



Metalog

Final report

Zoltán Kovács

University of Pannonia

kovacs@gtk.uni-pannon.hu

October 29., 2015

v.1.0



Contents

Introduction	
1. Evaluation of meetings	5
1.1. Statistical evaluation of meetings	5
1.2. Discussion evaluation of meetings	6
1.3. Observation of meetings	6
1.4. Observation of final conferebce	6
2. General project progress, outputs	6
2.1. WP1 Project management	6
2.2. WP2 Synthesis	7
2.3. WP3 LQF	7
2.4. WP4 LQF	7
2.5. WP5	7
2.6. WP6. Dissemination	7
2.7. WP7. Evaluation	7
3. Summary.....	7

Introduction

According to the evaluation plan there was a continuous evaluation of project progress based on the guidelines and instruments outlined in the evaluation report at the beginning of the project. Since in this first part of the project we do not have all the results, evaluation activity targeted rather the process than outputs.

1. Initial evaluation

Before the kick off meeting we learned the knowledge and expectations of the participants using a survey.

There expectations were:

What benefits do you want from the project for yourself?

- Overview of a new vocational sector
- More methodological skills
- More international contacts
- I worked a long time in professional education and I am personally very interested in this topic.
- It's an added value for me, as I refers to projects I were involved in.
- And it's nice to see progress and to feel that the project are still worth to be used.
- Deeper knowledge on the qualification demand of various target groups in logistics.
- Apply NQF/EQF knowledge in development and testing of a sectoral qualification framework; working together and sharing experiences in an interesting project partnership
- Increase competencies and expertize
- Consolidate existing partnerships
- Meet new partners

What are the benefits for your organisation in this project?

- Transfer of concepts in different sector
- Networking
- New scientific research results
- To improve our logistics education. More international contacts Knowledge on state of the art training systems
- My organization works with the SOLOS learning model and has great experience with the various instruments internal. We are very interested in future trend development to our national and international 66 partner companies (forwarding agencies).

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



- It is a further step for the company as one of the leaders in Europe for projects in the transport and logistics sector.
- Further development of our skills and knowledge on the issue of future training methods and tools.
- apply experience/knowledge from EQF/NQF projects and logistics related projects (e.g. ProfDRV) in development and testing of a sectoral qualification framework; valuable experiences for e.g. development of further sectoral qualification frameworks
- - Appropriate project results and products - Consolidate existing partnerships and get new partnership - Get financial sources

While partners mostly had a clear understanding of their own role in the project they missed some information:

- they needed more information on the beneficiaries of the project.
- what were they supposed to deliver and how to achieve.
- partners' role.

The knowledge of these helped the project management and WP leaders to focus on relevant issues. More detailed initial evaluation is in:

02_METALOG_initial_lime_eval_01c.pdf

Evaluator also informed the partners about the fundamentals of the evaluation:

01_METALOG_proj_Q_01ea.pdf

1. Evaluation of meetings

All meetings were evaluated by

- using a web survey system, (Limesurvey.)
- discussion of participants,
- observation of the evaluator.

1.1. Statistical evaluation of meetings

Each survey results can be seen in enclosed pdf files. There were differences between the content.

- initial survey helped to discover the information the gaps,
- post meeting surveys evaluated the meeting,
- virtual meeting (Adobe Connect) survey had specific questions about its efficiency and possible application in future.

Seeing the results about meetings we can conclude that by partners' opinion:

- the agenda was targeted,
- work conditions were good,
- meetings were mostly productive,
- regarding the results and the time utilisation of the participants were efficient,
- the appropriate work methods were used.

There were open ended questions related the improvement of the project.

We gave feedback for the partners about the meeting evaluation.

1.2. Discussion evaluation of meetings

Project coordinator summarised the results at the end of each meeting. Project evaluator went through the accomplishment and formulated recommendations for corrective and preventive actions. They can be found in the presentations

1.3. Observation of meetings

Project coordinator summarised the results at the end of each meeting.

Meetings were well prepared. Coordinator has compiled and published the agenda in time. Hosts perfectly organized the accommodation, travel, meeting venue. Physical conditions of the meetings were appropriate.

Discussions took place in an atmosphere of objectivity. There were no professional or personal conflict. Different opinions served as alternatives for better solution. All participants sought for improvement.

The WP leaders are prepared and presented to the job and the tasks correctly.

1.4. Observation of final conferebce

Evaluator asked the participants of the final conference about their impressions. They have found the presented results useful.

2. General project progress, outputs

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



2.1. WP1 Project management

Between meetings project coordinator - according to preliminary plan - regularly gave project status information for participants indicating delays by red colour as warning. (Monthly updates)

2.2. WP2 Synthesis

The summary of previous projects is done. Since some of the partners were involved in the previous projects which's products served as inputs, the information collecting was relatively smooth. WP2 product was externally evaluated by students.

2.3. WP3 LQF

Project partners gathered information about logistics processes. In somecases it was difficult to get information from companies.

2.4. WP4 LQF

The comparision between national characteristics is done.

2.5. WP5

AFT worked out a detailan plan to gather information about the circumstancef of national application.

2.6. WP6. Dissemination

Ther were slightly more PR than dissemination activity. (Exept WP2.) WP leader in cooperation with coordinator produced the necessary product in good quality. Partners use wide variety of PR tools such as personal meeting, paper and web based – including social media – to inform the public about the project.

2.7. WP7. Evaluation

The main outputs of the evaluation:

- evaluation plan, continuously being updated,
- surveys (initial, face-to-face, virtual)
- presentation about the project progress (by coordinator and evaluator)
- evaluator's recommendations.

3. Summary

The project's strengths

- Good team composition.
- The ambitious partners for high-level professional work.
- Feedback provided by the project management.
- The professionalism and atmosphere of meetings. (Good work atmosphere, without personal conflicts.)

Weaknesses

- The project suffered delays from the very beginning. This delay could not be worked off.
- During the planning the external partners' cooperation willingness (notably providing information) was underestimated.
- The loss of the first British partner.

Appendix 1. contains the open question part of the overall summative evaluation.

Enclosed .pdf files include statistical evaluation of meeting and the whole project.

Appendix 1. Answers for open ended questions.

What are the 3 most important benefits that you personally achieved from the project?

International understanding of qualifications frameworks
Detailed analysis about requirements in the logistics sector
Understanding stakeholders' concrete interests in having a sectoral qualification framework
Method for the definition of a Sectorial Qualification Framework
New international contacts

Partnership Activity

Collaboration with interesting and partly new project partners
Understanding the methodology behind building the LQF
Improvement of the know-how about training, and improvement of the English Language
More experience in the field of logistics

Understanding key issues in the sector across Europe
Networking and dissemination in workshops and conferences
Building a common framework at a European level
Networking with other EU organizations and partners
Possibility to apply the EQF in the context of logistics

What have been the 3 most important benefits for your organisation from project?

Partnership activity
Collaboration with interesting and partly new project partners
Participating in a trans-european effort
Networking with other EU organizations and partners
Possibility to use the research method in the field of logistics

Exposure to European projects
Further project experience in the transport and logistics sector
Understanding the methodology behind building the LQF
Availability of the LQF and the method for realizing it
New contacts in Europe

Networking with partners
Analysing core logistics work processes from a new perspective
Further work on qualification frames

What did we do well? (Give the main 3 only)

Partnership
Good collaboration and communication among partners / good partnership
The LQF methodology
Collaboration during project meetings
Structured partnermeetings

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



Project organisation & management
Solution-oriented work & dealing with problems
Defining fields of competencies
Good relations among the Consortium
Good communication between the partners at the meetings

Provision of anticipated outputs of the project
Initiating the process of building a SQF
Communication and Dissemination Tools
Group line-up

What could have been improved? (Give the main 3 only)

Advance information of what records to keep
The use of already existing information/material in the development of the LQF to reduce efforts for the field phase of the project
The LQF itself
Greater coordination of the Consortium especially at the beginning
Time management (more time for the last steps would have been useful)

More support for documentation
The financial administration of the project could have been solved more pragmatic (a lot of administration/efforts was required for providing necessary informations for financial reports)
The referencing of work processes to one single level of the LQF
Greater contribution from some project partners
Better and more access to companies

Dissemination activity
Extending the LQF to other logistics processes
More communication between the partner meetings

Has the project met your expectations? Please explain your answer.

Partly and it has opened up opportunities for further work that needs to be undertaken. The project met my expectation, but it would be important to have a follow-up project to work further with this basic version of an LQF and also to implement the work with it in a practical way, which makes it easier also to communicate its use to stakeholders. The project has met our expectations in terms of developing a framework to which stakeholders can refer to as a benchmark. However the LQF can be improved so as to be used more easily and more extensively on a daily basis. This would imply simplifying its structure. Yes, with reference to the LQF created within the project. With reference to the coordination and the contribution provided by some partners, my expectations were not fully met.