BUS

Small Business Quality Management System

LLP-LDV-TOI-2008-HU-003

PROJECT EVALUATION REPORT

Prepared by: Nataša Urbančíková, TU Košice

CONTENT

1. **Project summary…….. 3**
2. **WP1 evaluation……. 4**
3. **WP2 evaluation…… 12**
4. **WP3 evaluation……. 13**
5. **WP4 evaluation……. 14**
6. **WP5 evaluation…….. 14**
7. **WP6 evaluation…….. 15**
8. **WP7 evaluation ……. 18**
9. **WP7 evaluation…….. 19**
10. **General conclusions……. 20**

1. Project summary

The aim of the project is to transfer the results of "Quality Management Systems Training for SMEs" Leonardo project results that was implemented from 2002 to 2005. This project was implemented successfully in Greece, Spain, Austria, Czech Republic, France, United Kingdom, Finland and Italy. It developed a set of learning and practicing tools for acquiring necessary knowledge and skills on how to implement a quality assurance system according to ISO 9001:2000 standards. These products are very practical and easy to use for the SMEs and their simplicity and applicability to the SMEs has been proven.

The BUS project consists of following WPs:

WP1. Project management and administration

WP2. Needs analysis

WP3. Actualisation, translation and adaptation of the input materials

WP4. Trainers handbook, Multimedia CD and supporting documents

WP5. E-learning material development

WP6. Pilot trainings

WP7. Valorisation

WP8. Evaluation and quality management

The following main results have been produced:

- Web page of the project
- Needs analyses
- Brochure
- Guidebook
- Multimedia CD
- E-learning materials
- Training handbook
- Pilot training
- Supporting documents
- Valorisation plan
- IPR agreement

2. WP1. “Project management and administration” evaluation

The project management has been evaluated on ongoing base. The evaluation ensured that the project management has been efficient and effective.

The following tools have been used:

- Evaluation questionnaire after each project meeting. Altogether 5 project meetings have been carried out:
    - 1st kick of meeting in Athens, Greece
    - 2nd project meeting in Kosice, Slovakia
    - 3rd project meeting in Cluj, Romania
    - 4th project meeting in Athens, Greece
    - 5th project meeting and final conference in Budapest, Hungary

Each project meeting has been evaluated by all project partners based on the questionnaire that has been prepared by coordinator. All project partners filled in questionnaires and sent it to project coordinator after the project meeting was held (see Picture 1).

The project consortium consists of 6 partners:

P0: MVA Hungary
P1: CEE Hungary
P2: GMS Hungary
P3: TREBAG, Hungary
P4: TU Košice, Slovakia
P5: IDEC, Greece
P6: UAS Romania

Altogether **30 evaluation forms** have been received and evaluated. All project meeting organisers were aware of fact that the project meeting will be evaluated and also the evaluation criteria have been known before meeting organisation.

The kick off meeting evaluation pointed out following issues (for Kick off meeting questionnaire see Picture 1):

- Project partner were optimists regarding their ability to implement project results into their organisations
- There adjustment of the materials to country needs was consider as necessary
- WP6 was pointed out as most critical and it was recommended to put the effort in order to ensure its high quality fulfilment.
- The problem coming from financial crises has been stressed as it can effect the participation of SMEs in training.

The consortium meetings used the evaluation criteria's (for Consortium meeting questionnaire see Picture 2):

The criteria 1. Project meeting organisation

The criteria 2. Appropriateness of the leading of the workshop

The criteria 3. Effectiveness of the content

The criteria 4. The suitability of the resources

The criteria 5. The atmosphere

The criteria 6. The social event

Based on the questionnaires feedback all project meetings have been evaluated as:

1. Well organised
2. Appropriately leaded
3. Providing the high quality of presentations
4. Project partners were satisfied with agenda
5. The tasks to be completed for the next workshop were clear
6. The documentation was appropriate
7. The Consortium was suitable to complete the tasks after the personal meeting
8. Quality of collaboration among partners was stated as satisfacory
9. The suitability of the resources – equipment and materials was sufficient.
10. Social events and atmosphere during the meting were positive.

Picture 1. Kick off meeting evaluation questionnaire

KICK-OFF MEETING EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

18-19TH NOVEMBER 2008

ATHENS, PIRAEUS

ORGANISATION:	**COUNTRY:**
EVALUATOR:	**DATE:**

A) PREVIOUS PROJECT - QUALITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS TRAINING FOR SMES (2002-2005)

AS YOU ALREADY KNOW, THE BASE OF BUS PROJECT IS A PREVIOUS LEONARDO PROJECT CALLED 'QUALITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS TRAINING FOR SMES'. THIS PROJECT WAS IMPLEMENTED SUCCESSFULLY IN GREECE, SPAIN, AUSTRIA, CZECH REPUBLIC, FRANCE, UNITED KINGDOM, FINLAND AND ITALY BETWEEN 2002-2005. IT DEVELOPED A SET OF LEARNING TOOLS IN ORDER TO TRANSMIT ESSENTIAL SKILLS AND KNOWLEDGE CONCERNING THE IMPLEMEMNTATION OF A QUALITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM ACCORDING TO ISO 9001:2000 STANDARD.

		YES/NO	*COMMENTS*
1	DO YOU THINK THE PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE IS WORTH TO BE CONSIDERED?		
2	DO YOU THINK BUS WILL BE ABLE TO IMPLEMENT A SIMILAR METHODOLOGY?		
3	DO YOU SUGGEST TO ADAPT THE ALREADY EXISTING GUIDES AND E-LEARNING MATERIAL TO THE SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS OF BUS PROJECT?		

B) BUS PROJECT

		YES/NO	*COMMENTS*
1	DO YOU THINK BUS CAN BE A SUITABLE PROJECT IDEA TO DEVELOP RELEVANT AND INNOVATIVE E-LEARNING CONTENTS?		
2	DO YOU THINK BUS OBJECTIVES AND INDICATORS WILL BE REACHED AT THE END OF THE PROJECT?		

		YES/NO	COMMENTS
3	BUS WILL DEVELOP A LEARNING METHODOLOGY AND ALSO AN E-LEARNING PLATFORM. DO YOU THINK BOTH ARE USEFUL TOOLS FOR SMES?		
4	WHICH WORK PACKAGE OR PHASE CAN BE CRITICAL DURING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF BUS PROJECT?		
5	WHAT DO YOU THINK ARE THE MAIN POSSIBLE WEAKNESSES OF BUS PROJECT?		
6	WHAT DO YOU THINK ARE THE MAIN STRENGTHS OF BUS PROJECT?		
7	THE PARTNERSHIP EMBRACES ORGANISATIONS WITH VARIOUS PROFILES FROM DIFFERENT EUROPEAN COUNTRIES. DO YOU CONSIDER THIS DIVERSITY AN ADVANTAGE OR A DISADVANTAGE REGARDING THE PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION?		

C) EVALUATION OF KICK-OFF MEETING

		YES/NO	COMMENTS
1	DID THE KICK-OFF MEETING MEET YOUR EXPECTATIONS?		
2	DID YOU FIND THE ACCOMMODATION, MEETING ROOM AND TECHNICAL FACILITIES ADEQUATE?		
3	DID YOU FIND THE PRESENTATIONS USEFUL AND OF GOOD QUALITY?		
4	WHICH PRESENTATION WAS THE MOST INTERESTING AND / OR USEFUL FOR YOU?		
5	WHICH PRESENTATION WAS THE LEAST INTERESTING AND / OR USEFUL PART FOR YOU?		

D) OTHER COMMENTS, IF ANY:

Picture 2. Questionnaire for the Consortium meeting (sample)

CONSORTIUM MEETING EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

DATE OF THE MEETING

PLACE OF THE MEETING

ORGANISATION:	**COUNTRY:**
EVALUATOR:	**DATE:**

Please rate the meeting according the following criteria! Add some more comments if necessary!

1. The organization of the meeting

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Comments:

2. Appropriateness of the leading of the workshop

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Comments:

3. Effectiveness of the content

Quality of the presentations

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Comments:

Satisfaction with the Agenda

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Comments:

Definiteness of the tasks to be completed for the next workshop 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ***Comments:***
Distinctness of the documentation 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ***Comments:***
The suitability of the Consortium to complete the tasks after the personal meeting 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ***Comments:***
Quality of collaboration among partners 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ***Comments:***
4. The suitability of the resources
Equipment 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ***Comments:***
Materials 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ***Comments:***

5. The social events 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ***Comments:***
6. The atmosphere 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ***Comments:***
7. Other observations:

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME DEDICATED TO EVALUATION!

Besides the project meeting the **project workphase have been evaluated** on the onging base. They consisted from 4 evaluation phases:

Evaluation phase I: 1.10.2008 -30.3.2009
Evaluation phase II: 1.4.2009 - 30.9.2009
Evaluation phase III: 1.10.2009 - 30.3.2010
Evaluation phase IV: 1.4.2010 - 31.12.2010

Altogether **24 evaluation forms** have been prepared (for Evaluation form see Picture 3). The evaluation forms have been sent to project coordinator and helped to evaluate project progress and partners satisfaction. The evaluation of the consortium has been discussed during the next consortium meeting.

Picture 3. Work package evaluation form

Work Package Evaluation Form

This questionnaire is made for asking your opinion after each work-phase and your expectations concerning the coming months. Your opinion is very valuable for us and will be integrated in the reports of the project. Please answer the following questions.

Thank you for your cooperation!

Work Packages:	
Name of partner-organisation:	**Country:**
Address:	
Person responsible for data:	**Position of person in organisation:**
Date:	

1) Report about your past activities in the workphase:

2) Indicate changes in your past project activities:

3) Are there any expected future variations to your planned activities?

4) Did you feel the targets set out in the Work Package were met? If, No please comment

5) To what extent do you think you will use the reports and ideas generated by the Work Package?

6) Please comment on the project process eg: promoting/coordinating organisation, partnership, decision making and management.

7) Any other comments?

8) What is your overall impression of the Work Package?
(1 = very bad; 10 = very good)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Why?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME DEDICATED TO EVALUATION!

3. WP2. "Needs analysis" evaluation

The aim of this WP was to identify the concrete needs of the local SMEs according to quality management training and to draw their attention to the lacking competences in this field.

The result of the WP2 has been prepared based on partners in the "target countries" research on the quality management system used by the SMEs in their country with the coordination of IDEC. From the national reports a common report was elaborated. The report has been evaluated by project partners based on evaluation work package form. The first version of Need Analyses Report has been replaced by the second, more detailed and based on primary research in each country.

4. WP3. "Actualisation, translation and adaptation of the input materials" evaluation

The aim is this WP was to update the inputs of the project (the guidebook and the training material), to translate them into Hungarian, Romanian and Slovakian and adapt them to the national circumstances and the needs of local SMEs detected in the WP2.

The updated materials have been evaluated in each country by independent evaluators by the following partners:

P0: MVA Hungary
P4: TU Košice, Slovakia
P5: IDEC, Greece
P6: UAS Romania

The internal evaluations were sent to project coordinator. If evaluations were in national language the short description in English is provided.

5. WP4. "Trainers handbook, Multimedia CD and supporting documents" evaluation

In this workpackage partners elaborated Trainers handbooks with a multimedia CD and sample supporting documents for SMEs for quality management both for production and service sectors.

The updated materials have been evaluated in each country by independent evaluators by the following partners:

P0: MVA Hungary
P4: TU Košice, Slovakia
P5: IDEC, Greece
P6: UAS Romania

The internal evaluations were sent to project coordinator. If evaluations were in national language the short description in English is provided. If evaluations are in national language the short description in English is provided.

6. WP5. “E-learning material development” evaluation

The aim of this WP was the elaboration of a web-based e-learning material for QMS training for SMEs.

The e-learning materials has been evaluated by each partner were the pilot run of course has been carried out (altogether 4 pilot runs in 3 countries, 2 in Hungary, one in Slovakia and 1 in Romania).
For evaluation see part 7. WP6. “Pilot trainings” evaluation

7. WP6. “Pilot trainings” evaluation

WP was aimed to piloting the e-learning material among SME in Hungary, Slovakia and Romania. The Common Pilot Training Report has been prepared by IDEC Greece based on two types of questionnaires:

- Questionnaire for trainees
- Questionnaire for trainer

The evaluation of following items has been carried out:

- BUS training materials
- BUS course
- Global evaluation

It enabled to evaluate both training participants’ opinion and also trainer opinion. For questionnaires see Picture 4 and 5. **The comprehensive evaluation report prepared by IDEC Greece has been sent to project coordinator.**

Picture 4. Evaluation questionnaire for trainees

Evaluation Questionnaire for trainees

Name of trainee: _____ _____

Organization/Company: **Place (town, country):** **Date:**

Position/Function: **Sector:**

Please fill in all the questions as required below.
Use from 4 (most positive) to 1(most negative) according to your opinion.

A. Small BUS Training material

1. What do you think about the training material in general?

Very interesting			**Not interesting**
4	**3**	**2**	**1**

Comments and suggestions

2. There is a clear integration among all the elements in the material (theory, case studies etc).

I agree			I disagree
4	3	2	1

Comments and suggestions

3. Do you think that this training material introduces new and innovative elements respected to other training materials related to managing quality management systems?

Yes			No
4	3	2	1

Comments and suggestions

4. From your point of view, the training material for QMS could go more deeply into the following aspects:
5. Were there any topics which were not necessary?

B. COURSE EVALUATION (E-learning)

1. **Time distribution has been:**

Appropriate			**Inappropriate**
4	**3**	**2**	**1**

Comments and suggestions

2. **I find the delivery method:**

Appropriate			Inappropriate
4	3	2	1

Comments and suggestions

……..……
……..……
……..……..……

3. **I consider course facilities (web-platform, material etc) and services (communication with the trainer):**

Appropriate			Inappropriate
4	3	2	1

Comments and suggestions

4. **I find the course organization:**

Excellent			Very poor
4	3	2	1

Comments and suggestions

5. **Are technical issues (e.g. use of web-platform) clearly explained and demonstrated?**

Yes			No
4	3	2	1

Comments and suggestions

6. **Did you encounter difficulties in the pilot course?** Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, please specify

C. GLOBAL EVALUATION

Excellent			Very poor
4	3	2	1

Would you recommend this course to other persons? Why?

Please, write down other comments or suggestions.

Picture 5. Evaluation questionnaire for trainers

Evaluation Questionnaire for trainers

Name:

Methods of training (face to face or e-learning):

Number of trainees:

1. Did you find the training material useful for the target group?

Very useful			Not useful
4	3	2	1

Comments and suggestions

2. Did you find the training material complete?

Very complete			Not complete
4	3	2	1

Comments and suggestions

3. Do you think that this training material introduces new and innovative elements respected to other training materials concerning this topic?

Very innovative			Not innovative

Comments and suggestions

4. The contents appear relevant related to the sector of small business and useful.

I agree			I disagree
4	3	2	1

Comments and suggestions

5. In your opinion, trainee's participation has been:

Very active			None
4	3	2	1

Comments and suggestions

6. I consider course facilities (e-learning platform, material etc) :

Appropriate			Inappropriate
4	3	2	1

Comments and suggestions

7. I find the course organization:

Excellent			Very poor
4	3	2	1

Comments and suggestions

8. Did you encounter difficulties in the pilot course? Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes what? ☐

Small interest ☐

Small participation ☐

Inadequacy of training materials ☐

Other (please specify) ☐

9. Did you use other material and/or tools than those included in the training suite?

Yes No

If yes, please specify the material used:

Please, write down other comments or suggestions

8. WP7. "Valorisation" evaluation

WP aimed to:

- Dissemination and exploitation of the project results
- To reach target group at the widest possible extent for the dissemination of the project's results
- Dissemination of the project's results to target groups at national and international level
- Creating awareness among the related bodies
- Facilitating the access to the project outcomes
- The examination of commercial exploitation of project results by the project partners
- Elaboration of an IPR agreement for the commercialisation of the results.

The WP has been evaluated on ongoing bases as a part of Work phase evaluation described in details at the Part 2 of this report.

9. WP8. “Evaluation and quality management” evaluation

WP aimed to:

- Evaluation of projects interim and final products
- Assure the quality check of the project interim and final products
- Maximization of the project’s impact both in national and international level
- To ensure the application of quality management procedures in the implementation of the project.
- To ensure the quality of project outcomes and their applicability for the target group.
- To ensure the active participation of all project partners in the implementation of the project.

The WP8 has been evaluated on ongoing bases as a part of Work phase evaluation described in details at the Part 2 of this report.

The evaluation of project interim and final products has been assured:

Internally: feedback questionnaires

Externally: independent evaluation experts reviews, feedback questionnaires from target group

The procedure has been explained in detail in the previous sections of this Evaluation report.

10. General Conclusions

The coordinator started to communicate with NA after project proposal approval. The Contract materials and financial issues have been solved.

The coordinator of the project also started to communicate within partnership very early after the project approval has been announced. The communication included the preparation of the subcontracts with all partners (financial issues, tasks, timetable). The results of the meeting are in the meeting minutes. Setting up of communication systems – the general rules for communication have been agreed; the list of the partners and contacts has been elaborated and sent to all partners. Web-site preparation – the WEB site has been establish that includes public and private part. Management arrangements have been agreed including the management of quality control procedures.

The quality assurance was firmly incorporated into project form the very beginning phase. It enables to achieve high quality project results and overall satisfaction with project coordination.