



## WP 7 – QUALITY MANAGEMENT

### QUALITY REPORT 5

October 2014



## QUALITY REPORT 5

There are eight partners from five different EU countries participating and collaborating in this ECVET – HEALTH TOURISM project, who are working in different national cultures (at the beginning there were nine partners, one partner (P5) has withdrawn from the program in the meantime). To achieve the project aims the collaboration needs common policy and agreements according the working methods. Common quality procedures and quality standards should be created to make sure that the quality of the finished products will meet the requirements of the target groups. The project, concerning the project quality, foresees a specific work package (WP 7 “Quality management”), aimed to ensure the quality of activities and products to be developed during the project, to allow a smooth project operation and to secure the achievement of the project aims. This purpose will be served through a system of process-oriented self-evaluation by means of standardised feedback surveys and written documentation of project activities, which will be subject to approval by the partners involved and thus allow for additional reflection and self-assessment.

The project partners are committed to the project activities of **ECVET – HEALTH TOURISM** 2012-1-HU1-LEO05-05823 in accordance with the requirements and the best of their abilities in order to perform at a high level. The coordinator partner of the project is Hungarian Várnai Consulting Oktatási és Munkaerő-piaci Szolgáltató Nonprofit Kft. For the successful implementation of the project, the coordinating, leading activities are performed by Várnai Consulting Nonprofit Ltd. who constantly strives for taking into account the quality assurance principles.

The 6<sup>th</sup> **Consortium meeting of project** was realized in Budapest, Hungary, on 16<sup>th</sup> – 17<sup>th</sup> October 2014. During the meeting, a quality questionnaire - divided into 4 parts - was handed out not only to the partners but also to the participated stakeholders to be filled out. This good practise – which had been realised secondly after the first one during the 5<sup>th</sup> consortium meeting - resulted a measurable improvement in terms of quality measure and assurance concerning the ECVET-HT project. **The objective of the quality questionnaire - for project partners - was to gain useful conclusions and feedbacks about the progress of the project in order to ensure the improvement of cooperation and efficiency of quality insurance. The questionnaire covers the period from the 5<sup>th</sup> consortium meeting to the 6<sup>th</sup> one.** The main 4 parts of the questionnaire are the following:

- *Professional part - scale-mode questions about overall project satisfaction (progression of project, administration, assistance, communication and IT services)*
- *Quality management part - coordinator’s partner management measures, partner’s activities to ensure quality during the project*
- *Financial-administrative part - questions about financial aspects (help, administration, financial feedbacks)*

- *WP6 Pilot test on the enforcement of the Memorandum of Understanding – MoU ECVET for the professional figures in health-tourism*

All four parts give the possibility for detailed description, additions, and explanations from partner's side.

There were seven partners from five different countries who had to fill the questionnaire in. (The coordinator partner did not fill one, and one partner (P5) has withdrawn from the program in the meantime). So, from the seven partner organisations who had to fill the document, **there were eleven persons who filled out questionnaire** (some partners filled one together, some of them one of each person). The countries participating in the project are: **Hungary, Italy, Belgium, Romania and Slovakia.**

### **1. The professional part - scale-mode questions**

Concerning the period for the **6<sup>th</sup> consortium meeting**, the following statements and conclusions can be drawn.

As general, project partners had three remarkable parts to be evaluated and answered:

1. Professional Part
2. Quality Management Part
3. Financial-Administrative Part

Regarding the overall satisfaction of project implementation, **95% of the responders are very satisfied with the progression of the project** (from the 8 persons who filled the questionnaires out 6 person marked the point 5 which is the maximum point and only 2 person indicated 4 which also means satisfaction with the progression of the project). This level is 4% improvement comparing the previous quality questionnaire. During the last period (from the 5<sup>th</sup> consortium meeting to the 6<sup>th</sup> one) 91 % of the responders were 'very satisfied' with the progression of the project, so the current result shows **even better improvement.**

Concerning **help and guidelines from the coordinator partner**, each partner was **positively satisfied; more particularly 95%** of the responders claimed he/she gets any help without problem while 5% of the partners rated this question to 4 which also means a good satisfaction level. This shows **measurable growth of satisfactory level** and feedback; in the last quality report this percent was only 73%.

The same question about help from other partners brought different results as **82, 5% of the responders thought they got every help from other partners of the project.** This **satisfactory level** – despite the fact that the last time it showed 100% of satisfaction - is a **laudable level**, as during the previous quality reports, this level was only about 78-80%.

The administration work has also shown significant improvement as **97,5% of the partners were absolutely satisfied with the administrative operation while 2,5% of them were well satisfied**. This means that only one partner rated it 4 in the 5 scale rating. Compared to the previous quality report, this is 33,5% growth. This impressive development can be due to the fact that by the constant progress of the project and common cooperation, the partners managed to handle administration problems from time to time. This also means that the coordinating partner helped a lot and treated their needs completely.

Regarding **IT services**, it resulted outstanding tendencies as **95% is absolutely satisfied** and 5% is satisfied. This means **significant improvement and progress comparing the last survey (85% of total satisfaction)**, as the **IT services have changed for the better**, thus every partner was really satisfied about this important issue.

For the **project communication**, **95% were entirely satisfied** while only 5% were well satisfied. This resulted also a remarkable improvement compared to the last one (91% very satisfied, 9% well satisfied). Based on these feedbacks, it could mean a link between the last two questions; partners' better satisfaction with the IT services and also with the project communication, which complement each other.

Concerning the overall **satisfaction level with work packages (WP)** of the project, we got very positive feedbacks. According to this the detailed results were the following: 92,5% absolute satisfaction with WP1, 95% with WP2, 95% with Wp3, 97,5% with WP4, 97,5% with WP5, 97,5 with WP6 and 100% with WP7 and WP8. Overall, approximately **97% of the partners were absolutely satisfied with work packages**.

**Examining the feedbacks from partners about the results they were most satisfied with, we got very positive responses**, see as followings: *development of very productive relations and effective work among the transnational partners – allowing further collaborations in the field of integration of national VET systems and new Erasmus+ programme; design of professional figures in health-tourism, certification objectives; the work packages – especially WP4 and WP5; the MoU and learning agreements – as they are keys to improve mobility within countries and as they represent new opportunities to find jobs in European market; the developed 3 curriculums.*

**About the biggest problems the partners faced during the project period, we got the following remarks:** *coping with the amount of administration work; lack of financial support for certain activities related to meeting with stakeholders and key actors; signature of the Mou and Learning Agreement; financial-administrative part; the different and compulsory regulations of each country which made it hard to define the common practices and guidelines.* There were also 3 partners who claimed they did not have particular problem to be remarked. This shows us that **each partner took their job and responsibility seriously and thoroughly during the whole project period.**

Concerning the **partner's overall satisfaction with the implementation of the project, the partners gave us very positive responses as all of them considered that implementation and dissemination was very successful and positive.** Just some extracts from the answers: *great collaboration among partnership and excellent coordination of lead applicant; taking into consideration the facts outlined, I was more than satisfied. We had much too many hurdles and in my opinion we were very effective in creating a common platform. A lot of information could be used in further researches and project because the common talk gave us a lot of knowledge about the structure and operation of the VET of many other countries which is a very useful knowledge. I have to say that this fact alone would have justified the project but we gained much more.*

5

## 2. Quality Management Part

The satisfaction with the **coordinator partner's quality management measures** resulted prominent ratings, like **100% of absolute satisfaction.** Comparing to all previous reports, this result is the best concerning all project period, showing the fact that **the leading applicant even improved and extended the related questions and important feedbacks towards the partners and also took them seriously.**

Regarding the **activities realized in order to ensure the quality of the project,** one responder did not indicate any information. One partner mentioned the **continuous monitoring and communication, reminders and support from project coordinator.** Others highlighted the **shared definition by the partners of the quality steps linked to progression of the project activities and results achievements,** with regards to physical, financial, scientific and technical, and customer satisfaction aspects. Also others mentioned their **personal feedbacks from partners, stakeholders, as well as personal interviews and meeting.**

## 3. Financial-Administrative Part

**The financial administrative issue is always significant part of a project, since it forms the basis for project implementation, and so it is just as important as the professional work.**

**100% of the responders are absolutely satisfied with the financial-administrative help in the last period.** This is an outstanding improvement comparing the last survey (82%) and this excellent result also shows us the **prominent development of the quality of our work. Besides, one partner indicated that the financial part was completely organized and professionally carried out.**

**Each person - who had answered to this question - claimed he/she can ask for help without problem from the coordinator partner.**

For the questions of partners' experiences about the **communication via e-mail, skype with the coordinating partner,** we also got very positive remarks: they had several skype conferences and the Hungarian partners have also met in person as well several times. All partners claimed that the **communication was at its best and it rolled important part of the whole project period as it was**

**extremely fast, productive, well coordinated and adequate.** They also highlighted that the lead applicant helped them a lot and provided useful information.

Concerning partners' **satisfaction with financial-administrative part** of the project, we got positive feedbacks as: **transparency, effectiveness, accuracy, quick, problem-solving and helpful attitude from the coordinator, fast, reliable and satisfactory, care for details.** *Moreover the expenses of travelling and accommodation were very professionally organized and all the partners were previously informed about financial documentation.*

About aspects the partners were not satisfied with, we got the following remarks: out of 8 responders 7 indicated that there were no particular aspects to be remarked. One partner indicated that they still find the difference of daily rates between countries unfair and the bureaucracy is still too much. This last one can be explained by the specific nature of international funds.

#### **4. WP6 Pilot test on the enforcement of the Memorandum of Understanding – MoU ECVET for the professional figures in health-tourism**

**The fourth part of the questionnaire contained questions about the work package 6, additions from partners' side.** During the current work package the partners – based on the basis set out in the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), in former WP5 – commonly defined and developed the system and the form of the Learning Agreements and the model for Credits Awarding.

Partners overall contacted professional from the entire 3 concerned professional figures: Cosmetician, Fitness-wellness assistant and Health-tourism manager. However most of the partners (50%) contacted cosmeticians, and 25-25% the last two.

For the question how these persons responded to the Learning Agreement, we got different feedbacks: **most of the partners (5) claimed the contacted persons were very supportive and their reaction was very positive, as they were open for the new.** 2 persons highlighted the **verified interest level of concerned workers and trainees about the possibility to reach the new European qualification established by MoU were very significant.** One Hungarian and one Belgian partner indicated that **people were interested but scared of financial and operational contribution**, similarly to the fact that **it was difficult to understand the purpose of the project at first sight, therefore additional meetings and face-to-face communication was necessary.**

The way the partners contacted them was: **e-mail, telephone, skype and face-to-face meetings, also using social medias and personal contacts.**

For the questions if it was difficult to convince them, we got the following rates: 62,5% of them claimed it was not difficult at all, 25% indicated it was difficult as they have to explain thoroughly the scope and the benefits of the project. One partner did not answer to this question.

90% of the partners claimed they had enough time for the pilot testing; only one person indicated it was not quite enough.

**6 partners indicated they had no problems they faced with, while only 2 partners claimed they had organizational obstacles** and that the contacted people did not will to sign the Learning Agreements (LA) as they were afraid of all the personal info they had to provide, and they were scared it meant a financial contribution despite the fact that the partners explained them the details and the purpose of the LA and its future opportunities.

**Concerning the way the partners could solve the problems, they indicated that they explained there was no financial or operational contribution, as well as with top management and effective cooperation.**

**Major part of the partners (62,5%) asked for help from the coordinator partner, 12,5% did not asked for help and 25% did not leave any remarks at this part. Every partner, who asked for help from the coordinating partner, received adequate assistance and information from Hungary, showing that we fully complied our task for giving aid in any case needed.**

Furthermore, one partner indicated further completion regarding the project as he has very positive experience of transnational collaboration realised within the project and it could capitalised within further collaborations within new Erasmus+ programme.

## 5. Conclusions

***Overall, it is remarkable that project partners are much more satisfied with the progression of the project than during the previous periods. Excellent results were the 100% satisfaction with the progression of WP7 and WP8, the quality management measures and steps by the coordinator, the 100% satisfaction with the financial-administrative help of the leading partner. Furthermore, partners are also even better satisfied with every part of the project progression and its achieved results so far. Although, partners faced some problems during their tasks but they could solve them and they also could ask guidance from the coordinator partner who helped them in all cases.***

***We can draw the entire conclusion that the project itself was remarkably successful concerning not only the administration, but also the professional and international collaboration work so that the results and dissemination activities achieved so far can serve as a basis for future mobility applications and cooperation.***

### Quality Report - Stakeholders

Concerning the quality assurance questionnaire handed out to stakeholders during the Infoday and focus group related to the 6<sup>th</sup> transnational project meeting, we got **37 questionnaires filled out**. The objective of the quality questionnaire - for stakeholders- was to gain useful conclusions and feedbacks about the satisfaction level of the organisational work of the conference, also of the personal requirements, the former experiences about ECVET professional field, the concrete suggestions and opinions about introduction and recognition of ECVET guidelines into VET and other educational institutions. More precisely, questions about impression opinions, comments and development proposals concerning ECVET –HT project.

The survey contained the following questions:

1. *How satisfied are you with the organization of the conference?  
Are you satisfied with the content of the conference?*
2. *Did the Conference meet your expectations?  
Have you ever been any experience in the field of ECVET before?*
3. *Do you think that it would important to introduce ECVET lines (transparency, interoperability, recognition, and evaluation) into training and other educational institutions?*
4. *Do you plan to implement mobility projects in the near future (such as staff training abroad, foreign students' exchange?)*
5. *Please explain your impression of the views of the project!*
6. *Any suggestions, completions?*

Regarding the 1. question about overall satisfaction concerning the organization of the project, the average satisfaction level is 4,76 (in a 5 rate scale). This means **95,2% of absolute participant satisfaction**.

Concerning the content of the conference, **92% of the participant thought the professional content of the conference was remarkably good**.

**Also 92% of the participant thought claimed the conference fully met their former expectations**. They indicated that the presentation of the ECVET projects, all together with partners presentations are considered complete. The presentation of state secretary matched to the conference and they have received first-hand information of an implemented and completed ECVET project. One person even highlighted that he gained new and useful information as participant of LLL which he'd like to transfer and spread in his surroundings. Some of them marked some details they were missing such as only three specialist areas had been covered, other disciplines were not mentioned, and that it could be introduced in other areas. Other expressed he thought about a little more practice oriented conference.

**22% of the responders claimed they had previous experiences in the ECVET before while 78% did not have any former experiences**. This rate means that nearly  $\frac{1}{4}$  of participants already heard about

ECVET processes besides the **major part was really interested by its new topic, meaning that ECVET can be a new way of opportunity not only for individual persons but also for other educational institutions who are interested in recognition of informal and non-formal learning outcomes.**

People who claimed they already know what ECVET is about had participated in mobility or in other international projects where ECVET practices and theories were also used. One participant indicated that he took part in coordination of ECVET National Group of Experts.

**Every single participant marked it would be important to introduce ECVET lines (transparency, interoperability, recognition, evaluation) into training and other educational institutions.** This means that people understand aim and tools of ECVET, the way of its practical aspects and the significance of its eligibility and effectiveness.

The reasons why it would be important we got various responses. Most of the participants explained that **practical knowledge of a profession is essential for the world of work and so this major line is a support and an opportunity to recognize the obtained practical and theoretical knowledge.** Others indicated this importance due to employment in Hungary and also in Europe as a lot of people looking for work abroad and this is a great help for the prosperity of them by ECVET. **Overall it is important because of interoperability and consistency.** Further reasons were that this idea is valid in all areas, and it is important for interoperability as well as National VET system should be compatible with EU regulations.

31% of responders thought he will plan to implement mobility projects in the near future (such as staff training abroad, foreign students exchange), while 69% of them will not. 2 persons did not answer for this question. The persons who plans do this explained their reason by participating constantly in other Leonardo and different mobility projects. Others just made up their mind to make it in the near future based on what has been said during the conference.

**Generally people had very positive and appreciative feedback about the whole ECVET conference.** Some extracts from the remarks:

*“Relevant, well-organized and important direction”*

*“Increase the "receptionist" to higher level is excellent "idea" and step”*

*“I miss masseur but they will have their reasons”*

*“ Congratulations to the high-quality implementation of the project! The project implementation to be tested in practice is yet to be compiled”*

*“A well-implemented and useful project”*

*“It is important, useful and effective”*

*“Useful, thoughtfully constructed project”*

*“Useful on an important project during the two years, many of the participants are able to demonstrate results”*

*“Congratulations”*

*“Efficient and important project”*

*“Well organized and useful”*

*“It is very important result in rich, successful project”*

10

**Also further suggestions, completions were very promising:**

*“Congratulations!”*

*“There would be a need for involving more public bodies”*

*“Similar project could be developed for industrial professions”*

*“It would be good to summarize the experiences so far on a conference few years later”*

*“I would have listened more detail on behalf of Romanian and Slovak speakers about entire project implementation process from the beginning through the practical point of view.”*

*“I miss some of the concrete practical examples and implemented programs”*

*“Follow-up major national professional organizations for example. Physiotherapist Association, the involvement of EIT information and Balneology Association”*

*“You may want to test the project's results within Erasmus+ mobility projects.”*

**Overall speaking we can state that stakeholders and interested people involved in Infoday and Focus group was really satisfied and interested in ECVET project guidelines and its results achieved so far, considering it remarkable to activate ECVET process and enforce to put it in transparency across the participating countries in Europe. Furthermore they were very satisfied by participating in the final Infoday and Focus Group as they gained remarkably useful professional experience and information not only about an implemented ECVET project but about effective international collaboration and good practices, as well as inspiration for future work.**

### *The quality monitoring survey*

This kind of survey consists part of project quality plan serving the basis for not only qualitative but also quantitative results' summaries.

The specialty of this survey is that during this process not only the partners but also the interested/involved stakeholders and key actors evaluated all Work Packages occurred in entire project period.

By this kind of measure we have the possibility to get qualitative and comparable feedbacks about ECVET-HT project results and activities realized so far.

Persons had to rate each question between -2 and 2. (-2= Not satisfied; -1= Not much satisfied; 0=Enough satisfied; 1= Satisfied; 2=Very much satisfied). By this, counting average rates we could get the following quantitative results:

The survey contained the following parts:

*Overall rate of each WP  
 Technical-scientific Qualitative Monitoring - also for each WP  
 Casuistry Qualitative Monitoring – for each WP*

Concerning overall assessment of WP-s, 100% of the partners claimed that each WP had been realized accordingly and very professionally.

In terms of Technical-scientific Qualitative Monitoring, evaluation of each WP had been rated as:

Nr. of WP	Average rate between partners (-2 to 2.)
WP1	1,7
WP2	1,7
WP3	1,7
WP4	1,7
WP5	1,8
WP6	1,7
WP7	1,8
WP8	1,8

We can see how positively our partners evaluated the commonly realized work packages. No partner was giving rate -2;-1 or 0.

Examining results of Casuistry Qualitative Monitoring, partners gave the following feedbacks:

Nr. of WP	Average rate between partners (-2 to 2.)
WP1	1,9
WP2	1,9
WP3	1,8
WP4	1,8
WP5	1,8

**WP5 had been evaluated by key actors involved in activities of this WP. The following results came out:**

Nr. of WP	Average rate between partners (-2 to 2.)
WP5	1,7

**WP6 had been evaluated by VET providers and Trans-national Technical Working Group members and health tourism trainers** concerning activities carried out during WP 6. Results results below:

Nr. of WP	Average rate between partners (-2 to 2.)	By who?
WP6	1,7	VET providers
WP6	1,9	Trans-national Technical Working Group members
WP6	1,5	health tourism trainers

Evaluation of **WP7 expressed the satisfaction level by Trans-national Technical Working Group members** concerning activities carried out during WP 7.

Nr. of WP	Average rate between partners (-2 to 2.)
WP7	1,7

**WP8 had been evaluated by Trans-national Technical Working Group members, key actors and final users** (health tourism trainers, VET providers, enterprises, social partners; trade union, public institutions competent in VET and health tourism) involved in activities carried out during WP 8.

Nr. of WP	Average rate between partners (-2 to 2.)	By who?
WP8	1,9	Trans-national Technical Working Group members
WP8	1,8	key actors and final users

## Conclusions

**We can draw the conclusion that based on qualitative measures and survey, project partners and involved key actors/stakeholders was remarkably satisfied by the results, activities and aims the project achieved during the 2 year period.**

**We have concrete average number about the satisfaction level of each realised work package therefore – as it can be seen above – the lowest given rate was 1,7 from the scale -2 ->2, proofing the fact that the professional achievements have reached their goal and target groups and that is supported and justified by external professionals working in the open-labour market of health-tourism field not only in Hungary but in the involved European countries.**