



REPORT ON THE PROJECT MANAGEMENT ASSESSMENT

06.09.2021

Evaluation details

Evaluation of the overall assessment of project management

Description

The present QA10 questionnaire summarizes the results from questionnaire QA09 between September 2020 and September 2021.

The total number of answers from the partners of the SWARM project to the QA09 questionnaires was **60**, with the following distribution among the different patterns (P followed by a number stands for the partner number; the university/Institute to which is partner belongs and the country where it is located are specified between brackets)

- P1 (UNI, Serbia) - 15
- P2 (BOKU, Austria) - 2
- P3 (NMBU, Norway) - 1
- P4 (AUTH, Greece) - 1
- P5 (UACEG, Bulgaria) - 2
- P6 (UNIRIFCE, Croatia) - 4
- P7 (UL/IST, Portugal) - 1
- P9 (UNSA, Bosnia) - 5
- P10 (UNMO, Bosnia) - 5
- P11 (UPKM, Kosovo*) - 16
- P12 (AASKM, Kosovo*) - 7
- P13 (UoM, Montenegro) - 1

University of Nis



The partners P8 (UNS, Serbia), and P14 (PWMCVV, Serbia) did not answer the QA09 questionnaire. The next table presents the **total number of answers per score category**, as well as the **average grade** of the **60 answers** to the different question, also reproduced below along with the equivalent averages taken from the QA10 reports of Sept/ 2019 and Sept/2020 (between brackets):

- Structure of project time schedule: **4.80** (Sept/2019:4.82; Sept/2020:4.79)
- Communication between partners: **4.68** (Sept/2019:4.76; Sept/2020:4.74)
- Timeliness of feedbacks from the coordinator when requested: **4.83** (Sept/20:4.92: Sept/2020:4.86)
- Incisiveness of coordination: **4.74** (Sept/2019: 4.82; Sept/2020: 4.84)
- How do you rate overall the project management for the period of the last year?: **4.81** (Sept/2019: 4.89; Sept/2020:4.89)

The comparison between the results from Sept/2019, Sept/2020 and Sept/2021 denote a steady slight decrease in the rating of the project. However, the decrease is so small that it has no meaning. On the contrary: if we take into account the unfavorable present conditions due to COVID 19, it is remarkable how the project was able to maintain its global dynamics.

The table that follows the next one table provides the general characterization of the results about the "Overall assessment of work package management", including the results per partner.

Table/Figure

Overall assessment of project management – number of answers per category						
Grading	Very poor	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Average grade
Structure of project time schedule				7	53	4.80
Communication between partners				12	48	4.68
Timeliness of feedbacks from the coordinator when requested				12	48	4.83
Incisiveness of coordination				11	49	4.74
How do you rate overall the project management for the period of the last year?				4	56	4.81

Partner identification	P1 (UNI, Serbia)	P2 (BOKU, Austria)	P3 (NMBU, Norway)	P4 (AUTH, Greece)	P5 (UACEG, Bulgaria)	P6 (UNIRIFCE, Croatia)	P7 (UL/IST, Portugal)	P9 (UNSA, Bosnia)	P10 (UNMO, Bosnia)	P11 (UPKM, Croatia)	P13 (UoM, Montenegro)	AASKMN Kosovo	Total or average
Number of answers	15	2	1	1	2	4	1	5	5	16	1	7	60
Overall assessment of project management - results per partner and category													
Structure of project time schedule	4.93	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.50	4.25	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.94	5.00	5.00	4.80
Communication between partners	4.93	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.69	5.00	5.00	4.68
Timeliness of feedbacks from the coordinator when requested	4.73	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.75	5.00	4.80	5.00	4.69	5.00	5.00	4.83
Incisiveness of coordination	4.93	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.25	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.69	5.00	5.00	4.74
How do you rate overall the project management for the period of the last year?	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.94	5.00	5.00	4.81

Evaluation of the level of involvement

Description

The next table presents the **total number of answers per score category**, as well as the **average grade** of the **60 answers** to the different question, also reproduced below along with the equivalent averages taken from the QA10 reports of Sept/ 2019 and Sept/2020 (between brackets):

- Actively involved in the project development: **4.57** (Sept/2019:4.71; Sept/2020:4.52)
- Satisfied with the implementation of the project activities: **4.76** (Sept/2019:4.82; Sept/2020:4.78)
- Distribution among partners of tasks sharing: **4.73** (Sept/20:4.73; Sept/2020:4.76)

The previous results also prove the resilience of the project despite the COVID 19 issue.

The table that follows the next one table provides the general characterization of the results about the "General participant expectations", including the results per partner.

Table/Figure

Overall assessment of project management – number of answers per category						
Grading	Very poor	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Average grade
Actively involved in the project development			3	10	47	4.57
Satisfied with the implementation of the project activities				10	50	4.76
Distribution among partners of tasks sharing			1	7	52	4.73

Partner identification	P1 (UNI, Serbia)	P2 (BOKU, Austria)	P3 (NMBU, Norway)	P4 (AUTH, Greece)	P5 (UACEG, Bulgaria)	P6 (UNIRIFCE, Croatia)	P7 (UL/IST, Portugal)	P9 (UNSA, Bosnia)	P10 (UNMO, Bosnia)	P11 (UPKM, Croatia)	P13 (UoM, Montenegro)	AASKMN Kosovo	Total or average
Number of answers	15	2	1	1	2	4	1	5	5	16	1	7	60
Evaluation of level of involvement - results per partner and category													
Actively involved in the project development	4.87	4.50	4.00	5.00	4.50	3.75	4.00	5.00	4.40	4.88	5.00	5.00	4.57
Satisfied with the implementation of the project activities	4.93	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.69	5.00	5.00	4.76
Distribution among partners of tasks sharing	4.80	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.73

There were not suggestions for further project management improvement.

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.