

Quality Assurance
Evaluation of WP7
Report focusing on Impact based on TNA

Made by: Peter Karstensen (pka@easv.dk)

January 2012

Introduction:

This report is Ref. no 32 according to the Evaluation Plan. The following is the result of the audit of WP7 and specially focusing on the link to WP5

Evaluation:

The evaluation of the tools meaning the impact, perception and assessment of the tools are described in Appendix 6: Product Evaluations and in the dissemination part as well as the exploitation of the project

Link between TNA and Training Material

With respect to the problems mentioned in the Progress Report Assessment Sheet (dated February 7th 2011): *“The training material and the tool-box are well prepared, however it is not evident how these products built on results of the training needs analyses and how these ones are incorporated in the training”*

Evaluation shows that in the finalized TNA Report the link between TNA and Training Material is documented: Advices for the training material based on TNA are made on page 8 in the TNA Report, headline 5.6: Content of the training module *“Combining all this information it is advisable to...”*

The link further on to the development of the Tool Box is documented on page 13 in the TNA Report, headline 7.8: Content of the toolbox *“At this moment we would like to propose to development a toolbox for companies composed of several elements, very much in line with the training for the consultants...”*

Interpretations of the findings in TNA

Another problem was mentioned in the Progress Report Assessment Sheet: *“Training needs analyses is so far the only finalized key product. However the methodology used to interpret the findings of the conducted interviews is not fully clear”*.

Evaluation state that Training Needs Analysis process basically consists of two parts:

1. The identification of training requirements and
2. The most cost-effective means of meeting those requirements.

The previously delivered TNA document mainly covers the former part. To address the latter part, the consortium partners used the following methodology after the TNA document was finalized:

Every partner assessed the possibilities to address the identified needs with:

- Existing own tools
- Own tools already in development
- Variations/enhancements of the above

This assessment happened within the scope of the TNA results, the project timeline and the available project resources.

In parallel, a similar assessment took place between the different project partners to investigate which combination of tools, existing or under development, would be appropriate to address the TNA outcome. The decision of which tools to include was taken by consensus.

Qualifications of consultants

A third problem was mentioned in the Progress Report Assessment Sheet: *“A selection of consultants to be trained is not tackled although their quality and competences will be crucial for the impact and success of the project and its results”*

Evaluation shows partners disagree with on this (see Minutes from 4th Partner meeting, Finland, and page 5): *“We would have been selecting not knowing on what basis to select; what would be the ideal consultant to train? Instead, by having non-selected consultants trained we now have different answers and a variety of perspectives – and from that basis are now able to set criteria for the ideal consultant. We should, however, remember to reflect upon how it may throw evaluation results slightly”.*

Furthermore from interview with Project Leader in relation to the qualifications: *“We did not set up selection criteria for participating consultants and companies in the trial out period (WP 7) as it was outlined in the project application. In retrospect I still believe it was a good decision not to screen the participants because we would then have risked having too many consultants and companies that were similar. With the open format we opted for, we ended up with a great variety of consultants and businesses. The quality of the consultants and companies can of course always be debated, but from my project manager point of view quality is often also linked to engagement. In all trial-out countries we had great engagement and all participants were willing to share their experience with the ExBased training module and tool kit. This was very valuable when we moved to WP 8 and fine-tuning of the project outcomes”.*

Dissemination and website

The ExBased Handbook was not part of the project deliverables, but at an early stage of the project it was decided that a handbook would make our tool kit much stronger. It is intended as a bridge between the abstract concept of experience economy and the very hands-on tools we have created. In this context it has great value for dissemination and any business consultants or SMEs who goes directly to the website because it sets the frame and provides key reference points.