners?			✓	
Are you satisfied with the implementation of the project activities?		✓		
Is the project calendar well structured?			✓	
Is the tasks sharing well distributed among partners?		✓		
Do you receive feedbacks from the coordinator when requested on time?			✓	
How do you rate overall the project management for the period of the last year?			✓	

**Do you have any comments/suggestions?**



Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

## Partner 8

	Completely Negative	Partially Positive	Fully Positive	Exceeded Expectations
Have you been actively involved in the project development?			X	
Is the project coordination as much incisive as it should be?			X	
How is communication between partners?		X		
Are you satisfied with the implementation of the project activities?		X		
Is the project calendar well structured?			X	
Is the tasks sharing well distributed among partners?			X	
Do you receive feedbacks from the coordinator when requested on time?			X	
How do you rate overall the project management for the period of the last year?			X	

**Do you have any comments/suggestions?**



Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

## Partner 9

	Completely Negative	Partially Positive	Fully Positive	Exceeded Expectations
Have you been actively involved in the project development?			X	
Is the project coordination as much incisive as it should be?			X	
How is communication between partners?			X	
Are you satisfied with the implementation of the project activities?			X	
Is the project calendar well structured?			X	
Is the tasks sharing well distributed among partners?			X	
Do you receive feedbacks from the coordinator when requested on time?			X	
How do you rate overall the project management for the period of the last year?			X	

**Do you have any comments/suggestions?**




Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

### **(D)Satisfaction Questionnaire for Services Delivered: Training**

Trainers from Jordan Universities have been participated in three visit to EU countries and one in Jordan. The first one was in Portugal. The second one was in Slovakia. The third one was in Germany, and the last one was in Jordan,

Different workshops have been conducted at Jordan Universities during the last period for students and teachers.


Examples of these workshops: Career Planning for Undergraduate Students, Cloud Computing workshop, SLOVAK Training Workshop, PORTUGAL Training Workshop and MONOJO Training Workshop





Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

group: students





Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

### Trainers only1

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
E1	Portugal	16	5.2292	.46696	4.33	6.00
	Slovakia	8	5.0000	.43644	4.00	5.33
	Germany	0	.	.	.	.
	Spain	10	5.4667	.47661	4.67	6.00
	Total	34	5.2451	.48066	4.00	6.00
Sat1	Portugal	16	5.0000	.84327	2.67	6.00
	Slovakia	8	4.3750	.86258	3.00	5.33
	Germany	0	.	.	.	.
	Spain	10	5.1000	.75441	3.67	6.00
	Total	34	4.8824	.84838	2.67	6.00
Import	Portugal	16	5.3333	.47140	4.67	6.00
	Slovakia	8	4.7917	.39591	4.00	5.00
	Germany	0	.	.	.	.
	Spain	10	5.5333	.52587	4.67	6.00
	Total	34	5.2647	.53673	4.00	6.00
E2	Portugal	11	5.1136	.41629	4.25	6.00
	Slovakia	8	5.1406	.70533	3.63	5.75
	Germany	6	5.0000	.59687	4.50	6.00
	Spain	8	5.3281	.50858	4.38	6.00
	Total	33	5.1515	.53652	3.63	6.00
Sat2	Portugal	10	5.1250	.23570	4.63	5.50
	Slovakia	8	4.4531	.89127	3.13	5.63
	Germany	6	4.2708	.37430	4.00	5.00
	Spain	8	5.0781	.62299	4.00	6.00
	Total	32	4.7852	.66693	3.13	6.00
Import2	Portugal	11	5.2727	.45352	4.38	6.00
	Slovakia	8	5.2656	.76601	3.75	5.88
	Germany	6	4.0833	.57373	3.63	5.13
	Spain	8	5.2500	.63033	4.25	6.00
	Total	33	5.0492	.73815	3.63	6.00





Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union


#### ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
E1	Between Groups	.976	2	.488	2.274	.120
	Within Groups	6.649	31	.214		
	Total	7.624	33			
Sat1	Between Groups	2.754	2	1.377	2.033	.148
	Within Groups	20.997	31	.677		
	Total	23.752	33			
Import	Between Groups	2.587	2	1.294	5.795	.007
	Within Groups	6.919	31	.223		
	Total	9.507	33			
E2	Between Groups	.404	3	.135	.443	.724
	Within Groups	8.807	29	.304		
	Total	9.211	32			
Sat2	Between Groups	4.311	3	1.437	4.245	.014
	Within Groups	9.478	28	.338		
	Total	13.789	31			
Import2	Between Groups	6.844	3	2.281	6.247	.002
	Within Groups	10.591	29	.365		
	Total	17.436	32			




Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

## Means Plots






Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union






Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union






Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union






Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union





Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union





Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

### Students only

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
E1	Portugal	25	5.1600	.74610	3.33	6.00
	Slovakia	34	5.0098	.62757	3.33	6.00
	Monojo	17	5.5098	.55425	4.00	6.00
	Total	76	5.1711	.67439	3.33	6.00
Sat1	Portugal	26	5.3077	.82151	2.33	6.00
	Slovakia	33	4.8485	.67232	3.00	6.00
	Monojo	17	5.5490	.51291	4.33	6.00
	Total	76	5.1623	.74733	2.33	6.00
Import	Portugal	25	5.5067	.46268	4.33	6.00
	Slovakia	32	5.3021	.66321	3.67	6.00
	Monojo	17	5.7059	.43910	4.67	6.00
	Total	74	5.4640	.57023	3.67	6.00
E2	Portugal	51	5.0049	.86094	2.00	6.00
	Slovakia	50	5.0050	.69435	3.25	6.00
	Monojo	12	5.7708	.25469	5.38	6.00
	Total	113	5.0863	.77742	2.00	6.00
Sat2	Portugal	52	5.0962	.87153	2.00	6.00
	Slovakia	49	5.0230	.60039	3.75	6.00
	Monojo	12	5.6354	.37484	5.00	6.00
	Total	113	5.1217	.73960	2.00	6.00
Import2	Portugal	51	5.0588	1.00789	2.00	6.00
	Slovakia	47	5.2500	.58165	3.63	6.00
	Monojo	12	5.7083	.38188	4.88	6.00
	Total	110	5.2114	.81376	2.00	6.00





Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union


#### ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
E1	Between Groups	2.838	2	1.419	3.312	.042
	Within Groups	31.272	73	.428		
	Total	34.110	75			
Sat1	Between Groups	6.342	2	3.171	6.512	.002
	Within Groups	35.546	73	.487		
	Total	41.887	75			
Import	Between Groups	1.879	2	.940	3.052	.054
	Within Groups	21.858	71	.308		
	Total	23.737	73			
E2	Between Groups	6.291	2	3.146	5.636	.005
	Within Groups	61.399	110	.558		
	Total	67.690	112			
Sat2	Between Groups	3.679	2	1.839	3.513	.033
	Within Groups	57.586	110	.524		
	Total	61.264	112			
Import2	Between Groups	4.221	2	2.110	3.323	.040
	Within Groups	67.959	107	.635		
	Total	72.180	109			




Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

## Means Plots






Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union






Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union






Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union






Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union





Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union





Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

## **Results analysis :**

### **General Comments for all Evaluation Criteria**

- 1- The average of Evaluation (Exp., Sat. Imp.) is about 5 with stand and deviation about 0.6.
- 2- It is noted that the data are non-Symmetric and Skewed to the left.

## **Trainers**

### **Part 1: Comments for Overall assessment of organization....**

It is noted that there is not any difference between the countries regarding trainers for the expectation, Satisfaction because the P-value is  $\alpha > 0.05$ , while there is a difference about the importance ( $\alpha < 0.05$ ) and hence Spain is the best one with a mean of (5.5333).

### **Part 2: Evaluation of quality of training session:**

- a) Regarding expectation there is not any difference between the countries ( $\alpha = 0.724$ ).
- b) For the satisfaction it found that Portugal is the best one where ( $\alpha = 0.014$ ) with mean of (5.125).
- c) For the importance, it turns out that Portugal is the best country for this criteria with ( $\alpha = 0.022$ ) and mean of (5.2727)

So we can say that again is attained for trainers by Portugal in two criteria, namely; satisfaction and importance.





Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

## Students

### Part 1: Comments for Overall assessment of organization....

- 1) For the expectation we found that  $\alpha=0.042$  which indicates that the results for the students are different based on the place of training. That is due to  $\alpha=0.42$  and Monojo is the best one with mean of 5.5098.
- 2) The result showed that there is no difference between the Portugal, Slovakia and Monojo about the importance.
- 3) The table of students' training analysis showed that  $\alpha=0.002$  for the satisfaction and hence Monojo is the preferred with mean of 5.549 with standard deviation 0.51291.

Therefore, based on the above comments we can conclude that Monojo is the best one which gives the good training due to the students questionnaire analysis.

### Part 2: Evaluation of quality of training session:

#### 1) Expectation:

Since  $\alpha=0.005$  for the expectation of the evaluation based on students' opinions. We can say that Portugal, Slovakia and Monojo are equivalent.

#### 2) Satisfaction:

The ANOVA table indicates that  $\alpha=0.033$  for the satisfaction criteria and that Monojo is more powerful than Portugal and Slovakia with mean of 5.6354.

3) Finally, since  $\alpha=0.040$ , then Monojo achieved the highest mean 5.7083 with standard deviation of 0.38188 as compared to 5.0588 and 5.25 the means of Portugal and Slovakia respectively.



Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

## **(E) Satisfaction Questionnaire for Project Meetings**

### **Partner 1**

### ***QUESTIONNAIRE***

#### **OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF ORGANIZATION OF THE PROJECT MEETING**

<b>1</b>	<b>EXPECTATION</b> [ 1..6 ]	<b>SATISFACTION</b> [ 1..6 ]	<b>IMPORTANCE</b> [ 1..6 ]
1.1 Information related to logistics	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
1.2 Preparatory documents	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
1.3 Agenda	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>

#### **EVALUATION OF LEVEL OF COMMITMENT**

<b>2</b>	<b>EXPECTATION</b> [ 1..6 ]	<b>SATISFACTION</b> [ 1..6 ]	<b>IMPORTANCE</b> [ 1..6 ]
2.1 Participation of other partners	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>
2.2 Contribution to meeting sessions from other partners	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
2.3 Relevance and clarity of topics	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
2.4 Achievement of the targets of the meeting	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>



Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

**Partner 2**

### ***QUESTIONNAIRE***

#### **OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF ORGANIZATION OF THE PROJECT MEETING**

<b>1</b>	<b>EXPECTATION [ 1..6 ]</b>	<b>SATISFACTION [ 1..6 ]</b>	<b>IMPORTANCE [ 1..6 ]</b>
1.1 Information related to logistics	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>
1.2 Preparatory documents	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>
1.3 Agenda	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>

#### **EVALUATION OF LEVEL OF COMMITMENT**

<b>2</b>	<b>EXPECTATION [ 1..6 ]</b>	<b>SATISFACTION [ 1..6 ]</b>	<b>IMPORTANCE [ 1..6 ]</b>
2.1 Participation of other partners	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>
2.2 Contribution to meeting sessions from other partners	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>
2.3 Relevance and clarity of topics	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>
2.4 Achievement of the targets of the meeting	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>



Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

**Partner 3**

**Dead Sea**

### ***QUESTIONNAIRE***

#### **OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF ORGANIZATION OF THE PROJECT MEETING**

<b>1</b>	<b>EXPECTATION</b> [ 1..6 ]	<b>SATISFACTION</b> [ 1..6 ]	<b>IMPORTANCE</b> [ 1..6 ]
1.1 Information related to logistics	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>
1.2 Preparatory documents	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>
1.3 Agenda	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>

#### **EVALUATION OF LEVEL OF COMMITMENT**

<b>2</b>	<b>EXPECTATION</b> [ 1..6 ]	<b>SATISFACTION</b> [ 1..6 ]	<b>IMPORTANCE</b> [ 1..6 ]
2.1 Participation of other partners	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>
2.2 Contribution to meeting sessions from other partners	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>
2.3 Relevance and clarity of topics	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>
2.4 Achievement of the targets of the meeting	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>



Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

**Partner 3**  
**Leipzig, Germany**

### ***QUESTIONNAIRE***

#### **OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF ORGANIZATION OF THE PROJECT MEETING**

<b>1</b>	<b>EXPECTATION</b> [ 1..6 ]	<b>SATISFACTION</b> [ 1..6 ]	<b>IMPORTANCE</b> [ 1..6 ]
1.1 Information related to logistics	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>
1.2 Preparatory documents	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>
1.3 Agenda	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>

#### **EVALUATION OF LEVEL OF COMMITMENT**

<b>2</b>	<b>EXPECTATION</b> [ 1..6 ]	<b>SATISFACTION</b> [ 1..6 ]	<b>IMPORTANCE</b> [ 1..6 ]
2.1 Participation of other partners	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>
2.2 Contribution to meeting sessions from other partners	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>
2.3 Relevance and clarity of topics	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>
2.4 Achievement of the targets of the meeting	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>



Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

Partner 4

Dead Sea

### QUESTIONNAIRE

#### OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF ORGANIZATION OF THE PROJECT MEETING

1	EXPECTATION [ 1..6 ]	SATISFACTION [ 1..6 ]	IMPORTANCE [ 1..6 ]
1.1 Information related to logistics	6	5	6
1.2 Preparatory documents	6	6	6
1.3 Agenda	6	5	6

#### EVALUATION OF LEVEL OF COMMITMENT

2	EXPECTATION [ 1..6 ]	SATISFACTION [ 1..6 ]	IMPORTANCE [ 1..6 ]
2.1 Participation of other partners	6	3	6
2.2 Contribution to meeting sessions from other partners	6	2	6
2.3 Relevance and clarity of topics	6	5	6
2.4 Achievement of the targets of the meeting	6	4	6



Leipzig, Germany



Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

## QUESTIONNAIRE

### OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF ORGANIZATION OF THE PROJECT MEETING

1	EXPECTATION [ 1..6 ]	SATISFACTION [ 1..6 ]	IMPORTANCE [ 1..6 ]
1.1 Information related to logistics	6	5	6
1.2 Preparatory documents	6	6	6
1.3 Agenda	6	4	6

### EVALUATION OF LEVEL OF COMMITMENT

2	EXPECTATION [ 1..6 ]	SATISFACTION [ 1..6 ]	IMPORTANCE [ 1..6 ]
2.1 Participation of other partners	6	4	6
2.2 Contribution to meeting sessions from other partners	6	3	6
2.3 Relevance and clarity of topics	6	5	6
2.4 Achievement of the targets of the meeting	6	3	6



Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

**Partner 5**

### ***QUESTIONNAIRE***

#### **OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF ORGANIZATION OF THE PROJECT MEETING**

<b>1</b>	<b>EXPECTATION</b> [ 1..6 ]	<b>SATISFACTION</b> [ 1..6 ]	<b>IMPORTANCE</b> [ 1..6 ]
1.1 Information related to logistics		✓	
1.2 Preparatory documents		✓	
1.3 Agenda		✓	

#### **EVALUATION OF LEVEL OF COMMITMENT**

<b>2</b>	<b>EXPECTATION</b> [ 1..6 ]	<b>SATISFACTION</b> [ 1..6 ]	<b>IMPORTANCE</b> [ 1..6 ]
2.1 Participation of other partners		✓	
2.2 Contribution to meeting sessions from other partners		✓	
2.3 Relevance and clarity of topics		✓	
2.4 Achievement of the targets of the meeting		✓	





Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

**Partner 6**

**QUESTIONNAIRE**

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF ORGANIZATION OF THE PROJECT MEETING**

<b>1</b>	<b>EXPECTATION</b> [ 1..6 ]	<b>SATISFACTION</b> [ 1..6 ]	<b>IMPORTANCE</b> [ 1..6 ]
1.1 Information related to logistics	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
1.2 Preparatory documents	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
1.3 Agenda	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>

**EVALUATION OF LEVEL OF COMMITMENT**

<b>2</b>	<b>EXPECTATION</b> [ 1..6 ]	<b>SATISFACTION</b> [ 1..6 ]	<b>IMPORTANCE</b> [ 1..6 ]
2.1 Participation of other partners	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>
2.2 Contribution to meeting sessions from other partners	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
2.3 Relevance and clarity of topics	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
2.4 Achievement of the targets of the meeting	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>



Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

Partner7

### ***QUESTIONNAIRE***

#### **OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF ORGANIZATION OF THE PROJECT MEETING**

<b>1</b>	<b>EXPECTATION</b> [ 1..6 ]	<b>SATISFACTION</b> [ 1..6 ]	<b>IMPORTANCE</b> [ 1..6 ]
1.1 Information related to logistics	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>
1.2 Preparatory documents	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>
1.3 Agenda	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>

#### **EVALUATION OF LEVEL OF COMMITMENT**

<b>2</b>	<b>EXPECTATION</b> [ 1..6 ]	<b>SATISFACTION</b> [ 1..6 ]	<b>IMPORTANCE</b> [ 1..6 ]
2.1 Participation of other partners	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>
2.2 Contribution to meeting sessions from other partners	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>
2.3 Relevance and clarity of topics	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>
2.4 Achievement of the targets of the meeting	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>



Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

**Partner 8**

### ***QUESTIONNAIRE***

#### **OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF ORGANIZATION OF THE PROJECT MEETING**

<b>1</b>	<b>EXPECTATION [ 1..6 ]</b>	<b>SATISFACTION [ 1..6 ]</b>	<b>IMPORTANCE [ 1..6 ]</b>
1.1 Information related to logistics	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>
1.2 Preparatory documents	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>
1.3 Agenda	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>

#### **EVALUATION OF LEVEL OF COMMITMENT**

<b>2</b>	<b>EXPECTATION [ 1..6 ]</b>	<b>SATISFACTION [ 1..6 ]</b>	<b>IMPORTANCE [ 1..6 ]</b>
2.1 Participation of other partners	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
2.2 Contribution to meeting sessions from other partners	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
2.3 Relevance and clarity of topics	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>
2.4 Achievement of the targets of the meeting	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>



Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

**Partner 9**

**QUESTIONNAIRE**

**OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF ORGANIZATION OF THE PROJECT MEETING**

<b>1</b>	<b>EXPECTATION</b> [ 1..6 ]	<b>SATISFACTION</b> [ 1..6 ]	<b>IMPORTANCE</b> [ 1..6 ]
1.1 Information related to logistics	5	5	4
1.2 Preparatory documents	5	5	5
1.3 Agenda	5	5	4

**EVALUATION OF LEVEL OF COMMITMENT**

<b>2</b>	<b>EXPECTATION</b> [ 1..6 ]	<b>SATISFACTION</b> [ 1..6 ]	<b>IMPORTANCE</b> [ 1..6 ]
2.1 Participation of other partners	5	5	6
2.2 Contribution to meeting sessions from other partners	5	5	6
2.3 Relevance and clarity of topics	5	5	6
2.4 Achievement of the targets of the meeting	5	5	6



Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

## **(F) Satisfaction Questionnaire for Project Management**

**Partner 1**

### ***QUESTIONNAIRE***

#### **OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT MANAGEMENT**

<b>1</b>	<b>EXPECTATION [ 1..6 ]</b>	<b>SATISFACTION [ 1..6 ]</b>	<b>IMPORTANCE [ 1..6 ]</b>
1.1 Structure of project time schedule	6	4	6
1.2 Communication between partners	6	5	6
1.3 Timeliness of feedbacks from the coordinator when requested	6	5	5
1.4 Incisiveness of coordination	6	5	6

#### **EVALUATION OF LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT**

<b>2</b>	<b>EXPECTATION [ 1..6 ]</b>	<b>SATISFACTION [ 1..6 ]</b>	<b>IMPORTANCE [ 1..6 ]</b>
2.1 Actively involved in the project development	6	5	6
2.2 Satisfied with the implementation of the project activities	6	5	6
2.3 Distribution among partners of tasks sharing	6	5	5



Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

## Partner 2

### QUESTIONNAIRE

#### OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT MANAGEMENT

1	EXPECTATION [ 1..6 ]	SATISFACTION [ 1..6 ]	IMPORTANCE [ 1..6 ]
1.5 Structure of project time schedule	6	6	6
1.6 Communication between partners	6	5	6
1.7 Timeliness of feedbacks from the coordinator when requested	6	6	6
1.8 Incisiveness of coordination	6	6	6

#### EVALUATION OF LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT

2	EXPECTATION [ 1..6 ]	SATISFACTION [ 1..6 ]	IMPORTANCE [ 1..6 ]
2.4 Actively involved in the project development	6	5	6
2.5 Satisfied with the implementation of the project activities	6	6	6
2.6 Distribution among partners of tasks sharing	6	5	6



Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

### Partner 3

### QUESTIONNAIRE

#### OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT MANAGEMENT

1	EXPECTATION [ 1..6 ]	SATISFACTION [ 1..6 ]	IMPORTANCE [ 1..6 ]
1.9 Structure of project time schedule	6	6	6
1.10 Communication between partners	6	5	6
1.11 Timeliness of feedbacks from the coordinator when requested	6	6	6
1.12 Incisiveness of coordination	6	5	5

#### EVALUATION OF LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT

2	EXPECTATION [ 1..6 ]	SATISFACTION [ 1..6 ]	IMPORTANCE [ 1..6 ]
2.7 Actively involved in the project development	6	5	6
2.8 Satisfied with the implementation of the project activities	6	5	6
2.9 Distribution among partners of tasks sharing	6	5	6



Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

#### Partner 4

### QUESTIONNAIRE

#### OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT MANAGEMENT

1	EXPECTATION [ 1..6 ]	SATISFACTION [ 1..6 ]	IMPORTANCE [ 1..6 ]
1.13 Structure of project time schedule	6	6	6
1.14 Communication between partners	6	5	6
1.15 Timeliness of feedbacks from the coordinator when requested	6	6	6
1.16 Incisiveness of coordination	6	5	5

#### EVALUATION OF LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT

2	EXPECTATION [ 1..6 ]	SATISFACTION [ 1..6 ]	IMPORTANCE [ 1..6 ]
2.10 Actively involved in the project development	6	5	6
2.11 Satisfied with the implementation of the project activities	6	5	6
2.12 Distribution among partners of tasks sharing	6	5	6





Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

## Partner 5

### QUESTIONNAIRE

#### OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT MANAGEMENT

1	EXPECTATION [ 1..6 ]	SATISFACTION [ 1..6 ]	IMPORTANCE [ 1..6 ]
1.1 Structure of project time schedule		✓	
1.2 Communication between partners		✓	
1.3 Timeliness of feedbacks from the coordinator when requested		✓	
1.4 Incisiveness of coordination		✓	

#### EVALUATION OF LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT

2	EXPECTATION [ 1..6 ]	SATISFACTION [ 1..6 ]	IMPORTANCE [ 1..6 ]
2.1 Actively involved in the project development		✓	
2.2 Satisfied with the implementation of the project activities		✓	
2.3 Distribution among partners of tasks sharing		✓	



Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

## Partner 6

### QUESTIONNAIRE

#### OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT MANAGEMENT

1	EXPECTATION [ 1..6 ]	SATISFACTION [ 1..6 ]	IMPORTANCE [ 1..6 ]
1.5 Structure of project time schedule	6	6	6
1.6 Communication between partners	6	5	6
1.7 Timeliness of feedbacks from the coordinator when requested	6	6	6
1.8 Incisiveness of coordination	6	6	6

#### EVALUATION OF LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT

2	EXPECTATION [ 1..6 ]	SATISFACTION [ 1..6 ]	IMPORTANCE [ 1..6 ]
2.4 Actively involved in the project development	6	5	6
2.5 Satisfied with the implementation of the project activities	6	6	6
2.6 Distribution among partners of tasks sharing	6	5	6



Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

Partner 7

### QUESTIONNAIRE

#### OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT MANAGEMENT

1	EXPECTATION [ 1..6 ]	SATISFACTION [ 1..6 ]	IMPORTANCE [ 1..6 ]
1.9 Structure of project time schedule	5	5	6
1.10 Communication between partners	6	6	6
1.11 Timeliness of feedbacks from the coordinator when requested	6	6	6
1.12 Incisiveness of coordination	6	6	6

#### EVALUATION OF LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT

2	EXPECTATION [ 1..6 ]	SATISFACTION [ 1..6 ]	IMPORTANCE [ 1..6 ]
2.7 Actively involved in the project development	5	4	6
2.8 Satisfied with the implementation of the project activities	5	3	6
2.9 Distribution among partners of tasks sharing	5	4	6



Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

## Partner 8

### QUESTIONNAIRE

#### OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT MANAGEMENT

1	EXPECTATION [ 1..6 ]	SATISFACTION [ 1..6 ]	IMPORTANCE [ 1..6 ]
1.13 Structure of project time schedule	5	6	6
1.14 Communication between partners	5	4	6
1.15 Timeliness of feedbacks from the coordinator when requested	6	6	5
1.16 Incisiveness of coordination	6	6	6

#### EVALUATION OF LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT

2	EXPECTATION [ 1..6 ]	SATISFACTION [ 1..6 ]	IMPORTANCE [ 1..6 ]
2.10 Actively involved in the project development	4	4	5
2.11 Satisfied with the implementation of the project activities	5	4	5
2.12 Distribution among partners of tasks sharing	5	5	5



Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

## Partner 9

### QUESTIONNAIRE

#### OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT MANAGEMENT

1	EXPECTATION [ 1..6 ]	SATISFACTION [ 1..6 ]	IMPORTANCE [ 1..6 ]
1.17 Structure of project time schedule	5	5	5
1.18 Communication between partners	5	5	5
1.19 Timeliness of feedbacks from the coordinator when requested	5	5	5
1.20 Incisiveness of coordination	5	4	6

#### EVALUATION OF LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT

2	EXPECTATION [ 1..6 ]	SATISFACTION [ 1..6 ]	IMPORTANCE [ 1..6 ]
2.13 Actively involved in the project development	5	5	6
2.14 Satisfied with the implementation of the project activities	5	5	5
2.15 Distribution among partners of tasks sharing	5	5	5