



REPORT ON THE PROJECT MANAGEMENT ASSESSMENT

27.09.2019

Evaluation details

Results of evaluation the overall assessment of project management

Description

The present questionnaire summarizes the results from questionnaire QA09.

The total number of answers to the QA09 questionnaires was **38**, with the following distribution among the different partners of the SWARM project (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): 4
- P2 (BOKU, Austria): 1
- P3 (NMBU, Norway): 2
- P4 (AUTh, Greece): 2
- P5 (UACEG, Bukgary): 2
- P6 (UNIRIFCE, Croatia): 2
- P7 (UL/IST, Portugal): 2
- P8 (UNS, Serbia): 3
- P9 (UNSA, Bosnia): 6
- P10 (UNMO, Bosnia): 4
- P11 (UPKM, Croatia): 2
- P12 (TCASU, Serbia): 5
- P13 (UoM, Montenegro): 3
- P14 (PWMC VV, Serbia): 0

University of Nis



Strengthening of master curricula in water resources management
for the Western Balkans HEIs and stakeholders

Only partner P17 (PWMC VV, Serbia) did not answer to the QA09 questionnaire.

The next table presents the **total number of answers per score category**. The average of the **38 answers** to the different question were as follows:


- Structure of project time schedule: **4.82**
- Communication between partners: **4.76**
- Timeliness of feedbacks from the coordinator when requested: **4.92**
- Incisiveness of coordination: **4.82**
- How do you rate overall the project management for the period of the last year?: **4.89**

The figure after the next table provides the general characterization of the results about **“Overall assessment of work package management”**. The result for each partner is the average of the answers provided by that partner.

Table/Figure

Overall assessment of project management

	Grading	Very poor	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Structure of project time schedule					7	31
Communication between partners					9	29
Timeliness of feedbacks from the coordinator when requested					3	35
Incisiveness of coordination					7	31
How do you rate overall the project management for the period of the last year?					4	34



Evaluation of level of involvement

Description

The next table presents the **total number of answers per score category**, according to the **38** replies to the QA09 questionnaire, as previous mentioned. The average of the **38** answers to the different question were as follows:


- Actively involved in the project development: **4.71**
- Satisfied with the implementation of the project activities: **4.82**
- Distribution among partners of tasks sharing: **4.73**

The figure after the next table provides the general characterization of the results about " **General participant expectations**". The result for each partner is the average of the answers provided by that partner.

Table/Figure

General participant expectations

Grading	Very poor	Poor	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Actively involved in the project development	1			7	30
Satisfied with the implementation of the project activities				7	31
Distribution among partners of tasks sharing			1	8	29



Please indicate your suggestions for further project management improvement:

According to the QA09 survey, the only thing required (with less than 30 answers with 5) is to improve the communication between partners as well as the distribution among partners of tasks sharing.

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.

University



**Strengthening of master curricula in water resources management
for the Western Balkans HEIs and stakeholders**