SAFETY

simulation for medical practice

SIMULATION APPROACH FOR
EDUCATION AND TRAINING
IN EMERGENCY

R8.1 Evaluation questionnaires for partners and external evaluators

Evaluation questionnaires for partners and external evaluators

The aim of WP8 is to evaluate and guarantee the internal quality of the project as defined in R7.1 (Quality Assurance Plan). WP8 will determine whether the project planning and implementation are effective and there is a match between planned results / expected impacts and the quality of the main results.
ECID – as WP8 Leader – drafted specific evaluation questionnaires to collect formal feedback from external experts on project Milestones (specifically: ML1, ML2 and ML6) and selected a short list of independent evaluators (see R8.2 – Overall Evaluation report).
External evaluators were appointed for an impartial and specialist evaluation of the project to ensure objectivity. In this document the full semi-structured questionnaire is included.

This document also contains the list of questions asked to the partner for an internal evaluation on the quality of all the results. Valuedo collected the results of the internal evaluation process and elaborated a specific report respectively on all the results developed during the project implementation (see R8.2 – Overall Evaluation report).

To sum up, in this document the reader can find:
● The Evaluation questionnaires for the external evaluators on ML1, ML2 and ML6
● The questionnaires for the partners included in the Quarterly reports for evaluating all the project results.

The result of this internal and external evaluation can be found in R8.2 – Overall Evaluation Report.

1. Questionnaires for project partners on results
This part of the document provides all the questionnaires prepared for evaluating the results delivered by the partnership in M1 – M40 (all the results of this evaluation can be found in R8.2 Overall Evaluation Report). The questionnaires were distributed through the Quarterly Report and were filled in when theresults were delivered.

R1.1 – Desk Research on HEI educational offer - Action Plan

1. Are the specific tasks to be undertaken by researchers properly explained?
2. Is the plan effective for their purposes?
3. Is the methodology of the research clear?

R1.2 – Desk Research on scientific literature review - Action Plan

1. Do you think the research has been effective for its purpose?
2. Did you find the tools proposed by UIS user-friendly?
3. Is the methodology of the research clear?

R1.3 – Desk Research on companies good practices collection - Action Plan

Is structure of the research well designed?

Evaluation questionnaires for partners and external evaluators

Is the content of the t research sufficient?
Can R1.3 be the basis for next steps of the project?

R1.4 – Report on education & training convergences and divergences, literature review and company good practices in Emergency

1. Do you think the report provided relevant information for the project?
2. Was the methodology of the research clear?
3. Do you officially validate this result?

R2.1 – Action plan for the survey for the students and academics

1. Is the methodology of the research clear?
2. Are the questionnaires developed by UNIFG effective for their purpose (gathering the perceptions of students and academics to identify the most requested methodologies?)
3. Are there any relevant information not considered in the Action Plan?

R2.2 – Action plan for the semi-structured interviews for entrepreneurs

1. Are the methodologies and tools to deliver the interviews properly described?
2. Are the templates for reporting results effective for their purpose?
3. Are there any relevant information not considered in the action plan?

R2.3 – Training Needs Analysis

1. Do you think the need analysis provided relevant information for the project?
2. Are the templates for reporting results effective for their purpose?
3. Are there any relevant information not considered in the action plan?

R2.4 – Body of Knowledge

Is the structure of the document appropriate in your opinion?
Is the ambition of the document clear enough?
Is the methodology of the research clear?
Do you officially validate R2.4?

R3.1 – Action Plan

1. Is the structure of the document appropriate in your opinion?

Evaluation questionnaires for partners and external evaluators

2. Is the ambition of the document clear enough?
3. Is the methodology of the research clear?
4. Do you officially validate R3.1?

R3.2 Training material – first version

Does the first version of training material meet the expectations you had?
Have the training materials you have prepared been peer reviewed by at least one partner?
Have you peer reviewed the training materials prepared by another partner (at least 1)?
Do you validate this activity?

R3.3 Evaluation Report

Is the evaluation report complete?
Are the suggestions useful for the improvement of the materials?

R3.4 Trainig Materials - final version

Were the feedback considered in the revision of the materials?
Do you validate the final version of all materials?

R4.2 Memorandum on technical criteria for the development of e-learning modules and requirements of the technical environment

Is the document clear?
Does the document contains all the relevant aspects for the preparation of e-learning material?
Do you validate the report?

R4.3 Action Plan to develop e-learning courses

Is the Action Plan complete?
Did you find all the relevant information for the completion of the tasks?

R4.4 Action Prototype of e-learning modules

Did all the partners participated in the peer review process?
Do you overall structure of the modules?
Do you agree on the specific content of the modules?

R4.5 E-learning modules evaluation

Evaluation questionnaires for partners and external evaluators

Were all the pilot tests conducted?
Are all the feedback collected though the pilot tests included in the report?
Does the report include clear instructions for the revision of the materials?

R5.1 Training material for the first exceptional module

1. Are the training materials clear and effective?
2. Did all the partners contributed to the development according to the action plan?
3. Do you validate the result?

R5.2 Training material for the second exceptional module

1. Are the training materials clear and effective?
2. Did all the partners contributed to the development according to the action plan?
3. Do you validate the result?

R5.3 Prototype of exceptional e-learning modules

1. Are the training materials clear and effective?
2. Did all the partners contributed to the development according to the action plan?
3. Do you validate the result?

R5.4 Final version of the two new exceptional modules

1. Are the training materials clear and effective?
2. Did all the partners contributed to the development according to the action plan?
3. Do you validate the result?

R5.5 Handbook for the adoption of the project outputs

1. Is the Handbook complete and clear?
2. Is the Handbook an effective tool for exploitation of the project results?
3. Do you validate the result?

R6.1 Agreement

1. Is the Partners Agreement exhaustive in all parts?
2. Are duties and rights of each partner clearly explained?
3. Are the Financial rules (periodical payments from the Beneficiary to the partners) clear?

Evaluation questionnaires for partners and external evaluators

R7.1 – Quality Assurance Plan

1. Is the QA plan well-structured and clear in all the sections?
2. Is the QA plan explaining clearly the activity to perform in order to ensure the highest quality of processes, results and Milestones?
3. Are the responsibilities of each partner clearly explained and is the management structure effective to reach the project results?

R7.2 – Quarterly Project Report

1. Are the formats for the quality assurance clear and complete?
2. Are the responsibilities of Leader and other partners clear?
3. Is the division of the QR in a Google spreadsheet and downloadable file effective?

R9.1 – Dissemination and Exploitation Plan

Are Disseminations and Exploitation activities clearly explained and detailed?
Are the partners' responsibilities clear?
Are the templates (attendance sheets, tables to track the dissemination results, etc.) effective and easy to use?

R9.2 – Project website and social media

Is the website well-structured in all the sections and does it contain all the relevant information?
Is the website user-friendly and usable?
Are the text clear and easy to understand also for the stakeholders (language easy to understand, no technical words, etc.)

Questionnaires

Company questionnaire:
https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSeQzUjzH3wNrwbc6t6U3_9tBD6nwt07KtzC8Z3xPC_HIbfMkA/viewform

Students' questionnaires on Practical Scenarios:
https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSdOOiLi-AMBFdOVA0OyFlqhVKPj8FF6qASb5UT8-4gaMgkFQw/viewform

Students' questionnaires on Theoretical modules:
https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSd8Jg107dMmmugjXWH-KZw5NEYM-ce_Gfn9ikCHVOuzncNJFQ/viewform