

### 3. EVALUATION OF THE QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

#### 3.1. Achievement of planned outcomes and results

The section four of the *SkilledUp* of the project's QAP described outcomes and results expected to be achieved: a total of 27 deliverables across eight working packages. All results have been achieved and tangible deliverables (reports, Quality assurance and Communication plans, etc.) submitted to the project supervisory authority.

All planned events/activities took place according to the time schedule:

Event/Activity	Date
<b>WP1 Project Management</b>	
Set up steering group & management group	(1-2 times per year)
Kick-off meeting	November, 2018
<b>WP2 Preparation</b>	
Set up local expert groups	March, 2019
Focus group	November, 2018
VET teacher enterprise visits/'internships'	March, 2019
<b>WP3 Implementation I – Curriculum Development</b>	
Joint EG meeting in Estonia	June, 2019
<b>Implementation II – Training Program, accreditation</b>	
Training is running in all PP countries	September 2019 – September 2021
Completing 1 <sup>st</sup> batch of students	October 2021
Admission of 2 <sup>nd</sup> batch	September 2020
Students' and teachers' mobility	12-19 May 2021
<b>WP8 Dissemination &amp; Exploitation</b>	
Information campaign	January 2019 – August 2021
Dissemination events	28 02 2021 Latvian Television 30 03 2021 Experience exchange Rosenheim Event 13 04 2021 Event for Stakeholders in Lithuania 15 04 2021 Ministry of Education Lithuania 12 05 2021 Student mobility Event 19 05 2021 Student mobility Event 10 10 2021 Experience Exchange Estonia 16 09 2021 Final Conference Event

### **3.2. Quality assessment activities during the project implementation phase**

The QAP included seven measures to monitor the quality of the project processes and deliverables during the project implementation. These self-assessment tools aimed to monitor the quality of deliverables and identify the quality related implementation risks as soon as possible. Therefore, the first level of quality assurance has been exercised by the responsible partners, mostly the project lead, who collected and analysed the feedback on the project activities. The fully achieved goals and approved deliverables of the project prove that the quality assessment activities were sufficient for the project, nonetheless, the analysis below provides evaluation of the implementation of each tool and suggestions on how the approach can be improved in the future projects.

#### ***3.2.1. Partner meetings evaluation***

According to the QAP, the partner meetings evaluation was planned after each meeting via filling in a standard questionnaire. The indicated feedback collecting was implemented at the initial stages of the project implementation; however, it became obvious that with a considerable number of additional administration burden it provides little valuable information. Therefore, the standardised evaluation of the meetings has been discontinued by the lead partner, at the same time encouraging the partners to provide suggestions or additional comments directly with the lead as soon as they arise. According to the implementation evaluation analysis (see Section 2 of this report) this approach proved to be efficient, since the vertical communication (project lead-partners) was appraised as one of the strongest aspects of the partnership.

#### ***3.2.2. Intellectual outputs evaluation***

A common module template was developed and used by the partners. Initial evaluation of the developed module compliance with the structure of the template was done by the lead partner. In parallel, internal non-formal evaluation was constantly run via routine meetings and content discussions among partners. The mid-term report and evaluation proved it to be an acceptable solution.

Further, the evaluation of the 10 developed modules was run by Institute Rosenheim, a project partner not directly involved in the development of the modules. The assessment was based on the experience and knowledge of the specialist lecturers at the Rosenheim and was focused on the structure and content of the modules with the aim to improve them, if necessary. The results are available in the *Evaluation of the curriculum for further training* report. The evaluation was based on the developed criteria for compiling the content, taking into account the aimed versatility and practicality for various countries in close connection with the actual situation on the market. However, the criteria were very convincing and thoroughly elaborated, the actual analysis was missing in the report jumping immediately to suggestions and recommendation section. More description of the analysis and specific findings would provide valuable information for the module development as well as recommendations for further projects

#### ***3.2.3. Training performance evaluation***

To monitor and evaluate the developed training program, the survey among the participants (students) was run in all three countries (Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia) and among the teachers in Lithuania and Estonia. The results of the survey are presented in the *Summary and recommendations based on case studies from Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania*.

The main purpose of the participants survey was to evaluate the students' satisfaction with the training content, its alignment with the market needs, teaching quality; aspects for

improvement were identified. Although, the obtained feedback and insight were valuable and important, it would be recommended to produce a unified questionnaire for all three countries, to allow the cross-country comparison of the results. It is also not clear if the identified suggestions for improvement were taken into account and integrated in the final version of the training modules.

The main purpose of the teachers' questionnaire was to find out their opinion about the work in the project. Valuable feedback was received regarding the optional length that should be allocated for certain topics and its organisation (i.e., it is preferably to have groups with similar level of computer skills), collaboration with education establishment administration, teachers' qualifications. It would be recommended to run identical surveys in all participating countries to allow cross-country analysis. It is also unclear if the identified suggestions for improvement were addressed in the final version of the training modules.

In addition, it should be noted that there was only one round of evaluation run, however, the QAP suggested that there will be a mid-term and a final evaluation of the programme approbation in VET institutions using a standardised evaluation form.

#### **3.2.4. Employers' Satisfaction evaluation (with EQAVET indicators 6 and 9)**

The employers' satisfaction evaluation was run after completion of the training course to evaluate the perceived impact of training. According to the QAP, special attention was intended to be given to utilization of acquired skills at workplace (EQAVET indicator 9) and mechanisms to identify training needs in the labour market and evidence for their effectiveness (EQAVET indicator 6). The results of the evaluation are presented in the *Summary and recommendations based on case studies from Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania*.

The employers' satisfaction evaluation format was not defined in the QAP. As a result, there were quantitative survey run in Lithuania and Estonia and a case study in Latvia. The identification of employees' needs via interview and surveys was run in Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia at the beginning of the project. The implemented approach provided with valuable information, however, implementing a unified method across three countries would allow more thorough information as well as the cross-country analysis. The EQAVET indicators were somewhat addressed, however, more emphasis on them would be beneficial, especially within the after-training satisfaction evaluation. It is also unclear if the identified findings and suggestions for improvement were addressed in the final version of the training modules.

#### **3.2.5. Collaboration report**

According to the QAP, the collaboration report summarised the collaboration between all involved partners: what challenges the partnership addressed, what lessons were learnt. As a part of this report, and based on Case study reports, the Recommendations sections aimed to provide support to other communities/partnerships/countries intending to introduce WBL training programmes in their educational policies was developed. The results of the evaluation are presented in the *Summary and recommendations based on case studies from Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania*.

Besides describing the results of the training performance evaluation and employers' satisfaction evaluation, the report provided useful information about the preparation process for module development, including the woodworking sector analysis, choosing and training teachers and companies for participation, communication aspects, approaches to apply EQAVET blocks. The report was organised in blocks, summarising the situation in each country.

The European Commission's support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents, which reflect the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

The recommendation section was also structured by countries. The section aimed to target other industries and educational institutions as well as political decision makers at the national and European levels. Although for the main section of the report the by-country reporting approach was relevant and useful, the Recommendations aimed to provide support to other communities/partnerships/countries, therefore, the section would be improved by providing overall suggestions not restricted by a particular country. In the recommendation for political decision-makers section, there is only one proposal from Latvia. Feedback from Lithuania and Estonia and/or overall suggestions would have improved this section and would highlight the European added value of the project by suggestions on improving, i.e., legal certainty, greater effectiveness or complementarities, etc., beyond the region.

### ***3.2.6. Multiplier events evaluation***

According to the QAP, each event of the project was supposed to be evaluated and analysed to confirm achievement of the event objectives. A unified evaluation form (a questionnaire) was developed as the QAP attachment to be distributed to event participants during or at the end of each event. Nonetheless, the participants surveys were not run during the project implementation.

The organisation and impact of the final conference, which took place in Riga on 16.09.2021, was highly appreciated by the partners during the project partnership and implementation quality evaluation. The conference took place in a hybrid format hosting about 150 participants offline and about 320 online. The hybrid format was proved to be a successful solution (see Section 2 of this report), the availability of the recording on YouTube additionally contributing to the dissemination efforts. As a result of the conference, the Letter of intent was signed by all partners to reaffirm the commitment to promote and advance the developed intentions of the VET project across Europe. Nonetheless, no formal evaluation was run for this event either.

More attention to multiplier events evaluation would have strengthened the partnership effort to disseminate the results of the partnership. Collecting feedback from participants, i.e., using the developed questionnaires, would have enhanced the quality of the events and provide operational additional feedback from the sector representatives useful for the modules development. Collecting information about the multiplier events participants would have also helped to broaden the network and potentially attract more interested individuals from the industry, both employers and potential students, as well as governmental institutions.

### ***3.2.7. Dissemination evaluation***

The dissemination plan was described in two documents: the QAP and the Communication plan. The updated version of the communication plan also provides information about the dissemination results by compiling the deliveries and links.

The tools and expected deliveries were well described in the documents, however, quantitative goals were not set, except the number of publications on partners' websites (at least 6 per year), at least two social media posts per month and at least one interview of project participants in media in every Baltic country.

During the project implementation, the project website was set up and regularly updated. However, the partners failed to reach the goal of at least 6 publications on their websites. For instance, the partner "Latvijas finieris" provided quite detailed account of the project but only in a single publication; there was no information available on the Latvia University of Life Sciences and Technologies website. The same is applicable to the target of information dissemination via social media posts. Only the lead partner was active on social media, with some activity from Tsenter. According to the report, the Latvia University of Life Sciences and



*The European Commission's support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents, which reflect the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.*

Technologies had published some information on their Facebook page, however, the page is not available at the moment. The project participants interview on mass media was run only in Latvia.

More realistic dissemination plan would have been advisable for the project dissemination activities with closer control of the delivery during the whole length of the project implementation. Defining clear targets not only to the number of publications/activities but also individuals reached (i.e., website visitors) would have provided benchmarks to evaluate the dissemination effort during the project implementation and adjust its scope, channels, messages if necessary.

**Author:** Olga Dmitrijeva

**Date:** 2021