



MID-TERM ASSESSMENT OF THE EDUPLAN TOOL – STRONG POINTS AND WEAK POINTS

REPORT ON

- **EVALUATION BY PILOT 1 PARTICIPANTS REGARDING STRONG AND WEAK POINTS (June - August 2011)**
and
- **SWOT ANALYSIS BY EDUPLAN PARTNERS (September-October 2011)**

WP8 QUALITY MANAGEMENT

By

Helga TREIBER, SICFOR-FCF, Quality Manager of EDUPLAN

7 October 2011

Version 2: 16 November 2011

Table of Content

1) Introduction

2) Results of the Evaluation by Pilot 1 participant

2.1) Strong points

2.2) Weak points

3) Results of SWOT Analysis by Eduplan partners

3.1) Strengths

3.2) Weaknesses

3.3) Opportunities

3.4) Threats

4) Conclusions

Annex

- i. Evaluation questionnaire in English, French and German
- ii. SWOT analysis scheme
- iii. Raw results of evaluation questionnaire
- iv. Raw results of SWOT analysis

1) Introduction

The present report deals with **two different Eduplan assessment actions**:

- The evaluation of the tool **by the participants of Eduplan pilot 1** (June-August 2011)
- The SWOT analysis **by the project partners** (September – October 2011)

Both assessments are part of the Quality Management plan. Their aim is to accompany the development of the Eduplan tool, to identify bottlenecks and problems, and to initiate corrective measures if deemed necessary.

The **methodologies of both assessments differ considerably**. They will be described in Chapter 2 and Chapter 3 in greater detail.

2) Results of the Evaluation by Pilot 1 participants

The evaluation was carried out between June and August 2011. It took place **during the pilot 1 phase of the Eduplan tool development**. Stakeholders – identified by the Eduplan partners – were invited to work with Eduplan and fill in an evaluation questionnaire. **Eduplan pilot version 1** was available in English, German and French, and it contained about 125 items. The participants had to go through these items online, and to comment, delete or add items, as well as to test the usability of the tool.

The **evaluation questionnaire** contained a number of questions related to the tool, to quality assessment, to usefulness of (self) evaluation and benchmarking. It was distributed in German, English and French (see Annex i.) and the responses of **13 stakeholders** (testers) could be collected.

The overall results of the evaluation are described in a separate report. **In the present report, we deal only with the perceptions about Eduplan as expressed in the answers**. All answers given in the evaluation **relating to the understanding of the tool** are included in the current analysis. Answers without direct link to the tool are not included in the present analysis. The perceptions have been grouped into strong points and weak points made about Eduplan in order to make comparisons between the evaluation and the SWOT analysis. For a full list of perceptions, see Annex iii.

In the perceptions mentioned by the stakeholders in the questionnaires, we could identify five themes which could be considered as strong points of Eduplan. Similarly, there are five themes, which summarize weak point of Eduplan, or things to be improved for pilot version 2.

The comments made by the pilot 1 users of Eduplan, and the weak points brought forward, were taken into consideration and were integrated into a new version of the questionnaire. This questionnaire was fine-tuned at the Limerick meeting in September by the partners present and subsequently submitted to a SWOT analysis (see section 3 of this report)

2.1) Strong points

Strong points of Eduplan, mentioned in the answers of the evaluation participants concern ¹

- Different ways of using Eduplan
- Customer relations
- Training engineering

Different ways of using Eduplan

The participants of the evaluation consider Eduplan as a monitoring tool that can be used to deal with quality assurance and to engage in gradual improvement in training courses. Measurement and evaluation are seen as important assets of the tool. The tool facilitates the assessment process as the views of different actors of a given training are integrated into one database. It can easily be used for reporting and making presentations and it is also considered as useful for improvement of processes. The tool “is supposed to assess, but it also helps to better prepare”.

Customer relations

Regarding relations with customers, Eduplan can assist providers to “identify the important points to be validated in advance with the client (a kind of check list)”. Customers appreciate (self) evaluation of training measures, and Eduplan will contribute to enhance customer satisfaction. In case of customer dissatisfaction, the tool can be used for an objective analysis based on tangible facts “and not just the feelings of one or the other “.

Training engineering

Eduplan enhances training engineering and makes it more professional. With the help of Eduplan best practices can be analysed and introduced into the development of the content and format of the training, according to the needs of the learners

Finally, it was stated that “This tool lacks today”.

2.2) Weak points

The weak points of Eduplan, as to be found in the remarks made by the pilot 1 participants concern

- Usability and user groups
- Need for clarifications
- Feel and look
- Length of questionnaire

¹ The colours used for highlighting the areas correspond to the colours used to analyse the answers of pilot participants – see annex iii below.

Usability and user groups

The pilot version 1 is considered by some of the participants as rather discouraging to use such a tool in the future. It was recommended that trainers should be evaluated by their colleagues during the courses. Also, the organisation of one of the pilot 1 participants is not concerned by a tool such as Eduplan; they could recommend it, though. Another comment deals with the present tool which is not seen in line with the original specification of Eduplan.

Some comments deal with the user groups of Eduplan, and the impression that there is too much provider focus. Eduplan should be structured in a way that it is attractive for most varied users groups and it should be tailorable for most varied needs.

Need for clarifications

Several comments reveal a need for clarifications. The wording of the questions was not always easy to understand as the vocabulary is considered to be very technical, and the sentences long and not very concrete. A more pragmatic and concrete approach was recommended. Also, the evaluation system of Eduplan and the outcomes which can be expected needs to be better explained, in a guideline, for example. Especially, the understanding who are the 'customers' needs to be clarified and better explained.

Feel and look

Several participants of the pilot one are concerned with the feel and look of the Eduplan tool web site. The remarks concern visual aspects as the site is not considered to be visually pleasing. Also, the ergonomics of the site should be improved in order to facilitate the navigation. Furthermore, indicators for actual –target comparison should be integrated into the tool. The answer categories (in percentages) should also be changed into “yes –no” options or another scale with clear labels.

Length of questionnaire

The Eduplan questionnaire of Pilot version 1 was considered by far too long and in need of a drastic reduction as many participants of the evaluation mentioned.

3) Results of SWOT Analysis by Eduplan partners

SWOT analysis is a planning tool used to understand the **Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats** involved in a project (Eduplan tool). It involves specifying **the objective of the project** and identifying **the internal and external factors which are favourable or unfavourable for attaining the objective**.

The **objective of Eduplan** which was submitted **for assessment** is the following:

Eduplan is an online instrument adaptable to various contexts and evaluating the achievement of stated goals in the training for the benefit of organisations, institutions, consultants in chambers, projects managers and personnel working in a range of guidance settings and allows also individuals (e.g. apprentices) to fill-in their ratings.

The full SWOT analysis scheme is available in Annex ii.

The information for the SWOT analysis was collected during and after the Eduplan meeting in Limerick in September 2011. **A large part of the meeting was dedicated to the online Eduplan structure, and to the reduction of the number of items in the Eduplan tool in particular.** The **pilot 2** version of Eduplan will contain **about 40 items**, as compared to **about 125 items** which were included in **pilot 1**, and which were subject of the evaluation described above. The SWOT exercise presented here deals with the Eduplan Pilot 2 version as finalised during the meeting. **Seven** Eduplan partners from Ireland, UK, France and Germany have contributed with their perception of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of Eduplan online tool.

The answers collected in the four fields of the SWOT matrix have been grouped into thematic areas and are presented in the order given through the frequency of mentions in the SWOT exercise.

An overview of all answer is given in Annex iv. The results of the grouping and summarising of the answers per SWOT field is presented below.

3.1) Strengths

In total, 28 strengths of Eduplan have been identified by the partners. These strengths concern the following thematic areas²:

- Various ways of using Eduplan
- EQUARF/ EU compatibility
- Process of developing the tool
- Items and questions
- Online tool
- Market potential

² The colours used for highlighting the areas correspond to the colours used to analyse the statements of the SWOT contributors – see Annex iv below.

Various ways of using Eduplan

Points regarding the use of Eduplan were most often made in relation to strength. The variety of possibilities for deploying Eduplan is seen as key by the partners. The fact that different stakeholders (e.g. VET organisations, course organisers, chambers, enterprises, apprentices, course participant and other users) can use the tool within their own perspective are a main asset. Other strengths concern the adaptability of the tool to specific contexts, actions and needs of specific user profiles, and the distinction in customer, recipient and provider in particular. Eduplan can also be used for data-mining.

EQUARF/ EU compatibility

The fact that Eduplan is consistent with EQUARF and compatible with EQUARF criteria is underlined by several partners as is the fact that the project is developed at European level and follows EU accepted definitions. The consideration given to the quality management cycle (and inherent quality standards) were mentioned in particular.

Items and questions

Another strength of Eduplan is linked to the concreteness of the questions which are presented in a logical sequence. It has also been mentioned a couple of times that filling in the Eduplan questionnaire does not need long responses.

Process of developing the tool

The way, Eduplan tool is developed is seen as another strength. It regards mainly the fact that the Eduplan questionnaire has been developed in a collaborative effort, and that there is a common understanding of the questions. Common solutions for the tool have been found, in particular regarding the continuous reduction of questionnaire items.

Tool online

Eduplan is a tool which will be available online. This is seen as a big advantage as no will be no need to download and install the application.

Another strength which has been mentioned once is related to the exploitation potential of the tool which is given through the partnership and the institutions linked to them. Also the graphical illustration which allows for assessing development and process is seen as a strength.

3.2) Weaknesses

In total, 20 weaknesses have been identified by the partners during the SWOT exercise. The main points made concern:

- Usability matters
- Theoretical aims and reality
- Items and questions
- The market

Usability matters

At the current stage, Eduplan has neither an introduction explaining its scope (and the limitations) nor a set of instructions on how to use the tool. Concrete and detailed guidelines need to be elaborated. No possibilities are given to the users for describing and explaining educational developments. A higher level of interaction between participants could be achieved by continuous exchange of experience, though. The time to fill in the Eduplan questionnaire is considered too long. In order to make the Eduplan tool usable, these points need to be addressed in the following version in order to facilitate the usability and to enhance the motivation of potential users.

Theoretical aims and reality

Among the weaknesses mentioned in the exercise, the lack of a theoretical foundation and the definition of evaluation take an important dimension. Questions are raised about the added value of Eduplan in relation to the evaluation methodology currently practised in the partners' institutions and how the instrument can be helpful to the user for developing quality improvements after the evaluation results.

Items and questions

Regarding the questions and items in the Eduplan tool, the fact that the **"all-in-one" model** of Eduplan might result in **too general questions** and in **too few questions** for the **given target** groups, was mentioned. Continuous reduction of questions might lead to an oversimplification of the tool.

The market

A fourth set of weaknesses regards the potential market of Eduplan. A market analysis for Eduplan does not exist and it has not (yet) been tested. However, it is mentioned that Eduplan is not the only tool on the market, and competition is to be expected from other players.

Other weaknesses which have been mentioned during the exercise regard matters of **avoiding misuse of the data collected**, as well as **time and other constraints** which might limit the commitment of the partners.

3.3) Opportunities

15 opportunities have been identified by the partners of Eduplan. These opportunities are focussing on the following themes:

- Variety of options to use Eduplan
- Legislative/ regulatory environment
- European dimension
- Future of Eduplan

Variety of options to use

Most prominent among the opportunities of Eduplan are the variety of options to use it. Different groups can use the tool, and due to its multilinguality, it can be applied in different countries. It could be developed to be used in other sectors such as health or social inclusion. It could even be used to benchmark quality assurance processes between different groups, sectors or countries. Development of quality assurance in a given field can be made more transparent. Important assets are also possibilities of reporting, producing printed reports, and exporting graphs and tables for presentations.

Legislative/ regulatory environment

Many opportunities for Eduplan reside in the regulatory and legislative environment in which it will be used. In France, for example, the government has introduced an evaluation process into VET measures by law. A tool such as Eduplan is well set to comply with the requirements following from this law. The French Association for Standardisation (AFNOR) has set up a Commission working on the standardisation program for learning services, especially on evaluation processes. The French partner is a member of this AFNOR Commission.

European dimension

The link with the EU institutions, and the support from and dialogue with these institutions are considered to open opportunities for Eduplan. A coherent base within and equivalent framework is built over all participating countries. Eduplan could develop into a standardized benchmarking tool on European level.

Future of Eduplan

Future opportunities of Eduplan are related the integration into a broader and more comprehensive approach to overall evaluation, as long as there is interest among the users. A huge opportunity could be the extension of customer acquisition.

3. 4) Threats

Overall, 21 threats for Eduplan have been mentioned by the partners who participated in the SWOT exercise. These concern diverse issues and the order of the following presentation of the issues follows the frequency of mentions:

- Acceptance of tool
- Ergonomics
- Uni-dimensional use
- Sustainability

Acceptance of tool

The partners perceive as a threat that the tool might not be accepted and that providers need to be convinced to use it. The acceptance of Eduplan is threatened as more time is needed to carry out a training course and more costs incur for a given training when using the tool. A marketing concept is missing which could contain arguments to help “selling” the tool.

Ergonomics

Threats from the ergonomics of Eduplan are linked to the number of questions which need to be reduced and at the same time all relevant questions need to be included in the tool. Language and concepts are another concern here, as there are many possibilities for misunderstanding. The concepts need to be clearly explained in concise language in order to make sure “that phrases and explanations make sense to specific users in particular environments”. A “lack of comparability due to missing coherent evaluation standards over all participating countries” is identified. Also, the time used to work with the Eduplan tool can be a threat.

Uni-dimensional use

Not exploiting the multiple features and use options of Eduplan is perceived as another threat. Eduplan could be used in a top-down approach only which would turn it into a control instrument but which is not the initial aim of using Eduplan.

Sustainability

Treats regarding the sustainability of Eduplan are coming from the need to keep the tool up-to-date, and to maintain the database, from financial and economic constraints in the partner organisations and changes among the staff of the organisations involved.

Some more single items were perceived as threats for Eduplan such as the assurance of the **subjectivity of responses**, changes in **policies and legislative** environment, the harmonisation of the **items corresponding to the scales**, the **lack of space for explanatory comments** which will prevent from informed planning and critical thinking.

4) Conclusions

The conclusions to be drawn here are derived from the SWOT exercise **ONLY**. Conclusions from the Pilot 1 evaluation (see Section 2 above) have been integrated in the Eduplan online version which was submitted for SWOT analysis by partners, and which will be tested again in pilot 2. The conclusions take up the most important topics coming out of the SWOT analysis.

The SWOT analysis carried out after the Limerick meeting in September 2011 is a snapshot of appreciation by the Eduplan partners at a given point in time. Another SWOT analysis will be carried out after the end of the pilot 2 user tests and it will be interesting to observe the evolution in appreciation between both SWOTs.

The overall picture of the results reveals that the perceived **Strengths** of the tool prevail with **28 statements** made. **Weaknesses** and **Threats** were expressed through **20** and **21** statements, respectively. **15** statements were related to **Opportunities** of Eduplan.

The following table gives an overview on the quantitative outcomes of the SWOT analysis.

	Helpful to achieving objectives	Harmful to achieving objectives
Internal origins attributes of the organisation	STRENGTHS 28	WEAKNESSES 20
External origins attributes of the environment	OPPORTUNITIES 15	THREATS 21

Table 1: Quantitative results of the SWOT analysis

It is interesting to note that at the time when the SWOT analysis was carried out, the Eduplan partners identified an almost **equal number of facts which are considered helpful to achieving the objectives** of Eduplan (i.e. 43) **against 41 facts considered harmful to achieving the objectives**. In the coming months, it will be important to discuss opportunities which arise from Eduplan intensely among the Eduplan partnership in order to promote and prepare the successful launch of Eduplan towards the end of the project. Opportunities are good marketing arguments!

Regarding the **internal and external origins** for attaining the objectives, facts stated by the partners and related to the attributes of the organisation (i.e. Eduplan) outnumber stated facts which are attributed to its environment, with 48 mentions of internal origins versus 36 mentions of external origins. At the point in time when the SWOT analysis was carried out, internal project and organisation related facts prevail in the partners' assessment of Eduplan, with more mentions of strong items than of weak items. Regarding the external facts to be considered for a successful

completion of Eduplan, a considerable number of statements relate to threats. In the coming months, it will be important to address the threats which were singled out by the partners (see above Section 3.4) in project discussions and exchanges in order to promote the use of Eduplan among VET players and facilitate its acceptance.

Annex

i. Evaluation questionnaire in English, French and German

1 EVALUATION – Questionnaire for the benchmarking – tool

Dear Sir/ Madam,

This benchmarking tool-kit has been developed by EDUPLAN – LRD-partner, in order to assist VET providers to access their Quality Assurance processes through this (self-)evaluation tool.

With your feedback you help us to make this questionnaire-tool-kit more user-friendly. At the same time we would like to know more about your satisfaction with this (self-) evaluation-instrument and its effects on your institution/chamber of commerce/enterprise. Therefore we would like to ask you to send us the filled questionnaire-tool-kit together with this evaluation-questionnaire back until **(DATE)**. Many thanks for your support!

2 General information:

Name:	
company/organisation:	
Size:	
Phone:	
Fax:	
Email:	

3 How would you rate the following aspects of the tool regarding....

	Excellent	Good	Adequate	Inadequate
Quality of questions				
Clarity of questions				
Simplicity of questions and lack of scientific jargon/ terminology				
Comprehensibility of presented information				
Relevance and applicability to the target groups				
Time needed to complete it				

4 Benefits

- 1. Did the test about benchmarking-tools encourage you to get more involved into (self-)evaluation and in Quality Assurance in your company/organisation?
.....
.....
.....
- 2. Do you think that (self-)evaluation can help your company/organisation in any way? If so, how?
.....
.....
.....
- 3. Would people in your company/organisation have a positive attitude towards (self-)evaluation?
.....
.....
.....
- 4. Would people in other company/organisation you collaborate with have a positive attitude towards (self-)evaluation?
.....
.....
.....

5 General final remarks

The questionnaire-tool-kit will be revised. What kind of advice for improvement do you have for the new version?

.....
.....
.....
.....

2. How should in your opinion the benchmarking too questionnaire-tool-kit be further developed? Which aspects do you miss?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

EVALUATION – Questionnaire pour l'analyse comparative

Madame, Monsieur

Ce support d'analyse vous est proposé par LRD, porteur du projet, afin de guider dans leur démarche critique les acteurs de la FPC sollicités sur cette première approche de l'outil d'auto-évaluation en ligne EduPlan.

Votre retour va nous permettre tout d'abord d'améliorer ce support afin de le rendre plus opérationnel. Dans le même temps, nous souhaitons connaître vos premières impressions sur la construction de l'outil en ligne et sur son impact potentiel sur l'activité de votre structure. C'est pourquoi nous vous invitons à renseigner l'outil en ligne assorti de ce support d'analyse pour le lundi 8 août 2011 au plus tard.

Nous vous remercions par avance de votre cordiale collaboration.

Informations Générales :

Nom :	
Entreprise/Organisation :	
Taille ³ :	
Téléphone:	
Fax:	
Email:	

Comment évaluez vous la fonctionnalité de l'outil en ligne par rapport à :

	Excellent	Bon	Médiocre	Inapproprié
La qualité des questions (formulation, pertinence)				
La clarté des questions (sens, cohérence)				
La simplicité des questions ainsi que la terminologie employée				
La compréhensibilité des demandes/questions présentées				
La pertinence et le lien avec les publics cibles potentiels				
Le temps nécessaire à la saisie				

Avantages

1. En quoi cette première approche peut-elle être susceptible de vous amener à vous impliquer davantage dans l'auto-évaluation et la démarche qualité de la politique de

3 Nombre de collaborateurs, le cas échéant nombre de stagiaires sur l'année.

formation de votre structure ?

.....
.....
.....

2. Pensez-vous qu'une démarche d'auto-évaluation puisse-t-êtr profitable à votre structure ; si oui, en quoi ?

.....
.....
.....

3. Avez-vous déjà des collaborateurs engagés dans une démarche d'auto-évaluation dans votre structure ? Si oui sur quels aspects ?

.....
.....
.....

4. Avez-vous des collaborateurs de structures partenaires d'engagés eux même dans une démarche d'auto-évaluation ? Si oui, sur quels aspects ?.....

.....
.....
.....

Remarques d'ordre général

L'outil en ligne actuel est voué à être revisité. Quels points d'améliorations vous semblent profitables à proposer pour la prochaine version ?

.....
.....
.....
.....

2. Quels seraient pour vous les points à développer sur ce premier support d'analyse, sur quels aspects faire porter d'éventuels autres points d'attention ?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Evaluationsfragebogen für das Benchmarkinginstrument

Sehr geehrte Damen und Herren,

dieser Benchmarkingleitfaden wurde von den BEQUAL Partnern entwickelt, um Anbietern der beruflichen Bildung durch Benchmarking zu helfen, ihre Qualitätssicherungsprozesse zu optimieren.

Mit Ihrem Feedback geben Sie uns die Möglichkeit, dieses Benchmarkinginstrument noch benutzerfreundlicher zu gestalten. Gleichzeitig würden wir gerne mehr über Ihre Zufriedenheit hinsichtlich dieses Benchmarkinginstrumentes und dessen Auswirkungen auf ihr/e Institution(Handelskammer/Unternehmen) erfahren. Wir möchten Sie daher bitten den ausgefüllten Fragebogen bis spätestens **XXXX** an uns zurückzusenden.

Vielen Dank für Ihre Unterstützung!

1. Allgemeine Information

Name:	
Firma / Institution/ Organisation:	
Größe (der Institution / Organisation):	
Telefon:	
Fax:	
Email:	

2. Wie bewerten Sie die folgenden Aspekte des Benchmarkinginstrumentes?

	<u>Sehr gut</u>	<u>Gut</u>	<u>Ausreichend</u>	<u>Mangelhaft</u>
Qualität der Fragen				
Deutlichkeit der Fragen				
Einfachheit der Fragen und Fehlen von wissenschaftlicher Terminologie				
Verständlichkeit der dargestellten Information				

Relevanz und Eignung für die Zielgruppe				
Relevanz für CQAF				
Benötigte Zeit um den Fragebogen auszufüllen				

3. Nutzen

1. Hat der Fragebogen zu den Benchmarkinginstrumente Sie dazu ermuntert, sich künftig stärker an der Implementierung von Evaluation und Prozessen der Qualitätssicherung innerhalb ihrer Firma/Organisation zu beteiligen?

.....

2. Glauben Sie, dass Benchmarking für ihre Firma/Organisation hilfreich sein kann? Falls ja, in welcher Hinsicht?

.....

3. Würden Menschen in ihrer Firma/Organisation eine positive Einstellung zu Benchmarking haben?

.....

4. Würden Menschen anderer Firmen/Organisationen, mit denen Sie zusammenarbeiten, eine positive Einstellung zu Benchmarking haben?

.....

4. Schlussbemerkungen

1. Das Benchmarkinginstrument wird überarbeitet werden. Haben Sie gezielte Verbesserungsvorschläge für die neue Version?

.....

.....

2. Wie sollte Ihrer Meinung nach das Benchmarkinginstrument weiterentwickelt werden?
Welche Aspekte vermissen Sie bisher?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

3. Hätten Sie Interesse daran, an einer weiteren Probebefragung in einer späteren Phase des
Projektes teilzunehmen?

.....
.....

ii. SWOT analysis scheme



SWOT ANALYSIS NR 1 – SEPTEMBER 2011

At the recent meeting of the Eduplan partnership in Tours (April 2011), it was agreed that a first SWOT analysis of the Eduplan tool should be carried out in June 2011, at the point in time when the first piloting takes place. All Partners and the persons participating in the first piloting should carry out a SWOT analysis of the tool.

To remind, SWOT analysis is a planning tool used to understand the **Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats** involved in a project (Eduplan tool). It involves specifying **the objective of the project** and identifying **the internal and external factors which are favourable or unfavourable for attaining the objective**. More information about the SWOT analysis can be found in the Eduplan Quality Management Plan.

Below on page 2 is a graphical representation of the SWOT matrix and the **definition of the of the EDUPLAN tool objective**. On **page 3**, you will find the **four boxes** where you can insert **your comments regarding the Strengths, the Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats of the EDUPLAN tool** after having participated in the first piloting of Eduplan in June and July 2011. Finally, on page 4 **a listing** gives some **keywords** which **subjects could be of interest** when carrying out a **SWOT assessment of Eduplan tool**. Please feel free to mention any topic in **your SWOT analysis** and do not limit yourself to the items listed in the table.

Please fill in these boxes on page 3 below with your assessment comments and send the sheet back to helga.treiber@icons.fr.

The external evaluator – Prof Thomas Eckert – and the EDUPLAN quality manager – Helga Treiber – will analyse your answers and compile a summary of the analysis.



OBJECTIVE OF EDUPLAN TOOL

Eduplan is an online instrument adaptable to various contexts and evaluating the achievement of stated goals in the training for the benefit of organisations, institutions, consultants in chambers, projects managers and personnel working in a range of guidance settings and allows also individuals (e.g. apprentices) to fill-in their ratings.

Listing with keywords for S, W, O T for Eduplan tool

	Helpful to achieve objectives	Harmful to achieve objectives
Internal origins	<p>STRENGTHS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advantages of Eduplan • Competitive advantages of the tool • Resources, assets, people • Experience, knowledge, data • Marketing - reach, distribution, awareness • Innovative aspects • Localisation issues • Price, value, quality • Accreditations, qualifications, certifications • Management cover, succession 	<p>WEAKNESSES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disadvantages of Eduplan • Lack of competitive strength • Reputation, presence and reach • Known vulnerabilities • Timescales, deadlines and pressures • Commitment, leadership • Accreditations, etc • Management cover, succession
External origins	<p>OPPORTUNITIES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Market developments • Competitors' vulnerabilities • Trends in professional training world • Technology development and innovation? • New markets, vertical, horizontal • Niche target markets • Geographical, export, import • Business and product development • Information and research • Partnerships, agencies, distribution 	<p>THREATS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Political effects • Legislative effects • Environmental effects • Competitors' intentions • Market demand • New technology, service • Vital contracts and partners • Sustaining internal capabilities • Obstacles faced • Insurmountable weaknesses • Loss of key staff? • Economy - home, abroad

iii. Raw results of evaluation questionnaire

Perceptions of EDUPLAN - Analysis of the answers to the evaluation questionnaire among the participants of the first pilot – June –August 2011

Answers by 13 persons – Eduplan tool with about 125 questions

Strong points	Weak points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • as a monitoring tool to deal with quality assurance • allows to engage in a gradual improvement in the quality of training • can be automated to simplify the assessment process and the final report for presentation to management, instances demonstrating the effectiveness of training. • yes, as a tool for quality improvement. • yes, this approach of (self-)evaluation of quality is essential for customer satisfaction • an evaluation process is always beneficial. It allows analysing the best practices to develop the content and format of the training, according to the needs of the learners. • If an action "goes wrong", does not satisfy one of the actors, the tool can support the analysis on more tangible, more objective (and not just the feelings of one or the other). In this sense, it is a tool that makes training engineering more professional. It allows you to exchange with colleagues after the fact, based on a common repository: sharing best practices, mutual enrichment. Although this is not its primary function, it can also identify the important points to be validated in advance with the client (a kind of check list): the multi-function aspect of the tool lays in the fact that it is supposed to assess, but it also helps to better prepare. • Yes, of course. This tool lacks today. The parades that I try to set up have quite no effects, as evaluation after the course that provides poor feedback. • This way to proceed can be interesting because it allows the mixing of different point of view from each of the actors concerned by the training action. The size of our structure and the fact that we are located on different geographic areas forces us to automate the evaluation processes. • sehr hilfreich hinsichtlich Prozessverbesserungen, Messbarkeit, sowie als Bewertungsinstrument • Die Anmerkungen aus der Schweiz sind ziemlich gut, und ich denke, dass nun alle Unklarheiten und Doppelungen bereinigt sind. Mehr Fragen würde ich nicht empfehlen. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • this first approach discourages to use such a tool. • evaluations of trainers ought to be done by colleagues during the learning courses. • sehr „trägerlastig“; Welche Fragen sind nutzbar? (z.B. für die Planung von Qualifizierungsmaßnahmen für Ausbildungsberater) -> • Fragebogen zu umfangreich • Wir sind lediglich ein Verband, daher können wir das Tool nicht selber nützen, sondern nur entsprechend weiterempfehlen • Clarify the questions by using a vocabulary more usual. • A presentation of and explanation about the objectives of the questionnaire is missing at the beginning of the tool. Why is there several times the same title? Where is the section about the customer to whom the training action is provided? The library is complicated. • Modify the ergonomic by using another way to navigate through the items. • The items will they be assessed with a scale such as "entirely - not at all" ...? It would be indispensable, de notre point de vue, que cette échelle permette les nuances, car les items sont rédigés de façon très affirmative parfois même « extrêmes » : les termes « systématiquement », « tous »... étant très souvent employés. From our point of view, that this scale allows the nuances because the items are written in a very affirmative way, even quite "extreme": the words "always", "all" are very often used. • Should be more visually pleasing • Should be more visually pleasing. • So strukturieren, dass es für unterschiedliche Zielgruppen interessant wird. • There is still some jargon and lack of clarity in some of the titles for the questions. For example, when looking at the menu of questions, I wouldn't know what to expect or what exactly is meant by phrases such as: 'Carry through Courses'; 'Purposeful Management Instruments'; or 'Utilization of Requirement Profiles for Trainers' – the language/wording used is often unclear. Also, I'm not sure what the background to the decision to call trainers, lecturers (etc?) 'Customer' was, but it is a bit misleading. Also, will Mediators, Guidance Counsellors and Team Leaders and Managers in projects that are involving dual education/transition from school to profession also be categorised under this term 'Customer'? I think the number of questions still needs to be refined down further for the areas that

	<p>are currently defined in the Tool. This is to ensure that the task of Self-Evaluation is very focused and not too time-consuming, while still ensuring that all key questions are asked.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a tool tailored and “tailorable” to the specific needs of the educational structure by reducing the number of questions and make it more ergonomic. • The evaluation system and its outcomes should be explained in a guideline before starting answering the questions. • Reduce the volume of questions • For us - actually it should not be more detailed but almost reduced! • Also the trainer can and must self-evaluate. As for quality, one of the questions is whether the means given to the trainer, in terms of time (for internal trainers) or in terms of pay (for subcontractors and contractors) are according to his preparation, his professional awareness and his own training. Also, it needs to clarify whether the organization has standard certifications (ISO 29990, OPQF) or not. The writing of the points is sometimes difficult to understand (technical vocabulary, long and less concrete sentences) • Being more pragmatic, concrete. • es könnte evtl. sinnvoll sein stellenweise Soll/Ist Vergleiche einzubauen • The tool-kit needs to be further developed in my opinion to fully reflect the original specification for the Eduplan Project. The way it is presently being developed is around the (self-) evaluation of Courses, Course Design, Course Delivery, Course Satisfaction, etc. There appears to be very little developed to explore the (self-)evaluation of dual education and projects that are involved in the transition from school to profession – and these complementary elements and initiatives that are apart from (and in addition to) the course offerings. If the Eduplan tool is to be developed and used to its full potential; it should include these elements. It would be very helpful if the tool could be used to evaluate and measure the progression of learners; through the various initiatives offered – have learners progressed in level of educational offering, or to profession, etc. • Dann würde ich von einer Prozentangabe absehen: Entweder "ja" oder "nein" oder "eingeführt, aber noch verbesserungsfähig".
--	---

iv. Raw results of SWOT analysis

STRENGTHS please fill in	WEAKNESSES please fill in
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Online tool - suitable to different profiles of users - Adoptable to specific contexts and actions - Can be used in a non-linear way /mode - Access to a web based tool rather than an application that has to be installed - Potential of good distribution to partners with own institution - Ability to localise the tool to meet individual needs - Reduction of the number of questions - Common understanding of the questions - The additional “data-mining” capabilities - Strict working on the questionnaire by the group - Compatible to EQUARF criteria - Adaptable to needs of providers - Developed at European level - Concrete questions - Based on EU accepted definitions - Tool follows a logical sequence: the sequence of questions should be obvious to the user. - Does not require prolonged responses in written or descriptive form. - The fact we have agreed that different stakeholders can log in to provide answers from their own perspective is a definite strength – this was previously a weakness, as it was all about course organisers - Consistency with EQARF is a strength - Tool follows the quality circle of EQARF. The questions are clearly indicated and follow the different purposes of the users. - There is no need for long responses which are difficult to translate properly into all 3 main languages (EN, DE and FR). - Common solutions have been made with all partners – explicitly with those from the big European countries UK, France and Germany. - Consistency with EQARF as a huge strength - The instrument EDUPLAN focusses on different purposes of different stakeholders within the field of vocational educational learning and training: to VET organisations and course organisers, to chambers, to enterprises, to apprentices and other users resp. participants. - further differentiation of the benchmarking tool for external and self-evaluation (e.g. considering the 3 given scenarios of customer; provider; recipient) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Secure data from a bad use (ethical rules) - Not the only toll present on the “learning market” (competition) - 'What is the added value of Eduplan in comparison to other evaluation tools that are being used by partners? What does Eduplan do that we do not have already? - Is Eduplan able to assist partners in developing quality improvement once the evaluation has taken place – tis will need further development - Time constraints, commitment from partner organisations in current economic climate - “all in one”: too general for target groups? - Too less questions? - No theoretical basis (yet) - Not tested (yet) - No analysis of the market - Biggest weakness is in shortcomings re what we define as ‘evaluation’. Eduplan as currently designed does not ‘evaluate achievement of stated goals.. for the benefit of organisations etc.’ as we claim. It does not allow for evaluating outcomes (results of education efforts); only inputs (checking if all the right ‘ingredients’ are there in planning and delivery of courses) Eduplan is therefore more about planning than evaluation. - We do not have an introduction explaining this scope or limitation. - Neither do we have a set of ‘instructions’ – showing people who it should be used and by whom (very important that this should cover the use of results as well as inputting information) - Even though we do not want long and elaborate text entries, there is now no capacity for users to make any explanation of their entries where they wish. - The measurement instrument EDUPLAN should be used under 30 minutes. There might be a weakness in describing clearly educational developments. But by repeating the use of the questionnaire the graphical overview will be clearly indicating the further development of weak points. - We have actually to define an introduction explaining this scope. - We might think of a set of ‘instructions’ for any kind of purposes to enhance the practical use for any kind of people

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - graphical illustration of development / progress to reveal possible success (→ reaching a higher level of transparency) - extensively consideration of the cycle of quality management, as well as herein coherently defined quality standards - continuous reduction of questionnaire items → short and summarizing tool for evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - concretization of the guideline in greater detail, as well as its provision in all of the participating countries' languages - reach an entire transparency regarding the potential and ambition of Eduplan (→ e.g. detailed guideline with preamble and glossary) - enable a higher level of interaction between the participants, respectively a continual exchange of experience - oversimplification of the questions step by step
<p>OPPORTUNITIES please fill in</p>	<p>THREATS please fill in</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SICFOR-FCF is involved in the AFNOR Commission that works on the standardisation program for learning services, especially on evaluation processes. - French government has introduced evaluation process in the law (VET) - Potential to develop the tool to reach other markets, i.e. quality assurance of health projects/social inclusion projects as well as VET/Adult learning projects - Achieve different groups using the tool - Different countries can use if they will see the chance to implement special questions and translations - Support by EU institutions possible - Dialogue with EU institutions - The area of reporting represents the greatest opportunity: it is our experience that users are most motivated/encouraged to keep using by the ability to both produce reports, and to query and use the data inputted for ongoing planning. If we get this right (allowing for ease of viewing, comparison of responses from different stakeholders and comparison of trends over time) then it will become really useful and popular - I think there is a real opportunity – following on from successful development of Eduplan – to design a project that incorporates this tool (focused on ensuring quality in course planning) into a broader and more comprehensive approach to overall evaluation (taking into account all aspects to do with inputs, outcomes, impacts an lessons emerging) . This would be SPEAK of course! - The use of this tool of EDUPLAN is manifold. It covers the opportunity of giving a transparent view on the development of quality assurance within a given field (organisation, training proceedings, courses etc.). Moreover it opens the opportunity to print the results and the compared developments within the single sectors and to produce reports for different purposes (e.g. prove of training-quality of tutors and trainers within companies). - And last but not least a possible perspective might be to allow a benchmark within companies' quality assurance and between countries involved into that project. - There is a permeability to the broader and more comprehensive approach if people are interested in going more into detail and to stick on process-orientation explicitly in course planning. This instrument is called SPEAK – the starter of this innovation transfer project EDUPLAN. - increase of customer acquisition - foster a coherent base over all 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How to ensure the subjectivity of responses? - How to reduce the number of questions(to ensure ergonomics) without forgetting any sensitive point. - Sustainability in terms of keeping tool up-to-date – maintaining the severe databank - Finance –economic threats/ efficiencies being made in organisations/ institutions - Changes to policies & legislative effects - Changes in staff amongst the partnership team. - Acceptance of the instrument by the providers - Finding homogenes items corresponding to the scales - Quality statement of the instrument - Marketing concept - Convincing providers to use the instrument - With no room for explanatory comments, people will forget why they have made a particular answer or rating in the past. This will block the capacity for informed planning. - Unless we are very clear, expectations amongst many potential users will be the Eduplan answers their requirements in terms of course evaluation – the motivation for many will be about demonstrating the effectiveness or results of their courses (not the suitability and efficacy or content and delivery). - The format (although good for saving time) does not lend itself to crucial thinking. The threat is that users will see Eduplan as a way to comply with requirements (or fulfil a 'duty') rather than an opportunity to engage – with other stakeholders – in critical and honest reflection. - Even though we will allow capacity for other stakeholders to make their own entries (course participants etc) the danger is that some organisations will use it only in one dimension – ie from a top-down management perspective. This will make any kind of validation impossible. - Language and concepts used are always a threat: we need to ensure that phrases and explanations make sense to specific users in particular environments - We have to take care about the time to fill-in this instrument. If it is too long-lasting people would not do it. - The tool indicates a transparent insight view into quality of trainings etc. We have to ensure that it doesn't lead to a control instrument for the quality of trainers e.g. within companies or institutions. Therefore it should be used vice-versa: for the provider and the customer – and of course also by the
---	--

<p>participating countries according to equivalent framework conditions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- standardized benchmarking tool on European plane of reference	<p>user.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- We have to avoid one-dimensional use resp. purposes.- lack of comparability due to missing coherent evaluation standards over all participating countries- minor acceptance of additional expenditure of time caused by Eduplan
---	--