



Instituto Superior de Gestão e Administração de Leiria

Promoting Youth Employment in Remote Areas in Jordan / Job-Jo

Project Number: 598428-EPP-1-2018-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

Work Package 4 – Quality



Co-funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

Evaluation Report of the  
Job-Jo Kick-off Meeting, 24 to 26 February 2019  
Authors: Lurdes Castanheira, MSc. & Isabel Vilaça, Phd.

Leiria, Portugal, 25 of March, 2019



Co-funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

## Summary

1. Introduction .....	5
2. Project Beneficiaries and Dead Sea Meeting Participants .....	5
3. Evaluation Survey .....	7
3.1. Respondents.....	8
3.2 Results .....	8
3.2.1. Quantitative Analysis .....	8
3.2.3 Qualitative Analysis .....	10
4. Conclusion .....	12
ANNEX 1: Attendance Sheets .....	13
ANNEX 2: Evaluation Survey.....	17
DISCLAIMER.....	22

## Tables

Table 1. Job-Jo Partners and Work Packages Coordination.....	6
Table 2. List of participants in the Dead Sea Meetings .....	6
Table 3. Descriptive Statistics of Part I: Organization of the Meeting .....	8
Table 4. Distribution of Responses of Part I: Organization of the Meeting .....	9
Table 5. Descriptive Statistics of Part II: Results (of the Meetings) .....	10
Table 6. Distribution of Responses of Part II: Results (of the Meetings) .....	10
Table 7. Qualitative Data .....	11

## 1. Introduction

This report concerns, specifically, the meetings that took place in the Dead Sea Hilton facilities (25 and 26 of February). The first day of the Job-Jo Kick-off Meeting was the formal, public and official opening of the Job-Jo Project and took place in Mutah University, in Karak. The Conference Room was full of invited dignitaries, high representatives of all Jordanian partner Universities, teachers, students of Mutah University and staff. As there were no opportunity to record their evaluation of that specific event, it was our decision to focus this assessment in the opinion of the smaller group of persons involved in the Job-Jo Project, attending the Dead Sea sessions.

The Project, under the name “Promoting youth employment in remote areas in Jordan / Job-Jo”, and number 598428-EPP-1-2018-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP, has an Erasmus + grant and is expected to be developed for 36 months (between 15 November 2018 and 14 November 2021).

Its aim is to promote employment in Jordan poor remote areas. It proposes the (re)qualification of unemployed graduate young people, with a special focus on women. Through training in soft and management skills and the maximization of the experience in this kind of problematic area, shared by the European partners, it is expected to help the development of those remote areas. By itself, the project will set a network of stakeholders supported by this common goal of the promotion of employment, whose visibility is locally maintained by the Business Service Network Bureau (BSNB, in five Jordan Universities) and reinforced by the Job-Jo Website. Organized in six Work Packages (Preparation, Development, Quality, Dissemination and Exploitation and Management), the Project Coordinator, Mutah University, has distributed their leadership between some of the partners.

This first set of meetings was designed to (1) publicize the project to the Jordanian community creating, at the same time, an open arena of frank analysis of the reasons behind the unemployment problem and (2) give all partners representatives the opportunity to meet and set some ground working rules. It is this second objective that this evaluation report addresses.

## 2. Project Beneficiaries and Dead Sea Meeting Participants

The Project has 11 beneficiaries/partners (Table 1). For a clear understanding of each one’s role, each partners’ Work Package leadership and/or co-leadership is identified.

The meetings took place in the 25th and 26th of February, in a Hilton Dead Sea meeting room, and the participants are listed in Table 2.

Table 1. Job-Jo Partners and Work Packages Coordination

Co-beneficiary Institutions	Initials	City / Country	Work Package Coordination
AL-HUSSEIN BIN TALAL UNIVERSITY	AHU	MA'AN / JO	
GREATER ALKARAK MUNICIPALITY	GKM	ALKARAK / JO	
HOCHSCHULE FUR TECHNIK WIRTSCHAFT UND KULTUR LEIPZIG	HTWKL	LEIPZIG / DE	Development (WP2)
INSTITUTO SUPERIOR DE LEIRIA - ISLA LEIRIA	ISLA	LEIRIA / PT	Quality (WP4)
Int@E UG	Int@E	LEIPZIG / DE	
JORDAN UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY	JUST	IRBID / JO	Networking, Start-up activities (WP2)
MINISTRY OF PUBLIC WORKS AND HOUSING	MPWH	AMMAN / JO	
TAFILA TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY	TTU	TAFILA / JO	
UNIVERSITY OF CYPRUS	UC	NICOSIA / CY	Development (WP3)
UNIVERSITY OF JORDAN	UJ	AMMAN / JO	Dissemination & Sustainability (WP5)
<b>Project Coordinator</b>			
MUTAH UNIVERSITY LTD	MU	KARAK / JO	Management (WP6)

Table 2. List of participants in the Dead Sea Meetings

Name	25 of February	26 of February
Erasmus Office - Prof. Ahmad Abu-El-Haija	Yes	
Erasmus Office - Dr. Reem Khader	Yes	
Erasmus Office - Lucie Vincedem (trainee)	Yes	
AHU - Dr. Bassam Abu Karaki	Yes	Yes
AHU - Prof. Suliuman Al Khattab	Yes	Yes
GKM - Eng. Zubeida Madadha	Yes	Yes
HTWKL - Dr. Alex Dekin	Yes	Yes
Int@E - Dr. Maria Tuzani	Yes	Yes
ISLA - Dr. Lurdes Castanheira	Yes	Yes
ISLA - Prof. Isabel Vilaça	Yes	Yes
JUST - Prof. Fahmi Abu Al-Rub	Yes	Yes
MPWH - Eng. Layth Nawayseh	Yes	

Name	25 of February	26 of February
MU - Ali Qdah	Yes	Yes
MU - Dr. Mohammed Majali	Yes	Yes
MU - Dr. Saif Nawayseh	Yes	Yes
MU - Prof. Mohamed Sarayreh	Yes	Yes
MU - Prof. Omer Maaitah	Yes	Yes
TTU - Dr. Iyad Maaita	Yes	Yes
TTU - Prof. Mohamed Mahasneh	Yes	Yes
UCY - Dr. Georgia Kapitsaki	Yes	Yes
UJ - Eng. Leena Marashdeh	Yes	Yes
UJ - Eng. Rash Albik	Yes	Yes
UJ - Prof. Ahmed Al-Salaymeh	Yes	Yes

Note: See both Attendance Sheets in ANNEX 1

### 3. Evaluation Survey

The survey (ANNEX 2) was designed to assess the quality of the meetings in three main areas: Organization of the meeting (8 quantitative questions and one open-ended), Results (6 quantitative questions and one open-ended) and Leading partners synthesis (3 open-ended questions). The first two parts are directed to all participants and the last one is directed, as the name suggests, to those with a leading role in any of the Work Packages. The quantitative responses are in a four-point Likert type scale that goes from *Totally disagree* (point 1 of the scale) to *Totally agree* (point 4 of the scale).

In Part I the focus is the meeting itself and how well it was prepared and conducted. Examples of the statements are: “The agenda was timely distributed”, “The amount of discussion time was adequate” or “The meeting room and the equipment were adequate”; Part II is focused in the meeting results. In brief, it assesses the extent to which the participants felt that it was a productive meeting. Examples of the statements are: “Each partner's role in the project is clear”, “Short term tasks (until the next meeting) are clear”. Part III is designed as an opportunity to have a deeper reflection on what is ahead and how the team discussion provided individual insights that can be used in the project and/or in future meetings. After restricting the answer to target participants, the leading question is “What tasks are under your organization responsibility until the next meeting? Please identify the [first/second/third] task, the associated deadline (if applicable) and the main constraints (if applicable)”. Nine writing spaces are offered because the *task* itself, the *deadline* and the *constraints* have its own answer space and it is possible to register up to three tasks.

### 3.1. Respondents

The survey was online (in Qualtrics) from the 6<sup>th</sup> of March to the 22<sup>th</sup>. Its link was sent to the Project Coordinator to be distributed to the meeting participants. The photos of the Attendance Sheets participants emails (and signatures) are not clear enough to confidently send the survey link directly to them.

There are 20 answers and all respondents identified the organization. The only discrepancy is that two respondents identified themselves as belonging to Int@E and none to HTWKL.

### 3.2 Results

The data was analyzed with IBM SPSS Statistics 25. The global conclusion is that the meeting was perceived as very well organized, with clear positive Results and some room to improvement.

We will present the quantitative and the qualitative data separated.

#### 3.2.1. Quantitative Analysis

Concerning the Organization of the meeting, the general mean evaluation is high (M=3,61, SD=.70, Var=.49). As can be seen in Table 3, the average evaluation to each item is between 3,45 and 3,70 and the mode is always 4. Considering that the response scale (from 1 to 4), we can conclude that most participants considered that it was a very well-organized meeting.

In fact, they report that the purpose of the meeting was clear (M=3.70, SD=.733), the important issues were duly considered (M=3.65, SD=.745), the distribution of the meeting agenda was on time (M=3.70, SD=.733) and well organized (M=3.65, SD=.813), with a fair distribution of presentation time (M=3.55, SD=.826) and of discussion opportunity (M=3.45, SD=.826) or time (M=3.55, SD=.826) and the meeting space was adequate (M=3.60, SD=.754).

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics of Part I: Organization of the Meeting

	N	Mean	SD	Var	Min	Max
The purpose of the kick off meeting was clear	20	3.70	.73	.54	1	4
All relevant issues were contemplated in the meeting agenda	20	3.65	.76	.56	1	4
The agenda was timely distributed	20	3.70	.73	.54	1	4



	N	Mean	SD	Var	Min	Max
The presentations sequence was adequate	20	3.65	.81	.66	1	4
The attribution of time to each presentation was adequate	20	3.55	.83	.68	1	4
The discussion opportunities were adequate	20	3.55	.83	.68	1	4
The amount of discussion time was adequate	20	3.45	.83	.68	1	4
The meeting room and the equipment were adequate	20	3.60	.74	.57	1	4

As could be expected from the analysis of descriptive statistics, the majority of respondents were Totally in accord to the statements and one person was, globally, in disaccord (Table 4). The main aspect that congregates the least accord was the amount of time dedicated to the discussion. In concrete, 40% of participants manifested their perception that longer time to debate would have been appreciated.

Table 4. Distribution of Responses of Part I: Organization of the Meeting

	Totally agree		Agree		Partially agree		Totally disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The purpose of the kick off meeting was clear	16	80	3	15	0	0	1	5
All relevant issues were contemplated in the meeting agenda	15	75	4	20	0	0	1	5
The agenda was timely distributed	16	80	3	15	0	0	1	5
The presentations sequence was adequate	16	80	2	10	1	5	1	5
The attribution of time to each presentation was adequate	14	70	4	20	1	5	1	5
The discussion opportunities were adequate	14	70	4	20	1	5	1	5
The amount of discussion time was adequate	12	60	6	30	1	5	1	5
The meeting room and the equipment were adequate	14	70	5	25	0	0	1	5

Concerning the Results of the meeting, the evaluation is, also, high ( $M=3,40$ ,  $SD=.79$ ,  $Var=.62$ ) but there is less consensus (Table 5). In fact, the mean varies between 3.3 and 3.5 but the dispersion measures are higher than in the assessment of the Organization. The short-term tasks and objectives are sensed as clear ( $M=3.4$ ,  $SD=.75$ ,  $Var=.57$  and  $M=3.4$ ,  $SD=.82$ ,  $Var=.67$ , respectively) but longer responsibilities were less consensual when considering their immediately apparent aims ( $M=3.4$ ,  $SD=.88$ ,  $Var=.78$  and  $M=3.4$ ,  $SD=.88$ ,  $Var=.78$ ).

The analysis of the distribution of responses allows for some clarification (Table 6).

For, at least, half the participants, the meetings were Totally beneficial. The majority of the remaining persons felt that the results were positive but there is room for improvement.

Table 5. Descriptive Statistics of Part II: Results (of the Meetings)

	N	Mean	SD	Var	Min	Max
Each partner's role in the project is clear	20	3.30	.87	.75	1	4
The role of my organization in the project is clear	20	3.50	.89	.79	1	4
Short term tasks (until the next meeting) are clear	20	3.40	.75	.57	1	4
Short term objectives (until the next meeting) are clear	20	3.40	.82	.67	1	4
Long and medium-term tasks are clear	20	3.40	.88	.78	1	4
Long and medium-term objectives are clear	20	3.40	.88	.78	1	4

Table 6. Distribution of Responses of Part II: Results (of the Meetings)

	Totally agree		Agree		Partially agree		Totally disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Each partner's role in the project is clear	10	50	7	35	2	10	1	5
The role of my organization in the project is clear	14	70	3	15	2	10	1	5
Short term tasks (until the next meeting) are clear	10	50	9	45	0	0	1	5
Short term objectives (until the next meeting) are clear	11	55	7	35	1	5	1	5
Long and medium-term tasks are clear	12	60	5	25	2	10	1	5
Long and medium-term objectives are clear	12	60	5	25	2	10	1	5

### 3.2.3 Qualitative Analysis

The qualitative data (Table 7) was collected through the open-ended questions in each of the three parts. It should be noticed that there is a considerable participation, especially when the invitation is directed to the leading members (Part III). This is a very positive output to register since respondents of questionnaires typically offer little qualitative contributions.

All comments deserve attention but the suggestion of a daily synthesis, made at the end of each day, may help in the important aspect of the sensation of meeting efficiency.

Table 7. Qualitative Data

		<b>N</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Part I: Do you have any suggestion . . . in terms of its organization		2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A record or summary of the main decisions of each working day must be made. This clarifies the tasks and levels of responsibility of each partner.</li> <li>- More local workshops should be conducted.</li> </ul>
Part II: Do you have any suggestion . . . in terms of results		2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- More time for discussion.</li> <li>- Everything well organized.</li> </ul>
	Identification	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Creation of capacity building plan.</li> <li>- Dissemination.</li> <li>- Dissemination.</li> <li>- Evaluation of the kick-off meeting.</li> <li>- The design, application and data processing of the Kick-off meeting evaluation instrument.</li> </ul>
Part III: First task	Deadline	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- All time.</li> <li>- Every 6 months.</li> <li>- Immediately after the kick-off meeting.</li> <li>- No deadline specified, but soon.</li> <li>- Unclear. As soon as possible.</li> </ul>
	Constraints	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cooperation of all partners.</li> <li>- None.</li> <li>- None relevant.</li> <li>- Partners cooperation.</li> </ul>
	Identification	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Elaboration of the quality plan.</li> <li>- Newsletter.</li> <li>- Organization of capacity building visit.</li> <li>- Survey.</li> <li>- The design of the Quality Plan.</li> </ul>
Part III: Second task	Deadline	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 15.04.2019.</li> <li>- 15/4/2019.</li> <li>- 2019 (summer or autumn).</li> <li>- In a short term.</li> <li>- Unclear. As soon as possible.</li> </ul>
	Constraints	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- For the 2nd task, it will be examined if it is feasible.</li> <li>- Interest of the people to respond.</li> <li>- News from partners.</li> <li>- Process of validation of the QP.</li> <li>- Some doubts about the exact dates of completion of each task and how to work with partners.</li> </ul>
	Identification	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The approval of Diagnostic Tools; The dissemination of the Job-Jo Project locally; The proposal of the ISLA area of intervention in the field of training.</li> </ul>
Part III: Third task	Deadline	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- May/June; In a short term; After May and before August.</li> </ul>
	Constraints	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Some doubts about the exact dates of completion of each task and how to work with partners.</li> </ul>

Note. All statements are considered, but the presentation order is alphabetized.

#### **4. Conclusion**

The data collected through the Evaluation Survey allow us to state that, regarding the Organization of the Kick-off Meeting - Part I of the questionnaire - the partners evaluated the meetings as well organized, with clear objectives, carried out in an adequate space and with enough time for presentation and discussion of each WP.

Regarding proposals for improvement, it was suggested that a summary/minute should be made at the end of each working day, to clarify the tasks and levels of responsibility of each partner.

Concerning the Results - Part II of the questionnaire - the partners evaluated the meetings as beneficial, considering that their tasks in the short term were clarified. However, they noted that the long-term tasks / responsibilities are less clear.

To improve Results, at future meetings, it was suggested to increase the discussion time of each WP.

Regarding the systematization of the work to be carried out by each partner - Part III of the questionnaire - there is some uncertainty about due dates of some tasks, about the form of cooperation between partners and about the validation process of tasks whose success is dependent of everybody's input (e.g. Dissemination and Quality Plan).

## **ANNEX 1: Attendance Sheets**

(598428-EPP-1-2019-JO-EPPKA2-CEHE-JP)

Amendence sheet

Date: 24/12/2019

Title of Meeting: Kick off Meeting \_\_\_\_\_

Lectures name: \_\_\_\_\_

No.	Name of participant	Institute of Participant	Email	Telephone	Signatures
1	Prof. Fawzi Al-Murad	JUST	abonabab@just.edu.jo	0740235161	
2	Dr. Saif Al-Nawaisch	HITAC Leptis	saif@hitac.com.jo	+96275202300	
3	Dr. Saif Al-Nawaisch	WIDE	bucadim@mail@gmail.com	+96275202300	
4	Dr. George Khatib	UCY	gk@ucy.ac.cy	+35799483110	
5	Mohammed A. Almajali	TJU	mohammed.almajali@tju.edu.jo	0796543300	
6	Mohammed A. Almajali	MU	mohammed.almajali@gmail.com	+96275202300	
7	Dr. Saif Al-Nawaisch	AHU	saif@ahu.edu.jo	+96275202300	
8	Dr. Saif Al-Nawaisch	AHU	saif@ahu.edu.jo	+96275202300	
9	Dr. Saif Al-Nawaisch	MU	saif@mu.edu.jo	+96275202300	
10	Mohammed Samir	Mutah University	msamir@mutah.edu.jo	0797515151	
11	Dr. Saif Al-Nawaisch	Mutah University	saif@mutah.edu.jo	+96275202300	
12	Dr. Saif Al-Nawaisch	Mutah University	saif@mutah.edu.jo	+96275202300	
13	Dr. Saif Al-Nawaisch	Mutah University	saif@mutah.edu.jo	+96275202300	
14	Eng. Ghazi Nawaisch	MPWH	ghazi.nawaisch@mpwh.com	+96275202300	
15	Dr. Saif Al-Nawaisch	TJU	saif@tju.edu.jo	+96275202300	
16	Dr. Saif Al-Nawaisch	ISLA	saif@isla.edu.jo	+96275202300	
17	Dr. Saif Al-Nawaisch	ISLA	saif@isla.edu.jo	+96275202300	
18	Dr. Saif Al-Nawaisch	ISLA	saif@isla.edu.jo	+96275202300	
19	Dr. Saif Al-Nawaisch	UJ	saif@uj.edu.jo	+96275202300	
20	Dr. Saif Al-Nawaisch	UJ	saif@uj.edu.jo	+96275202300	
21	Dr. Saif Al-Nawaisch	UJ	saif@uj.edu.jo	+96275202300	
22	Dr. Saif Al-Nawaisch	UJ	saif@uj.edu.jo	+96275202300	
23	Dr. Saif Al-Nawaisch	UJ	saif@uj.edu.jo	+96275202300	

Co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union

Promoting Youth Employment in Remote Area in Jordan / Job-Jo (598428-EPP-1-2019-JO-EPPKA2-CEHE-JP)

ERASMUS+ ACTION

Title of Meeting: Kick off Meeting

Lecturas name:

Date: 25/7/2019

Place of Meeting/Training

No.	Name of Participant	Institution of Participant	Email	Telephone	Signatures
1	Issabel Misco	ISLA	issabel.misco@gmail.com	0766068300	[Signature]
2	Abu ad Alkhalaf	Erasmus staff			[Signature]
3	Razan Alkhalaf	Erasmus office			[Signature]
4	Maria Vincent	Erasmus office			[Signature]
5	Under Castanheira	ISLA	Under.Castanheira@isla.jo	965036068	[Signature]
6	Eng. Zubaida Mada'Alha	GKM	Zubaida.Mada'Alha@gmail.com	0777685200	[Signature]
7	Eng. Ghailth Nawarbeh	MPWH	ghailth-nawarbeh@mpwh.jo	0799350155	[Signature]
8	Ali Zuhair Abu Al-Rub	JUST	abwahrub@just.edu.jo	079623516	[Signature]
9	Eng. Fakhri Abu Al-Rub	HTWK Leipzig	f.khalaf@htwk-leipzig.de	0753467116	[Signature]
10	Eng. Basma Nazam	INT@E	basma.nazam@gmail.com	0799350155	[Signature]
11	Dr. Georgia Katsaki	UEY	gkatsa@uey.gr	+3579838340	[Signature]
12	Dr. Mohamed Al-Mekkesel	TTU	mekkesel@ttu.edu	029633920	[Signature]
13	Mohamed A. Almgall	MU	medmgall@gmail.com	0796998111	[Signature]
14	Prof. Sultan Alkhalaf	AHU	dealkhalaf@ahu.edu.jo	0799350155	[Signature]
15	Dr. Bassam Abukaraki	AHU	abukaraki@ahu.edu.jo	0799350155	[Signature]
16	Dr. Saif Alnawasyseh	Mutha	Saif9826@yahoo.com	07524946	[Signature]
17	Eng. Ma'ath	Mu	alponkar@math.edu.jo		[Signature]
18	Mohammad Sarireh	Muth Uni	Sarireh.2000@yahoo.com	0773531531	[Signature]
19	Eyat Amariya	TTU	Eyat.K.Amariya@gmail.com	0773531531	[Signature]
20	Abbas Al-Sakymeh	UJ	Sakymeh@ju.edu.jo	077644241	[Signature]
21	Leana Hirasleh	UJ	leana.hirasleh@ju.edu.jo	07774610	[Signature]
22	Rasha AlBaik	UJ	Rashalbaik93@gmail.com	0796780090	[Signature]

**Attendance sheet**

Title of Meeting: Kick off Meeting  
 Lecturers name: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date: 26/2/2019  
 Place of Meeting/Training: \_\_\_\_\_

No	Name of participant	Institute of Participant	Email	Telephone	Signatures
1	Prof Fawzi Abu Marab	TUST	abmarab@just.edu.jo	0776227516	
2	H.E. Akar Dehin	Hank Leipzig	akarak@tma.l.com	+49 15116674226	
3	M.Sc. Waswa Izzawi	UTQ	tubean.mawad@gmail.com	+99573237420	
4	Dr. Gerry Kaptsaki	UCY	gkap@cs.ucy.ac.cy	+3579788380	
5	Mohammed Almasayseh	TTU	mohammed.almasayseh@ttu.edu.sa	01152333333	
6	Mohamed A. Almajali	MU	mohamed.almajali@mu.edu.jo	0792331204	
7	Prof. Suwaim Alkhatib	AHU	alshkhat@ahu.edu.jo	0799386646	
8	Dr. Bassam Abu Karaki	AHU	abukarak@ahu.edu.jo	0799386646	
9	OMU Maccush	MU			
10	Mohammed Sarairch	Mutah University	sarairch_2000@yahoo.com	079753151	
11	Zubeida Madadha	GKM	zubeida.Madadha@yahoo.com	0797655224	
12	Ghaith Nawaiseh	TTU	Egred . g . nawaiseh@gmail.com	079228386	
13	Pr. Fyad Amin	Mutah (MU)		079556954	
14	Dr. Omar Alaudah	ISLA	audah@isla.edu.jo	965076068	
15	Udeh Cantanberia	Mutah	u.cantanberia@mutah.edu.jo	079228386	
16	Issab Vilag	UOJ	vilag@uoj.edu.jo	079228386	
17	Saif Alnawayseh	UOJ	saif.alnawayseh@uoj.edu.jo	079228386	
18	Rasha AlBak	UOJ	rasha.albak@uoj.edu.jo	079228386	
19	Lena Marashdeh	UOJ	lmarashdeh@uoj.edu.jo	079228386	
20	Ahmed Al-Salayneh	UoJ	ahmed.al-salayneh@uoj.edu.jo	079228386	
21					
22					
23					



## **ANNEX 2: Evaluation Survey**

qualtrics.



Co-funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union



### Job Jo Kick-off Meeting 24 to 26 February 2019

Promoting youth employment in remote areas in Jordan - (Job Jo)  
598428-EPP-1-2018-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

We ask your kind collaboration to evaluate the Job Jo Kick-off meeting that took place in Jordan last February. This evaluation survey has three parts. The first two are to all participants; the last part is addressed to partners with a leading role in any of the Work Packages.

Please identify your University/ Organization

- Mutah University
- Jordan University of Science and Technology
- Greater Karak Municipality
- Al-Hussein Bin Talal University
- University of Jordan
- Tafila Technical University
- Ministry of Public Works and Housing
- Hochschule fur Technik Wirtschaft und Kultur Leipzig
- INT@EUG
- Instituto Superior de Leiria - ISLA Leiria
- University of Cyprus

Part I: Organization of the meeting

The purpose of the kick off meeting was clear

Totally disagree



Partially agree



Agree



Totally agree



All relevant issues were contemplated in the meeting agenda

Totally disagree

Partially agree

Agree

Totally agree

The agenda was timely distributed

Totally disagree

Partially agree

Agree

Totally agree

The presentations sequence was adequate

Totally disagree

Partially agree

Agree

Totally agree

The attribution of time to each presentation was adequate

Totally disagree

Partially agree

Agree

Totally agree

The discussion opportunities were adequate

Totally disagree

Partially agree

Agree

Totally agree

The amount of discussion time was adequate

Totally disagree

Partially agree

Agree

Totally agree

The meeting room and the equipment were adequate

Totally disagree

Partially agree

Agree

Totally agree

Do you have any suggestion to further improve the functioning of the next meeting, in terms of its organization? If so, please share them with us.

Part II: Results

Each partner's role in the project is clear

Totally disagree

Partially agree

Agree

Totally agree

The role of my organization in the project is clear

Totally disagree

Partially agree

Agree

Totally agree

Short term tasks (until the next meeting) are clear

Totally disagree

Partially agree

Agree

Totally agree

Short term objectives (until the next meeting) are clear

Totally disagree

Partially agree

Agree

Totally agree

Long and medium-term tasks are clear

Totally disagree

Partially agree

Agree

Totally agree

Long and medium-term objectives are clear

Totally disagree

Partially agree

Agree

Totally agree

Do you have any suggestion to further improve the functioning of the next meeting, in terms of the results? If so, please share them with us.

Does your organization have a leading role in any of the Work Packages?

Yes

No

### Part III: Leading Partners

This area is reserved for partners with a leading role in any of the Work Packages. In order to systematize each partner's role, we propose that you share your opinion on the tasks, deadlines, and possible constraints associated with your organization's role until the next meeting. Please focus only on the main tasks (three at most).

What tasks are under your organization responsibility until the next meeting? Please identify the first task, the associated deadline (if applicable) and the main constraints (if applicable).

Tasks	<input type="text"/>
Deadline	<input type="text"/>
Constraints	<input type="text"/>

What tasks are under your organization responsibility until the next meeting? Please identify the second task, the associated deadline (if applicable) and the main constraints (if applicable).

Tasks	<input type="text"/>
Deadline	<input type="text"/>
Constraints	<input type="text"/>

What tasks are under your organization responsibility until the next meeting? Please identify the third task, the associated deadline (if applicable) and the main constraints (if applicable).

Tasks	<input type="text"/>
Deadline	<input type="text"/>
Constraints	<input type="text"/>

Thank you very much for your participation.

## **DISCLAIMER**

This publication was produced with the financial support of the European Union. Its contents are the sole responsibility of *Lurdes de Jesus Leite Castanheira and Isabel Maria Vilaça Tavares de Campos / ISLA Instituto Superior de Leiria* and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Union.