



Erasmus+

Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

WP 5 - Project assurance and efficiency (Quality Plan)

EVALUATION OF MANAGEMENT MEETINGS

CRE.THI.DEV.

October 2018







Erasmus+

Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

Document Data

Distribution List	CO (Confidential, only for members of the Consortium (including the Commission Services))
Document Version	0.1
Reviewed by	
Review Date	

Version	Date	Author/Organization
0.1	5 October 2018	Maya Dimitriadou / CRE.THI.DEV

Disclaimer

This project has been funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union.

The information and views set out in this publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the European Union. Neither the European Union institutions and bodies nor any person acting on their behalf may be held responsible for the use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged.

Copyright © INVENT Consortium, 2015-2018





Erasmus+

Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

Table of Contents

1	Executive Summary	4
2	Introduction.....	4
3	Objectives of the Deliverable	4
4	Methodology	5
5	Results	5
6	Conclusions.....	7
7	Annexes	7
	Annex I : QF-PME(1.0): Project Meeting Evaluation Questionnaire.....	8





Erasmus+

Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

1 Executive Summary

In the scope of the INVENT project, and particularly according to what is foreseen in the Quality Plan, this report contains the results of the evaluation of the management meetings of the project according to what is foreseen in the Quality Plan Manual.

The management meetings have been evaluated as successful.

2 Introduction

The management meetings that took place during the lifetime of INVENT project are one of the most important tools used for the communication between the partners.

Each meeting was organized by the Project Coordinator (JUST) in cooperation with the partner who was responsible for its hosting.

There were five management meetings for INVENT project, which were the following:

1. Kick-off meeting: Dead Sea, Jordan, February 20-23, 2016
2. 2nd meeting: Leipzig, Germany October 24– 28, 2016
3. 3rd meeting: Porto, Portugal, April 30– May 1, 2017
4. 4th meeting: Athens, Greece, October 12-13, 2017
5. Final meeting: Dead Sea, Jordan, September 25-29, 2018

Before the meetings, the PC prepared the Agenda of the meeting that was circulated to the partners. During the meetings all partners presented the progress of the WPs they were responsible for as well as the different activities that were organized by them. After each meeting, the PC prepared the minutes of the meeting that were also circulated to the partnership.

3 Objectives of the Deliverable

The objective of the evaluation of the management meetings was to assess different aspects of them, so that necessary actions were taken for the preparation of the next one, if it deemed necessary, which means, if the evaluations scored beneath the acceptance limit of 75% satisfaction.





Erasmus+

Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

4 Methodology

The quality of the management meetings has been evaluated through questionnaires that were answered by all partners that participated in them, using the QF-PME Project meeting evaluation questionnaire (Annex I).

For the evaluation of the meetings, a set of indicators have been established, which could be measured on a scale from 1 to 5, where 5 is very positive and 1 is very negative. The indicators were relevant to the different aspects of the meetings.

The partners had access to the questionnaire, through google forms.

The answered questionnaires were elaborated by the Quality Manager, who informed the partnership accordingly. The results of the evaluations were also presented during the management meetings of the project.

The elaboration of the answers to the questionnaires was made by CRE.THI.DEV, with the use of excel.

The formula for the evaluation of results was the following:

$$[(1a + 2b + 3c + 4d + 5e)/5 (a+b+c+d+e)] \%$$

Where:

a, b, c, d, and e are the numbers of questionnaires that rated the activity with 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 respectively.

The activity was considered successful if the percentage of satisfaction was more than 75%. In case the percentage of satisfaction was less than 75%, CRE.THI.DEV would propose proper corrective actions which should be agreed with the Project Coordinator.

5 Results

The results of the evaluation of management meetings, are presented in the table below. No assessment was performed for the kick-off meeting, because the questionnaire had not been developed yet.







Erasmus+

Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

Question	Percentage (%) of satisfaction			
	2 nd meeting, Leipzig	3 rd meeting, Porto	4 th meeting, Athens	Final meeting, Dead Sea
How do you evaluate the agenda of the meeting?	87,14	93,33	90,00	100,00
What is your opinion of the general organization and facilities of the meeting?	84,29	95,00	93,33	98,46
What is your opinion for the venue of the meeting?	87,14	93,33	93,33	100,00
How do you evaluate access to the venue of the meeting?	84,29	90,00	85,00	96,92
How do you evaluate the presentations by the members of the consortium during the meeting?	85,71	86,67	91,67	96,92
How do you evaluate the presentations by the guests that were invited to the meeting?	88,57	82,86	94,00	95,38
Was the timetable respected?	87,14	86,67	86,67	96,92
To which extent did the meeting live up to your expectations?	84,29	86,67	90,00	96,92
What is your opinion regarding the added value of the meeting with respect to the progress of the project and the scheduling of the next steps?	81,43	90,00	91,67	98,46
How do you evaluate catering and meals?	84,29	81,67	85,00	95,38
How do you evaluate the accommodation (hotel) that was proposed by the host of the meeting?	94,29	91,67	80,00	98,46





Erasmus+

Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

6 Conclusions

The management meetings that took place during the project were successful, especially the final meeting that was organized by the project coordinator (JUST) and there was no need for corrective actions.

7 Annexes







Erasmus+

Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

Annex I : QF-PME (1.0): Project Meeting Evaluation Questionnaire

[Place where the meeting was held] meeting evaluation ([date of meeting])

Please answer each question with an evaluation from 1-5, where 1 is Poor and 5 is Very Good.

PROJECT MEETING EVALUATION					
	1	2	3	4	5
How do you evaluate the agenda of the meeting?					
What is your opinion of the general organization and facilities of the meeting?					
What is your opinion for the venue of the meeting?					
How do you evaluate access to the venue of the meeting?					
How do you evaluate the presentations by the members of the consortium during the meeting?					
How do you evaluate the presentations by the guests that were invited to the meeting?					
Was the timetable respected?					
To which extent did the meeting live up to your expectations?					
What is your opinion regarding the added value of the meeting with respect to the progress of the project and the scheduling of the next steps?					
How do you evaluate catering and meals?					
How do you evaluate the accommodation (hotel) that was proposed by the host of the meeting?					
COMMENTS:					





WORKSHOP (VISITS) EVALUATION					
	1	2	3	4	5
What is your opinion of the general organization of the visits that took place between [date] and [date]?					
How do you evaluate access to the sites of the visits?					
Were the visits of added value with respect to the objectives of the project?					
COMMENTS:					
QUESTIONS REGARDING SPECIFIC CONDITIONS THAT CONCERN THE SPECIFIC MEETING					
	1	2	3	4	5
COMMENTS:					





Erasmus+

Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP



Erasmus+



Erasmus+

Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

WP 5 - Project assurance and efficiency (Quality Plan)

Technical Implementation Report – Quality Assurance measures –May 2018

CRE.THI.DEV.

May 2018



Erasmus+





Erasmus+

Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

Document Data

Distribution List	CO (Confidential, only for members of the Consortium (including the Commission Services))
Document Version	0.1
Reviewed by	
Review Date	

Version	Date	Author/Organization
0.1	15 May 2018	Maya Dimitriadou / CRE.THI.DEV

Disclaimer

This project has been funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union.

The information and views set out in this publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the European Union. Neither the European Union institutions and bodies nor any person acting on their behalf may be held responsible for the use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged.

Copyright © INVENT Consortium, 2015-2018





Erasmus+

Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

Table of Contents

1	Executive Summary	4
2	Introduction.....	4
3	Objectives of the Deliverable	4
4	Results	4





Erasmus+

Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

1 Executive Summary

In the scope of the INVENT project, and particularly according to what is foreseen by ERASMUS PLUS Programme, this report contains the Quality Assurance measures that have been implemented from April 2017 until May 2018.

2 Introduction

This report is sent to the Project Coordinator in order to compile the Progress report on implementation of the action from April 2017 until May 2018.

3 Objectives of the Deliverable

The objective of this report is to inform the Project Coordinator about the progress of Quality Assurance issues so that he compiles the overall report to be sent to Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA)

4 Results

In the scope of the INVENT project, and particularly according to what is foreseen in the WP5 Project assurance and efficiency, the consortium decided that it is to the benefit of the satisfaction of its quality objectives to prepare a Project Quality Plan Manual.

The objective of the Quality Plan Manual is to ensure the production of concrete and high-quality results in line with the project plans.

In this context, the main purpose of the Quality Plan Manual is to facilitate the project's management and guide all partners on the evaluation and quality issues, by establishing a coherent set of guidelines by which all aspects of the project are managed and measured. It is the use of these guidelines that will ensure better collaboration among the consortium members, individuals and groups, and will also ensure that the entire consortium is responsible for and engaged in the work that is produced by the project.

The main purpose of the Project Quality Plan is to describe the Quality Management procedures that the project team will follow in order to ensure, monitor and control the quality of all processes and deliverables produced during the INVENT project lifecycle. In particular:





Erasmus+

Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

- To clearly define the content, format, review and approval process of the project deliverables;
- To define the responsibilities of the project partners regarding those deliverables.
- To identify all the different tools and means to be applied throughout the project duration
- To provide guidelines for adequate implementation and thereby assure that certain quality standards in the performance of our tasks are fulfilled.
- To define the quality requirements that must be obtained throughout the project lifecycle, those that the deliverables, actions and results must conform to.

The Quality Plan Manual was drafted by CRE.THI.DEV (Quality Manager) and submitted to the other members of the Quality Committee (JUST, University of Cyprus, ARCA,P&B, MU and AULE) for comments and amendments. The final version of the Quality Plan Manual (version 1.0) was issued on 5 January 2017.

The Quality Plan Manual foresees for activities of internal and external evaluation. Internal evaluation is carried out by the partners of the project and external evaluation is carried out a) by the external monitor as well as b) by the target groups of the different activities of the project (e.g participants in dissemination or training activities). Evaluations are carried out mainly with the aid of specific questionnaires that are included as annexes to the Quality Plan Manual. Google forms is used for the circulation of the questionnaires to the members of the consortium.

From April 2017 up to May 2018 the following evaluations have taken place:

a) Internal evaluation of deliverable “Communication plan and toolkit”. This deliverable was accepted by the partnership with no changes.

b) 2nd internal evaluation of the project. All 20 questions scored above 81% satisfaction (75% satisfaction is the acceptance limit). 15 questions either showed an increase in satisfaction either remained stable, while only 5 questions showed a small decrease in relation to the 1st internal evaluation. These were the following:

How do you evaluate the consortium’s efficiency to resolve problems? – from 96,67% (1st evaluation) to 94% satisfaction.

How do you evaluate the effectiveness and clarity of communication with other agencies eg. the National Agency, EEA Grants Managing Authority? – from 85,45% (1st evaluation) to 81,67%.

How do you evaluate the quality of the relationship among the partners and team-development? – from 91,67% (1st evaluation) to 88,33%.





Erasmus+

Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

How do you evaluate the adherence to the Work Plan by all partners? – from 83,33% (1st evaluation) to 81,67%.

How do you evaluate the quality of materials/guides/reports/products throughout the life-cycle of the project? – from 91,67% (1st evaluation) to 88,33%.

The results of the evaluation were taken into consideration by the coordinator of the project.

c) Internal evaluation of the meeting in Porto, Portugal (April-May 2017) and Athens, Greece (October 2017).

d) Evaluation of the dissemination activities held by the Jordanian Universities was performed locally.

e) Evaluation of the training activities in European partners' countries for CTI staff, by the trainees.

Finally, a quality event took place in Athens, Greece from 3-5 May 2018.





IN^oVENT



Erasmus+

Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

WP 5 - Project assurance and efficiency (Quality Plan)

Technical Implementation Report – Quality Assurance measures -March 2017

CRE.THI.DEV.

March 2017







Erasmus+

Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

Document Data

Distribution List	CO (Confidential, only for members of the Consortium (including the Commission Services))
Document Version	0.1
Reviewed by	
Review Date	

Version	Date	Author/Organization
0.1	9 March 2017	Maya Dimitriadou / CRE.THI.DEV

Disclaimer

This project has been funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union.

The information and views set out in this publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the European Union. Neither the European Union institutions and bodies nor any person acting on their behalf may be held responsible for the use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged.

Copyright © INVENT Consortium, 2015-2018





Erasmus+

Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

Table of Contents

1	Executive Summary	4
2	Introduction.....	4
3	Objectives of the Deliverable	4
4	Results	4





Erasmus+

Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

1 Executive Summary

In the scope of the INVENT project, and particularly according to what is foreseen by ERASMUS PLUS Programme, this report contains the Quality Assurance measures that have been implemented until March 2017.

2 Introduction

This report is sent to the Project Coordinator in order to compile the Progress report on implementation of the action that is due not later than 15 April 2017.

3 Objectives of the Deliverable

The objective of this report is to inform the Project Coordinator about the progress of Quality Assurance issues so that he compiles the overall report to be sent to Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA)

4 Results

In the scope of the INVENT project, and particularly according to what is foreseen in the WP5 Project assurance and efficiency, the consortium decided that it is to the benefit of the satisfaction of its quality objectives to prepare a Project Quality Plan Manual.

The objective of the Quality Plan Manual is to ensure the production of concrete and high-quality results in line with the project plans.

In this context, the main purpose of the Quality Plan Manual is to facilitate the project's management and guide all partners on the evaluation and quality issues, by establishing a coherent set of guidelines by which all aspects of the project are managed and measured. It is the use of these guidelines that will ensure better collaboration among the consortium members, individuals and groups, and will also ensure that the entire consortium is responsible for and engaged in the work that is produced by the project.

The main purpose of the Project Quality Plan is to describe the Quality Management procedures that the project team will follow in order to ensure, monitor and control the



**INVENT****Erasmus+**

Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

quality of all processes and deliverables produced during the INVENT project lifecycle. In particular:

- To clearly define the content, format, review and approval process of the project deliverables;
- To define the responsibilities of the project partners regarding those deliverables.
- To identify all the different tools and means to be applied throughout the project duration
- To provide guidelines for adequate implementation and thereby assure that certain quality standards in the performance of our tasks are fulfilled.
- To define the quality requirements that must be obtained throughout the project lifecycle, those that the deliverables, actions and results must conform to.

The Quality Plan Manual was drafted by CRE.THI.DEV (Quality Manager) and submitted to the other members of the Quality Committee (JUST, University of Cyprus, ARCA,P&B, MU and AULE) for comments and amendments. The final version of the Quality Plan Manual (version 1.0) was issued on 5 January 2017.

The Quality Plan Manual foresees for activities of internal and external evaluation. Internal evaluation is carried out by the partners of the project and external evaluation is carried out a) by the external monitor as well as b) by the target groups of the different activities of the project (e.g participants in dissemination or training activities). Evaluations are carried out mainly with the aid of specific questionnaires that are included as annexes to the Quality Plan Manual. Google forms is used for the circulation of the questionnaires to the members of the consortium.

Up to March 2017 the following evaluations have taken place: a) internal evaluation of the deliverables of the Work Packages that have been produced by March 2017. The deliverables have been accepted with no changes b) external evaluation of the ETM that took place in Jordan on 17 October 2016, c) external evaluation (7 December of 2016) by Prof.Dr Amr Amin who was hired as external monitor for his vast experience ,d) 1st internal evaluation of the project as a whole (one internal evaluation of the whole project is foreseen for each year of the project). All responses (to the 20 questions) scored above 75% of satisfaction, which is the acceptance limit.





Erasmus+

Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

WP 5 - Project assurance and efficiency (Quality Plan)

EVALUATION OF TRAINING

CRE.THI.DEV.

September 2018



Erasmus+





Erasmus+

Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

Document Data

Distribution List	CO (Confidential, only for members of the Consortium (including the Commission Services))
Document Version	0.1
Reviewed by	
Review Date	

Version	Date	Author/Organization
0.1	18 September 2018	Maya Dimitriadou / CRE.THI.DEV

Disclaimer

This project has been funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union.

The information and views set out in this publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the European Union. Neither the European Union institutions and bodies nor any person acting on their behalf may be held responsible for the use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged.

Copyright © INVENT Consortium, 2015-2018





Erasmus+

Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

Table of Contents

1	Executive Summary	4
2	Introduction.....	4
3	Objectives of the Deliverable	4
4	Methodology	4
5	Results	5
6	Conclusions.....	10
7	Annexes	10
	Annex I : QF-STE(1.0): Staff evaluation of host organisations Questionnaire	11





Erasmus+

Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

1 Executive Summary

In the scope of the INVENT project, and particularly according to what is foreseen in the Quality Plan, this report contains the results of the evaluation of the training activities of the project according to what is foreseen in the Quality Plan Manual.

The training, at its whole, has been evaluated as successful.

2 Introduction

The training (WP2) that was conducted in the framework of the project was a crucial activity. The goal of this project activity was, that the CTIs staff, learn from European experience of CTIs staff and other organizations.

The training of the CTIs staff was very important in order to give them a precise representation of strategy, methodology, mechanism, form and means of innovation and training activities of the European Centers.

The training was organized, on the basis of the training program (WP2) that was developed by ARCA after taking into consideration the analysis of training needs (WP1) of Jordanian organizations that would host the CTIs.

3 Objectives of the Deliverable

The objective of the evaluation of training was to assess the results of training and lead to corrective actions, by the Project Coordinator, if it deemed necessary.

4 Methodology

The quality of the training activities of the project has been evaluated through questionnaires that were answered by the trainees that participated in the courses, using the QF-STE Staff evaluation of host organizations, questionnaire (Annex I). For the evaluation of the training, a set of open questions was used combined with a set of indicators that have been established, which could be measured on a scale from 1 to 5, where 5 is very positive and 1 is very negative. The indicators were relevant to the confidence the trainees gained on specific topics and to the evaluation of the environment of the host institutes.







Erasmus+

Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

The answered questionnaires were sent to the Project Coordinator and the Quality Manager and were evaluated. The results of the training evaluation were also presented during the management meetings of the project.

The indicators of the questionnaire could be answered with the aid of a five points rating scale where 1 is poor and 5 is very good

The elaboration of the indicators of the questionnaires was made by CRE.THI.DEV, with the use of excel.

The formula for the evaluation of results was the following:

$$[(1a + 2b + 3c + 4d + 5e)/5 (a+b+c+d+e)] \%$$

Where:

a, b, c, d, and e are the numbers of questionnaires that rated the activity with 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 respectively.

The activity was considered successful if the percentage of satisfaction was more than 75%. In case the percentage of satisfaction was less than 75%, CRE.THI.DEV would propose proper corrective actions which should be agreed with the Project Coordinator.

The answers to the open questions were recorded and presented during the management meetings.

5 Results

The results of the evaluation of training activity, as a whole, are presented below. Same answers by the trainees are recorded once.

What are the most useful activities/visits you had during your stay in the EU hosts? Why

- Visits to IDEA and Engino in Cyprus and useful presentations with live case studies
- How to infuse change and to impact a traditional culture
- Technical visit to Corallia and Impact Hub , in Athens “Lean startup” lecture, fundraising and Innovation structure in Greece, University – business cooperation
- Promotion of CTI services through communication channels and techniques
- How to build business canvas to establish an e-learning center at University of Jordan according to canvas model
- Exposure to ARCA’s incubation process and how they select startups





Erasmus+

Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

- ARCA startup visit, startup management
- European network
- Innovation transfer process and approaches
- The visit of the hospital in Italy because it is a good example
- The most useful visit to Department of Industrial and Digital Innovation because The DIID was inspired by the innovative concept of Triple Helix in which the University Research, Education and Technology Transfer are integrated into a single training model (Italy)
- Presentations were rich and useful because the presenters were specialized in their fields. Field visits were very interesting and well selected and also match the project objectives. Lessons learned were very good for me, especially to see a practical and live case study (Cyprus)
- Lectures, discussion, teamwork (Porto)
- Explore some companies in Porto

What are the least useful activities/visits you had during your stay in the EU hosts? Why

- Some long lectures
- Technical visit to National Center for Scientific Research “Demokritos and Innovathens in Athens,
- I think the activities and the visit have been carefully selected (Cyprus and Italy)
- Most of these presentations were general information, which can be downloaded from the websites
- Some videos were of bad voice quality

List the most useful lesson learned

- The network is very important to connect entrepreneurs and successful company
- Learning from success stories for Entrepreneurship and innovative companies
- Sources of funding are different in earlier stages than advanced stages
- Risks and challenges are part of the journey let's accept it, face it, even enjoy it. The dream is bigger, faith in one's abilities is crucial
- To be updated with innovation field in world institutions, to make national network for Jordanian Entrepreneurs
- Innovation, incubator, fundraising for the project



Erasmus+





Erasmus+

Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

- The importance of clusters, there is a procedure for technology transfer office, the cooperation between academia and business
- To have faith that R&D and technology transfer is a way to sustainable development. To search for alternatives and make plan B & C to choose the most suitable business model for your Technology transfer office.
- Introduction to CTIs
- Business plan
- Model Canvas
- Building and discussing our own business model
- New ideas to the selection process of startups
- There are a variety of information exchanges both formal and informal that are effectively being utilized for technology transfer
- Expand Collaborative Research and Development (R&D) Partnerships in the Public and Private Sector
- Create a sense of community among public agencies, universities, and industries to help energize these groups to enhance a culture of innovation
- You must plan before you start the work
- The model in which startups work
- Startup assessment
- Startup management
- The importance to know your client
- European Innovation network
- We learned a practical approach of how the CTI works
- Collaboration is the base to do any work or project
- EU Opportunities (H2020 and other programmers) so important to help researchers in my University to get the fund.

How was the study visit useful to your work? What type of knowledge you will take back home?

- Understanding the TTO services from UCY,
- Startup management (ecosystem) is essential to make sustainable innovation
- Field visits







Erasmus+

Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

- New information about how business incubators are working
- The tools I have learnt will help me as a technology transfer officer to help others in developing their ideas
- To see startups and innovative companies growing up.
- Innovation structure in Greece
- Business – University cooperation because this is important to build incubator in my university
- Principles and sources of funding
- How to build a business plan according to canvas model (UCY & ARCA)
- To consider canvas model in our work
- The assessment and management methods were very useful and I recommend to be used in our center in Jordan
- How to create a strategy for innovation and linkage between Academia and Industry.
- Innovation assessment
- In the social impact realm, examining your leadership style and your personal shortcomings is essential to ensuring a successful year of moving your ideas forward and making an impact on those you set out to help. No leader or entrepreneur should forego the opportunity to reflect on their lessons learned and use these lessons as a springboard for growth in the coming year.

To what extent did you gain confidence in the following topics you learnt?

(Average percentage of satisfaction for all training weeks)

- Leadership and presentations **85,21%**
- Open Innovation and living labs **85,00%**
- Transfer of technology processes **79,37%**

The host institute environment

(Average percentage of satisfaction for all training weeks)

- The training was suitable and in good environment **88,06%**
- The study visits were relevant and useful **85,00 %**
- The people we met during the visit were of great value added **94,70%**





Erasmus+

Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

What were the biggest obstacles and problems?

- Some presentations were very long
- Finding a proper funding to start new innovative ideas (high risk investment)
- Transportation (in Greece and Cyprus)
- The trainees are not of the same level (gathering Professors with students??) (Greece)
- I have one problem. The training program was theoretical and did not contain practical training
- The visits were more restricted to presentations and facilities and less to examples and operations (Greece)
- We need an exchange of staff with ARCA to gain from their experience
- No real obstacles in Cyprus and Italy
- Perfect (Portugal)

Your suggestions for improvement

In the first week of training there was a need for more time to be devoted to the increase in knowledge gained from the training, as well as a need for more visits to Entrepreneurship centers and startups. This need seems to have been satisfied by the 3rd week of training.

- Emphasize on visits and interactive lectures and open dialogues. Training environment to be more interactive. Adapt a variety of training methods. (Greece).
- Stay more days with successful real cases which are incubated in ARCA
- It would be more beneficial to host existing companies and companies which already exist in the incubator to talk about their experience
- I need to learn some skills like Industry and Law languages which support us in case of Negotiation when transferring a new technology
- Visit of a chamber of Industry and commerce
- Entrepreneurship should be part of the academic plan in the Universities.
- Everything was more than perfect. I wish we had a visit to Entrepreneurship centre to have a look at the facilities they had
- It was very good, maybe if other business models were discussed and compared to canvas
- Always try to get applied examples
- More days for training and less hours





Erasmus+

Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

- To cover visits with success stories, to meet some of them
- More practical visits to organizations other than the hosting company
- The training needs more than one week to do perfect

6 Conclusions

The training activities that were carried out during the project were successful and there was no need for corrective actions.

7 Annexes





Annex I : QF-STE(1.0): Staff evaluation of host organisations Questionnaire

Instructions: Please give your answers or comments in writing, or indicate the extent to which you gained confidence in the topics you learnt in the mobility to the EU host. The scale is 1-5

Date / /	7.1 CTI staff evaluation of host institutes	Questionnaire number			
Units staff name		Host institute Country:			
Organization name:					
Q1: Organization place:					
Q2: Type of organization:					
1. Research 2. Public organization 3. Private 4. Other.....					
Section one: units staff background					
1	What are the most useful activities/ visits you had during your stay in the EU hosts? why				
2	What are the least useful activities/ visits you had during your stay in the EU hosts? why				





Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

3	List the most useful lesson learned					
4	How was the study visit useful to your work? What type of knowledge you will take back home?					
Section two: To what extent did you gain confidence in the following topics you learnt?						
Background		Not at all	Not well	Neutral	Well	Very well
1	Leadership and presentations	1	2	3	4	5
2	Open Innovation and living labs	1	2	3	4	5
3	Transfer of technology processes	1	2	3	4	5
4	OTHER TO BE DEFINED	1	2	3	4	5
5	Other (please specify)	1	2	3	4	5
Section three: the host institute environment		Not at all	Not well	Neutral	Well	Very well
1	The training was suitable and in good environment	1	2	3	4	5
2	The study visits were relevant and useful	1	2	3	4	5
3	The people we met during the visit were of great value added.	1	2	3	4	5
5	What were the biggest obstacles and problems?					





Erasmus+

Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

6	Your suggestions for improvements:
---	------------------------------------





Erasmus+

Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

WP 5 - Project assurance and efficiency (Quality Plan)

INTERNAL EVALUATIONS OF INVENT PROJECT

CRE.THI.DEV.

September 2018



Erasmus+

Page 1 of 10





Erasmus+

Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

Document Data

Distribution List	CO (Confidential, only for members of the Consortium (including the Commission Services))
Document Version	0.1
Reviewed by	
Review Date	

Version	Date	Author/Organization
0.1	19 September 2018	Maya Dimitriadou / CRE.THI.DEV

Disclaimer

This project has been funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union.

The information and views set out in this publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the European Union. Neither the European Union institutions and bodies nor any person acting on their behalf may be held responsible for the use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged.

Copyright © INVENT Consortium, 2015-2018





Erasmus+

Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

Table of Contents

1	Executive Summary	4
2	Introduction.....	4
3	Objectives of the Deliverable	4
4	Methodology	5
5	Results	5
6	Conclusions.....	8
7	Annexes	8
	Annex I : QF-PQA(1.0):Project Quality Assessment Questionnaire	9



Erasmus+



Erasmus+

Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

1 Executive Summary

In the scope of the INVENT project, and particularly according to what is foreseen in the WP5 Project assurance and efficiency, this report contains the results of the internal evaluations of the project that were conducted two times during its lifetime and at the end of the project, according to what is foreseen in the Quality Plan Manual.

All questions included in the questionnaire scored above the acceptance limit of 75% satisfaction, which means that no corrective action was necessary.

2 Introduction

The quality of the project processes has been done through self-evaluation of the consortium by the project partners themselves, using the Project Quality Assessment Form QF-PQA (Annex I). For the evaluation of the project as a whole, a set of indicators have been established, which can be measured on a scale from 1 to 5, where 5 is very positive and 1 is very negative. The indicators are generally relevant to the quality of the project management, coordination, structure, support mechanisms, content, and resources.

The evaluation was primarily done by each partner, who answered twenty questions with an assessment of the performance of the consortium. The QM collected all the answers, which reflected the views of the consortium on its progress, from the partners and assessed them, according to part 4, Methodology. In case the QM, upon processing the results found that the results of the answers to one or more questions were below the expected performance, informed the PC in order to set forth problem-solving procedures.

The evaluation has been performed three times, during the lifecycle of the project.

3 Objectives of the Deliverable

The questionnaire (QF-PQA(1.0)) that was used for the internal evaluation of the project consisted of 20 questions that referred to the project quality in general. The deliverable is a table, where the comparison between the three (3) internal quality assessments is presented, in terms of % of satisfaction as described in part 4, Methodology.

The objective of internal evaluation was to assess different aspects of the project progress and lead to corrective actions, by the Project Coordinator, if it deemed necessary.





Erasmus+

Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

4 Methodology

The project quality assessment questionnaires consisted of questions that could be answered with the aid of a five points rating scale where 1 is poor and 5 is very good

The elaboration of the answers to the questionnaires was made by CRE.THI.DEV, with the use of excel, and the results have been sent, each time, to the project coordinator and presented during the project meetings.

The formula for the evaluation of results was the following:

$$[(1a + 2b + 3c + 4d + 5e) / 5 (a+b+c+d+e)] \%$$

Where:

a, b, c, d, and e are the numbers of questionnaires that rated the activity with 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 respectively.

The activity was considered successful if the percentage of satisfaction was more than 75%. In case the percentage of satisfaction was less than 75%, CRE.THI.DEV would propose proper corrective actions which should be agreed with the Project Coordinator.

All partners had access to the questionnaire through google forms.

5 Results

In the 1st evaluation, 12 answered questionnaires were received.

In the 2nd evaluation, 11 answered questionnaires were received

In the final evaluation, 16 answered questionnaires were received

All questions showed a percentage of satisfaction over 75% (which is the limit, under which corrective actions are needed).

In the following table the 20 questions and their evaluation are presented.

INTERNAL EVALUATIONS OF INVENT PROJECT				
(Percentage of satisfaction)				
	How do you evaluate....	1 st internal evaluation	2 nd internal evaluation	3 rd internal evaluation
1.	The extent to which the consortium commits time and	93,3	95,0	92,5







Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

INTERNAL EVALUATIONS OF INVENT PROJECT				
(Percentage of satisfaction)				
	How do you evaluate....	1st internal evaluation	2nd internal evaluation	3rd internal evaluation
	resources as required by the Work Plan?			
2.	The consortium's efficiency to resolve problems?	96,7	94,0	92,5
3.	The effectiveness and clarity of the communication among the partners and the Project Coordinator?	86,7	91,7	90,0
4.	The effectiveness and clarity of communication with other agencies eg. the National Agency, EEA Grants Managing Authority?	85,5	81,7	90,0
5.	The commitment and proportionate involvement of all partners?	76,7	88,3	87,5
6.	The arrangements for the implementation of the work packages and the administration of budgets?	90,0	95,0	91,3
7.	The effectiveness of the project co-ordination?	93,3	96,7	86,3
8.	The professional competence and commitment displayed by the PC?	95,0	95,0	90,0
9.	The quality of the relationship among the partners and team-development?	91,7	88,3	88,2
10.	The quality of the project monitoring and evaluation processes?	93,3	93,3	92,5
11.	The quality of the project information/results dissemination	90,0	93,3	91,3







Erasmus+

Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

INTERNAL EVALUATIONS OF INVENT PROJECT				
(Percentage of satisfaction)				
	How do you evaluate....	1st internal evaluation	2nd internal evaluation	3rd internal evaluation
	arrangements?			
12.	The adherence to the Work Plan by all partners?	83,3	81,7	87,5
13.	The deviations from the Work Plan? If any, were they based on well-considered reasons and mutual agreement?	83,3	91,7	90,0
14.	The quality of the project in terms of its short, medium and long term impact at local/regional/national/European level?	86,7	93,3	95,0
15.	The quality of materials/guides/reports/products throughout the life-cycle of the project?	91,7	88,3	88,8
16.	The support from within your partner organization, in terms of managerial support, specialized support or peer support?	86,7	98,3	93,8
17.	The sufficiency, range and suitability of project resources, including, where appropriate, technology resources?	88,3	88,3	87,5
18.	The sharing of resources/expertise amongst transnational partners?	90,0	93,3	86,3
19.	The extent to which technology and other resources are used effectively and innovatively?	85,0	85,0	90,0
20.	The link between project workplan and cost-effective use of	91,7	93,3	92,5







Erasmus+

Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

INTERNAL EVALUATIONS OF INVENT PROJECT				
(Percentage of satisfaction)				
	How do you evaluate...	1 st internal evaluation	2 nd internal evaluation	3 rd internal evaluation
	resources?			

6 Conclusions

All questions, included in the questionnaire scored, in all three (3) internal evaluations, above the acceptance limit of 75% satisfaction, which means that no corrective action had to be taken.

7 Annexes







Erasmus+

Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

Annex I : QF-PQA(1.0):Project Quality Assessment Questionnaire

Date of Assessment:

Assessment made by: Organization/name

Answer each question with an evaluation from 1-5, where 1 is Poor and 5 is Very Good

Performance Indicators/Issues to be addressed		1	2	3	4	5
How do you evaluate....						
1.	The extent to which the consortium commits time and resources as required by the Work Plan?					
2.	The consortium's efficiency to resolve problems?					
3.	The effectiveness and clarity of the communication among the partners and the Project Coordinator?					
4.	The effectiveness and clarity of communication with other agencies eg. the National Agency, EEA Grants Managing Authority?					
5.	The commitment and proportionate involvement of all partners?					
6.	The arrangements for the implementation of the work packages and the administration of budgets?					
7.	The effectiveness of the project co-ordination?					
8.	The professional competence and commitment displayed by the PC?					
9.	The quality of the relationship among the partners and team-development?					







Promotion of Innovation Culture in the Higher Education in Jordan
561996-EPP-1- 2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

Performance Indicators/Issues to be addressed		1	2	3	4	5
10.	The quality of the project monitoring and evaluation processes?					
11.	The quality of the project information/results dissemination arrangements?					
12.	The adherence to the Work Plan by all partners?					
13.	The deviations from the Work Plan? If any, were they based on well-considered reasons and mutual agreement?					
14.	The quality of the project in terms of its short, medium and long term impact at local/regional/national/European level?					
15.	The quality of materials/guides/reports/products throughout the life-cycle of the project?					
16.	The support from within your partner organization, in terms of managerial support, specialized support or peer support?					
17.	The sufficiency, range and suitability of project resources, including, where appropriate, technology resources?					
18.	The sharing of resources/expertise amongst transnational partners?					
19.	The extent to which technology and other resources are used effectively and innovatively?					
20.	The link between project workplan and cost-effective use of resources?					

