


Kick-off Meeting Evaluation

WP 3 – Quality Assurance

AUA

WP Leader

**October, 2018**

****

**CLICHA**

**CLIMATE CHANGE IN AGRICULTURE**

**Project Nr. 586273-EPP-1-2017-1-EL-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP**

**Document Data**

*Deliverable: Kick-off Meeting Evaluation*

*Work Package No & Title: WP3 - Quality Assurance*

*Work Package Leader: P1- AUA (Greece)*

*Work Package Co-Leaders: P2 - CRETHIDEV (Greece)*

*Partners involved: P3 National Centre for Scientific Research “Demokritos” (DEMOKRITOS) - (Greece), P4 University of Jendouba (UJ) - (Tunisia), P5 - The University of Carthage (UCAR) - (Tunisia), P6 - University of Sousse (US) - (Tunisia), P7 - The National Institute of Field Crops (INGC) - (Tunisia), P8 - Centre of Adaptation to Climate Changes (CACC) - (Tunisia), P9 - Latvia University of Agriculture (LLU) - (Latvia), P10 - Università degli Studi di Torino (UNITO) - (Italy)*

*Distribution level: Partnership (Confidential)*

*Reviewed by: Consortium*

*Document Version: 1*

*Status: Fianl*

**Document History**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Version** | **Date** | **Author/Organization** | **Changes** |
| 0.1 | 24/10/2018 | AUA - CRETHIDEV | First Draft |
| 1 | 15/11/2018 | AUA - CRETHIDEV | Final |
|  |  |  |  |

**Disclaimer**

This project has been funded with the support of 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 Commission and/or the Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency. Neither the European Commission nor the Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency, not any person acting on the Commission’s behalf and/or the Education, Audio-visual and Culture Executive Agency’s behalf, may be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

All rights are reserved. Reproduction is authorized, except for commercial purposes, provided the source is acknowledged.

Copyright © CLICHA Consortium, 2017-2020

# Introduction

The current report presents the evaluation of the CLICHA Kick-off meeting, organized by the Agricultural University of Athens (AUA) in Greece. The meeting lasted for 1 day, December 21st, 2017 and it took place at the University Conference Hall.

There were 22 participants in the meeting from 9 Partner Organizations. The analysis presented in the following pages is based on the responses from 11 participants, since the organizers weren’t invited to participate in the survey.

The Quality Manager created and circulated an evaluation questionnaire in online form (survey monkey) in January, 2018 to all participants. The responses were anonymous.

# Analysis

In the following figure (Fig.1), the average score per evaluation question is presented (a 4 points Likert Scale: 1=Poor - 4=Excellent). .

Figure : Average scores per question

As shown, the average responses in all questions are above the pre-determined by the project Quality Plan threshold of approval, i.e. more than 70% of answers with score ≥ 2 on a 4 point Likert Scale (1=Poor, 4=Excellent).

In the following Tables, the responses in each question are presented more analytically.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Question | Participants | Answer |
| Overall, how valuable did you find the meeting? | 1 | 4. Very valuable |
| 2 | 4. Very valuable |
| 3 | 2. Somewhat valuable |
| 4 | 3. Valuable |
| 5 | 4. Very valuable |
| 6 | 3. Valuable |
| 7 | 4. Very valuable |
| 8 | 4. Very valuable |
| 9 | 4. Very valuable |
| 10 | 4. Very valuable |
| 11 | 4. Very valuable |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Question | Participants | Answer |
| To what extent has your participation in the meeting improved your understanding of the project’s objectives, actions and foreseen results? | 1 | Improved |
| 2 | Greatly improved |
| 3 | Somewhat improved |
| 4 | Improved |
| 5 | Greatly improved |
| 6 | Greatly improved |
| 7 | Greatly improved |
| 8 | Greatly improved |
| 9 | Improved |
| 10 | Greatly improved |
| 11 | Greatly improved |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Question | Participants | Answer |
| Logistics [Preparation of the meeting]  (1=Poor, 4=Excellent) | 1 | 4 |
| 2 | 4 |
| 3 | 3 |
| 4 | 4 |
| 5 | 4 |
| 6 | 4 |
| 7 | 4 |
| 8 | 4 |
| 9 | 4 |
| 10 | 4 |
| 11 | 3 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Question | Participants | Answer |
| Logistics [Pre-meeting registration process]  (1=Poor, 4=Excellent) | 1 |  |
| 2 |  |
| 3 |  |
| 4 |  |
| 5 |  |
| 6 |  |
| 7 |  |
| 8 |  |
| 9 |  |
| 10 |  |
| 11 |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Question | Participants | Answer |
| Logistics [Hosting arrangements]  (1=Poor, 4=Excellent) | 1 | 4 |
| 2 | 3 |
| 3 | 2 |
| 4 | 4 |
| 5 | 3 |
| 6 | 4 |
| 7 | 4 |
| 8 | 4 |
| 9 | 3 |
| 10 | 4 |
| 11 | 3 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Question | Participants | Answer |
| Logistics [Organization & management of the meeting]  (1=Poor, 4=Excellent) | 1 | 4 |
| 2 | 4 |
| 3 | 3 |
| 4 | 4 |
| 5 | 4 |
| 6 | 3 |
| 7 | 3 |
| 8 | 4 |
| 9 | 3 |
| 10 | 3 |
| 11 | 4 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Question | Participants | Answer |
| Logistics [Venue]  (1=Poor, 4=Excellent) | 1 | 4 |
| 2 | 4 |
| 3 | 2 |
| 4 | 3 |
| 5 | 3 |
| 6 | 3 |
| 7 | 4 |
| 8 | 4 |
| 9 | 3 |
| 10 | 4 |
| 11 | 4 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Question | Participants | Answer |
| Logistics [Lunch & Coffee breaks]  (1=Poor, 4=Excellent) | 1 | 4 |
| 2 | 3 |
| 3 | 2 |
| 4 | 4 |
| 5 | 4 |
| 6 | 3 |
| 7 | 4 |
| 8 | 3 |
| 9 | 2 |
| 10 | 3 |
| 11 | 3 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Question | Participants | Answer |
| 6. Agenda / Meeting proceedings [Overall technical program]  (1=Poor, 4=Excellent) | 1 | 4 |
| 2 | 4 |
| 3 | 3 |
| 4 | 3 |
| 5 | 3 |
| 6 | 4 |
| 7 | 4 |
| 8 | 4 |
| 9 | 3 |
| 10 | 4 |
| 11 | 4 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Question | Participants | Answer |
| Agenda / Meeting proceedings [Section themes & content]  (1=Poor, 4=Excellent) | 1 | 4 |
| 2 | 4 |
| 3 | 2 |
| 4 | 3 |
| 5 | 3 |
| 6 | 4 |
| 7 | 3 |
| 8 | 4 |
| 9 | 3 |
| 10 | 4 |
| 11 | 4 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Question | Participants | Answer |
| Agenda / Meeting proceedings [Quality of presentations]  (1=Poor, 4=Excellent) | 1 | 4 |
| 2 | 4 |
| 3 | 3 |
| 4 | 3 |
| 5 | 3 |
| 6 | 4 |
| 7 | 4 |
| 8 | 3 |
| 9 | 4 |
| 10 | 4 |
| 11 | 3 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Question | Participants | Answer |
| Agenda / Meeting proceedings [Questions & discussion]  (1=Poor, 4=Excellent) | 1 | 3 |
| 2 | 4 |
| 3 | 2 |
| 4 | 3 |
| 5 | 3 |
| 6 | 4 |
| 7 | 4 |
| 8 | 3 |
| 9 | 3 |
| 10 | 3 |
| 11 | 4 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Question | Participants | Answer |
| Agenda / Meeting proceedings [Punctuality & respect of time]  (1=Poor, 4=Excellent) | 1 | 4 |
| 2 | 4 |
| 3 | 3 |
| 4 | 4 |
| 5 | 3 |
| 6 | 4 |
| 7 | 4 |
| 8 | 4 |
| 9 | 4 |
| 10 | 4 |
| 11 | 4 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| # | What did you like most about the meeting? |
| 1 | The lead partner and most of partners knew well the objective of the project |
| 2 | Explanation of work plan and getting to know each other |
| 3 | The fact that I’ve met with all partners |
| 4 | Very well organized; participants had provided with all necessary organizatory information |
| 5 | We had the opportunity to meet, know the partners and also to discuss with details, to exchange opinions and ideas about the project |
| 6 | Interchange of opinions |
| 7 | Get to know the partner and exchange opinions on the project |
| 8 | Better understanding the project |
| 9 | The exchange and sharing of information and knowledge between partners and the establishment of relationships with colleagues in Athens, Latvia and Italy |
| 10 | Getting to know each other and better understanding project objectives |
| 11 | The discussions because these provided a common ground and helped planning of work activities |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| # | 3. What did you like least about the meeting? |
| 1 | Some partners were less informed or less involved |
| 2 | Limited knowledge of english of some participants |
| 3 | The lack of logistics |
| 4 | There was no city tour; Not very exact tasks for each participant |
| 5 | Some presentations |
| 6 | Not enough time for discussion |
| 7 | More time would be appreciated |
| 8 | All good |
| 9 | The program is overloaded it had to be programmed in two days meeting to discuss more specifically activities to be carried out |
| 10 | The time allowed for the meeting was too limited |
| 11 | The social program |

Finally, in the comments and suggestions section of the questionnaire one participant noted “Meeting should last 2 days”.

# Conclusions

Overall, the Kick-off Meeting was considered very successful. The majority of the participants gave very high scores in all criteria (3 or 4 on a 4-point Likert Scale). Most of the participants pointed the opportunity to meet with the rest of the partners and discuss with details the work plan and project implementation as most valuable contribution of project meeting.

There were some complaints about the short duration of the meeting and the lack of social program. Thus, although the overall analysis does not dictate any immediate action, results are a useful reminder to the partners-meetings’ hosts that all aspects of meetings are important for the project quality.

So, it is suggested that project meetings should be scheduled to last 2 days.

# ANNEX – Meeting Evaluation Questionnaire

**Meeting Evaluation Form**

Dear colleague,

Thank you for your participation in this meeting. You are kindly requested to take part in this short survey. Your feedback is very valuable in view of the further project progress and performance. All data will be treated confidentially.

Please answer each question with a grade between 1-5, where 1 is Poor and 5 is Excellent.

If you give 1 or 2, please explain why, using the comment space below. It would be helpful to have your comments or suggestions.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| 1. The meeting was well planned and organized. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The agenda of the meeting was clear, balanced, focusing on all key topics. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The topics were presented and discussed in a clear and understandable manner. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The timetable was respected. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. All participants had to opportunity to express their observations/comments/questions about the topics of the meeting. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The meeting provided added value with respect to the progress of the project and the scheduling of the next steps. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Access to the venue of the meeting was easy. (\*) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The conference room and its facilities facilitated the work during the meeting. (\*) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Catering and meals were satisfactory. (\*) |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Comments / Suggestions:** | | | | | |

*(\*) In case of long-distance meetings (teleconferences/videoconferences/skype meetings), questions (7), (8) and (9) should not be answered.*

Name & Organization: (optional)\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Thank you for your cooperation!