

OpenQAsS

Open Source **Q**uality **A**ssurance **S**ystem for
Vocational Education

2014-1-HU01-KA202-002356

ERASMUS+ Strategic Partnership

2014-2017



Evaluation of the 2nd Meeting

**19th-20th May 2015, Alcalá de Henares
(Madrid)**

iTStudy Hungary Ltd.

Gödöllő, June 2015.

Document data

Author: Szilvia Vancsikné Tóth
Version: published
Theme: Evaluation of the 2nd meeting
Outcome: O1-O2
Date: 17/6/2015
Document Type: report
File: OQ_2nd_meeting_Evaluation_report.docx
Lector: Laszlo Muller
Product ID: EVALM2
Target group: Project partners

Table of Content

Document data	2
Table of Content	2
Questionnaire design	3
Evaluation of the questionnaire.....	3
Arrangements	4
Day 1	4
Day 2	4
Suggestions and Comments	5

Questionnaire design

1. The first section is about the planning and development of the kick-off meeting, quality of the project consortium, participation of partners and general items related to the meeting:
 - Organisation
 - Clear objectives
 - Helpful Coordinator
 - Meeting room
 - Cooperative atmosphere
2. The second section dealt with programs of Day-1. The items to be valued were:
 - The progress report
 - National reports
 - Suggestions to design OpenQAsS toolkit
 - goals
3. The third section dealt with programs of Day-2. It included several items:
 - Following dissemination and evaluation tasks
 - Editing and translating tasks about the front-end portal
 - Next steps of the project
 - Financial requirements
 - Consultation with teachers
4. The fourth part of the questionnaire allowed partners to include any other comment or suggestion regarding all those aspects not dealt with in the questionnaire, or aspects that should be taken into further account.

Evaluation of the questionnaire

The partners filled out the evaluation questionnaire on the project portal.

<http://openqass.itstudy.hu/en/content/evaluation-2nd-meeting-19th-20th-may-2015-alcal%C3%A1-de-henares-madrid>

After the deadline iTStudy collected the answers, summarized them and made this evaluation.

Each partner has given a specific valuation, considering a 1-to-5 scale (where 1 means “strongly agree”, 2 means “agree”, 3 means “don’t know” and 4 means “disagree” and 5 means “strongly disagree”). According to this, the most significant results are described.

Arrangements

General Items

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	DON'T KNOW	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
1. We arrived at the venue without any problems	12	1	0	0	0
2. The meeting was well organised	13	0	0	0	0
3. The meeting objectives were clear	11	2	0	0	0
4. The hosting organisation did a good job	13	0	0	0	0
5. There was a cooperative atmosphere at the meeting	13	0	0	0	0

Regarding the **first section** (“General items” see above), the evaluation given to the statements of the first section is quite positive in general. The less valued item is the meeting objectives, where 2 respondent valued are “agree”.

The other statements gets the highest value in the general section.

Day 1

Day 1

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	DON'T KNOW	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
11. The progress report made clear where we are in the project establishment.	11	2	0	0	0
12. The national reports gave an overview on the different VET systems in the partner countries.	7	6	0	0	0
13. I understand that the national reports should be finalized before publishing them on the portal.	12	1	0	0	0
14. I agree that in OpenQAsS Toolkit only the common core of the different QA systems could be modelled.	9	4	0	0	0
15. The suggestion of the headmasters provide a good starting point to design OpenQAsS Toolkit.	8	5	0	0	0
16. The goals of the first day were achieved.	9	4	0	0	0
17. I enjoyed the cultural program.	10	2	1	0	0

For **second section**, dealing with the quality of the programs of Day-1. The less valued has been the national reports, where 6 respondent valued: “agree”, and the other respondents: strongly agreed with that statement.

Almost half of the respondents answered that we strongly have a good starting point to design OpenQAsS Toolkit, but the other respondents are agree with it.

Day 2

Day 2

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	DON'T KNOW	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
17. I understand my tasks related to the dissemination and evaluation.	11	2	0	0	0
18. It is clear to me what kind of editing and translating work needed to implement the language versions of the front-end portal.	10	3	0	0	0
19. I understand the activities related to the second intellectual outcome (O2)	7	6	0	0	0
20. I agree to ask permission from CEDEFOP to reuse the Quality Management Handbook and other EQAVET contents.	11	2	0	0	0
21. I understand how to prepare the financial report for the period: 1. September 14–31. March 14.	5	7	1	0	0
22. I understand the aims of the consultations with teachers.	9	4	0	0	0
23. I know what are the most important elements of the documentation of the events.	10	3	0	0	0
24. I understand that I have to translate the online contents (from the Cedefop QM Handbok) into my language.	7	4	2	0	0
25. I The aims of the second day were achieved.	10	3	0	0	0

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication [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.

Third section is dealing with the programs of Day 2. In it, the mostly highly valued items have been the dissemination and evaluation tasks and also the upcoming translation tasks which are in the next steps during the project period. On the other hand, the items that have been less valued have been the ones about preparing the financial report. Almost half of the partners sure about what kind of activities related to the second intellectual output O2.

Suggestions and Comments

Suggestions

Left Blank	11
User entered value	2
Average submission length in words (ex blanks)	44.00

Comments

Left Blank	12
User entered value	1
Average submission length in words (ex blanks)	30.00

Suggestions by partners

The partners could give suggestion for improving the planning of the coming transnational meeting. There were two comments in this part: *“In order to improve the discussions could be interesting to have the material about presentations one or two days before meeting.”*

“For O2 I would like to see us use the results as quickly as possible, and in conjunction with the Cedefop Toolkit) to identify the range and nature of activities that we have to capture via our toolkit. I think it important to put out a draft as soon as possible so that we can understand the requirements and debate any issues. This is a key activity.”

Comments

Partners willing to do so, were able to include any suggestion regarding all those aspects not deals with in the questionnaire or aspects that should be taken into further account. Only 1 partner gave comment for this section:

“As there is a sizable element of development (of a Toolkit and a Course) I would like to see more time spent on issues relating to design, implementation and test.”

According to the responses of the Evaluation questionnaire we can declare, that basically all partner was satisfied with the 2nd meeting of the **OpenQAsS** project. If it's possible, it would be important to keep this quality of organising for the upcoming meetings too.