

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
Fifth Management Meeting, online, 30 of October 2020



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

Summary

1. Introduction.....	5
2. Fifth Management Meeting Participants and Meeting Agenda	6
3. Evaluation Survey.....	7
3.1. Dissemination of the Survey and Respondents	7
3.2 Results	7
3.2.1. Quantitative Analysis	8
3.2.4 Qualitative Analysis	10
4. Conclusion	11
ANNEX 1: Meeting Agenda.....	12
ANNEX 2: Evaluation Survey.....	15
DISCLAIMER.....	23

Tables

Table 1. Job-Jo Partners and Work Packages Coordination.....	5
Table 2. List of participants in the Second Management Meeting	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 Meeting).....	9
Table 6. Distribution of Responses of Part II: Results (of the Meeting).....	10
Table 7. Qualitative Data.....	10

1. Introduction

This report concerns the management meeting that took place online, the 30th of October 2020.

This was the fifth Management Meeting of the Job-Jo Project. 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.

By itself, the project will set a network of stakeholders supported by the common goal of the promotion of employment. The Project visibility is locally maintained by the Business Service Network Bureau (BSNB, in five Jordan Universities) and reinforced by the Job-Jo Website and Facebook page. Organized in six Work Packages (Preparation, Development, Quality, Dissemination and Exploitation and Management), the Project Coordinator, Mutah University, has attributed their coordination to some of the partners (Table 1).

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) Co-leadership of WP4
UNIVERSITY OF JORDAN	UJ	AMMAN / JO	Dissemination & Sustainability (WP5)
Project Coordinator			
MUTAH UNIVERSITY LTD	MU	KARAK / JO	Management (WP6)

The 2020 worldwide Covid-19 pandemic situation imposed severe restrictions in day-to-day life and as would be expected, Job Jo project planned activities, namely the management meetings, had to be adapted to comply to the restrictions, but maintained. This meeting took place in an online environment, through Zoom video platform.

2. Fifth Management Meeting Participants and Meeting Agenda

The meeting date was proposed by email, the 22nd of October and its Agenda was sent to all participants the same day, for analysis and feedback. The final meeting Agenda was distributed one day before the event (see Annex 1). Table 2 depicts the list of the 18 participants of the meeting and their institution. It is noted that the External Evaluator, Waleed Salameh, attended the meeting.

Table 2. List of participants in the Second Management Meeting

Name		30 of October
Professor Omer Nawaf Khaled Maaitah; Coordinator	Mutah University	Yes
Dr. Mohammad R. O. Al Majali; Technical Manager	Mutah University	Yes
Waleed Salameh	External Auditor	Yes
Dr. Fahmi Ahmed Abu Al-Rub; Contact person JUST	Jordan University of Science and Technology	Yes
Ruba Hassan	Jordan University of Science and Technology	Yes
Dr. Ahmed S. A. Al-Salaymeh; Contact person UJ	University of Jordan	Yes
Rasha Albeek	University of Jordan	Yes
Hanan Slayhmeh	University of Jordan	Yes
Professor Mohammad Almahasneh; Contact person TTU	Tafila Technical University	Yes
Dr. Suleiman Ahmad S. Al khattab; Contact person AHU	Al Hussein Bin Talal Univesrity	Yes
Ghaith Nayef Abdo Alnawaiseh; Contact person MPWH	Ministry of Public Works and Housing	Yes
Dr. Alexandros Yeratziotis	University of Cyprus	Yes
Dr. Evangelia Vanezi	University of Cyprus	Yes
Dr. Riyadh Qashi	INT@E	Yes
Dr. Ing Yaarob Al Ghanem	Hochschule fur Technik Wirtschaft und Kultur Leipzig	Yes
Dr. Oleg Krikotov	Hochschule fur Technik Wirtschaft und Kultur Leipzig	Yes

Name		30 of October
Professor Isabel Maria Vilaça Tavares Campos	Instituto Superior de Leiria – ISLA Leiria	Yes
Dr. Lurdes JL Castanheira	Instituto Superior de Leiria – ISLA Leiria	Yes

3. Evaluation Survey

The questionnaire was designed for the first meeting and has been used all through the project to guarantee comparability between the meetings. In the first report, the characteristics of the questionnaire were specified, and we will not elaborate on them any further. Still, it should be noted that its design contemplates three main areas: organization of the meeting, Results, and Leading Partners reflections.

The first section has seven quantitative questions related to the meeting organization, answered in a Likert-type scale of 4 points: 1 = Totally disagree, 2 = Partially agree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Totally agree; it has, also, a qualitative question soliciting for suggestions to further improve the organization of future meetings. The second section has five questions related to the meeting functioning, answered in the same Likert-type scale, and a similar open qualitative question directed to further improve the functioning of the meeting. The final section, directed exclusively to partners with a leading responsibility, aims to provide a foci of reflection about the pending responsibilities.

3.1. Dissemination of the Survey and Respondents

The evaluation survey was online (in Google Forms, see ANNEX 2) from the 30th of October until the 15th of November. Its link was sent to the Project Coordinator to be distributed to the meeting participants and two reminders were sent to everybody in the 2nd and on the 6th of November. On the 15th of November, the survey was blocked, and no more answers were recorded. There are 18 answers, and all respondents identified their organization.

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=3,31, SD=0,80). As can be seen in Table 3, the average evaluation to each item is between 3,22 and 3,44 and the mode is 4. Considering the response scale (from 1 to 4), we can conclude that most participants considered that it was a well-organized meeting.

In fact, they report that the purpose of the meeting was clear (M=3,28, SD=1,02), the important issues were duly considered (M=3,11, SD=1,02), the distribution of the meeting agenda was on time (M=3,22, SD=1,00) and well organized (M=3,33, SD=0,69), with a fair distribution of presentation time (M=3,39, SD=0,69) and of discussion opportunity (M=3,44, SD=0,78) or time (M=3,39, SD=0,85).

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

	Mean	SD	Mode	Min	Max
Organization of the meeting (aggregated value)	3,31	0,80	4	2	4
The purpose of the 5th management meeting was clear	3,28	1,02	4	1	4
All relevant issues were contemplated in the meeting agenda	3,11	1,02	4	1	4
The agenda was timely distributed	3,22	1,00	4	1	4
The presentations sequence was adequate	3,33	0,69	3 ^a	2	4
The time attribution to each presentation was adequate	3,39	0,69	4	2	4
The discussion opportunities were adequate	3,44	0,78	4	2	4
The amount of discussion time was adequate	3,39	0,85	4	2	4

^a. There are several Modes. The smallest value is shown

As could be expected from the analysis of descriptive statistics, the majority of respondents were Totally in Agree to the statements (Table 4). The main aspects 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 2nd management meeting was clear	10	56	5	28	1	6	2	11
All relevant issues were contemplated in the meeting agenda	8	44	6	33	2	11	2	11
The agenda was timely distributed	9	50	6	33	1	6	2	11
The presentations sequence was adequate	8	44	8	44	2	11		
The time attribution to each presentation was adequate	9	50	7	39	2	11		
The discussion opportunities were adequate	11	61	4	22	3	17		
The amount of discussion time was adequate	11	61	3	17	4	22		

Concerning the Results of the meeting, the evaluation is high ($M=3,14$, $SD=0,98$) but there is less consensus (see Table 5). The mean varies between 3,00 and 3,28 but the dispersion measures are higher than in the assessment of the meeting Organization. The short-term tasks and objectives are perceived as clear ($M=3,28$, $SD=1,07$ and $M=3,22$, $SD=1,06$, respectively) but longer responsibilities were less consensual when considering their immediately apparent aims ($M=3,00$, $SD=0,97$ and $M=3,06$, $SD=0,99$).

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

	Mean	SD	Mode	Min	Max
Results of the meeting (aggregated value)	3,14	0,98	4	1	4
Each partner's role in the project is clear	3,00	,970	3	1	4
The role of my organization in the project is clear	3,28	1,02	4	1	4
Short term tasks (until the next meeting) are clear	3,28	1,07	4	1	4
Short term objectives (until the next meeting) are clear	3,22	1,06	4	1	4
Long and medium-term tasks are clear	3,00	0,97	3	1	4
Long and medium-term objectives are clear	3,06	0,99	3 ^a	1	4

^a. There are several Modes. The smallest value is shown

The analysis of the distribution of responses allows for some clarification (Table 6). A global interpretation of the data suggests that partners perceive that their institution

role is clearer than the role of the other partners. Another conclusion may be that short term tasks and objectives are better understood than long- and medium-term tasks and objectives.

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

	Totally agree		Agree		Partially agree		Totally disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Each partner's role in the project is clear	6	33	8	44	2	11	2	11
The role of my organization in the project is clear	10	56	5	28	1	6	2	11
Short term tasks (until the next meeting) are clear	11	61	3	17	2	11	2	11
Short term objectives (until the next meeting) are clear	10	56	4	22	2	11	2	11
Long and medium-term tasks are clear	6	33	8	44	2	11	2	11
Long and medium-term objectives are clear	7	39	7	39	2	11	2	11

3.2.4 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.

The only suggestion made concerns the arrangement of the room stating that a round table (probably as the ones in the kick-off meeting) is a better option.

Table 7. Qualitative Data

	N	Comments
Part I: Do you have any suggestion . . . in terms of its organization	7	- Video should be on - six persons wrote that they have no suggestions
Part II: Do you have any suggestion . . . in terms of results	5	- five persons wrote that they have no suggestions

	N	Comments
Part III: First task	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Arrange training - Collaborate in the preparation of the online training sessions schedule; it should be done by 9th of November; a meeting between the Europeans partners needs to take place and the coordination of agendas needs to be agreed - Conducting on-line training for students - Organize the online training plan for staff. deadline is in two weeks. - Preparation of Training Plan for Students and Staff with EU partners - Quality report contributions - Redesign the training evaluation questionnaire - Sustainability plan
Part III: Second task	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Adapt the trainee evaluation, made by the trainer, to a group of trainees. - Arrange workshops - Capacity building plan - Local Meeting - Preparation of Training Plan for Students and Staff with EU partners - Training workshop-stakeholder workshop
Part III: Third task	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Define the schedule for online training for students and staff - Dissemination workshop - Management - Preparation of Training Plan for Students and Staff with EU partners

Note. All statements are transposed, 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 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. Nevertheless, it was suggested that all participants should have the video camera on. In fact, several participants had the video off even when they were speaking.

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.

Regarding the systematization of the work to be carried out by each partner - Part III of the questionnaire – it seems that each partner is aware of his short and medium to long term tasks and objectives.

ANNEX 1: Meeting Agenda



ERASMUS+ PROGRAMME

Promoting Youth Employment in Remote Areas in Jordan/ Job-Jo
Project Number: 598428-EPP-1-2018-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

Fifth Management Meeting Agenda

On line meeting

Friday 30/10/2020

3.00 Pm-7.00pm

Omer Maaitah is inviting you to a scheduled Zoom meeting.

Join Zoom Meeting



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

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.

Venue: on line

Session (1): Chaired by Prof. Omer Maaitah		
3.00 -3.20pm	Introduction about last activity	
3.20-3.40pm	Discussion the online training schedule	Dr Alexandros Yeratziotis
3.40-4.30	Training in BSNB (reschedule) in Jordan	Dr Alexandros Yeratziotis, Evangelia Vanezi Dr. Riyadh Qashi, Prof. Yaarob al Ghanem and Professors Lurdes Castanheira and Isabel Vilaça
4.30-5.00	Student training in EU and replacing by online training	Dr Alexandros Yeratziotis, Dr. Riyadh Qashi, Prof. Yaarob al Ghanem and Professors Lurdes Castanheira and Isabel Vilaça
5.00-5.15	Enhancing the website	Omer Maaitah, Emad Qalgy and Dr Alexandros Yeratziotis
5.15-5.20	New Equipment	Dr Mohamed Sarayreh
5.20-5.30	Discussion the Med report	Dr Mohamed Majalee
5.30-5.45	Physical Local meeting and workshops in JUST, MU, TTU, AHU and UJ	Prof Fahmi, Prof Ahmed, Prof Suliman and Prof Mahsneh
5.45-6.00	Result of Job Jo findings to be sent to ministry of MPWH in Jordan	Gyith and Zobideh and Omer Maaitah
6.00-7.00 pm-	Closure discussion	

ANNEX 2: Evaluation Survey

Job Jo 5th Management Meeting - online - 30 of October 2020

We ask your kind collaboration to evaluate the Job Jo 5th Management Meeting. 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.

+ Required

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



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

Identification

1. Please identify your University/ Organization *

Mark only one oval.

- 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 für Technik Wirtschaft und Kultur Leipzig
- INT@EUG
- Instituto Superior de Leiria - ISLA Leiria
- University of Cyprus

Part I: Organization of the meeting

2. Agenda preparation *

Mark only one oval per row.

	Totally disagree	Partially agree	Agree	Totally agree
The purpose of the 5th management meeting was clear	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
All relevant issues were contemplated in the meeting agenda	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The agenda was timely distributed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The presentations sequence was adequate	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

The time attribution to each Meeting development was adequate

3. **Meeting development** was adequate

	Totally disagree	Partially agree	Agree	Totally agree
The discussion opportunities were adequate	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The amount of discussion time was adequate	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

4. 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

5. 

Mark only one oval per row.

	Totally disagree	Partially agree	Agree	Totally agree
Each partner's role in the project is clear	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The role of my organization in the project is clear	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Short term tasks (until the next meeting) are clear	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Short term objectives (until the next meeting) are clear	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Long and medium-term tasks	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

are clear _____

Long and medium-term objectives are clear _____

6. 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.

**Part III:
Leading
Partners**

This area is reserved to partners with a leading role in any of the Work Packages. We invite you to 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).

7. 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).

8. 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).

9. 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).

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms

DISCLAIMER

This publication was produced with the financial support of the European Union. Its contents are the sole responsibility of *ISLA Instituto Superior de Leiria* and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Union.