



WP 7 – QUALITY MANAGEMENT

QUALITY REPORT 1

April 2013



QUALITY REPORT 1

There are nine partners from five different EU countries participating and collaborating in this ECVET-Health Tourism project, who are working in different national cultures. To achieve the project aims the collaboration needs common policy and agreements according the working methods. Common quality procedures and quality standards should be created to make sure that the quality of the finished products will meet the requirements of the target groups. The project, concerning the project quality, foresees a specific work package (WP 7 “Quality management”), aimed to ensure the quality of activities and products to be developed during the project, to allow a smooth project operation and to secure the achievement of the project aims. This purpose will be served through a system of process-oriented self-evaluation by means of standardised feedback surveys and written documentation of project activities, which will be subject to approval by the partners involved and thus allow for additional reflection and self-assessment.

The project partners are committed to the project activities of ECVET Health tourism - 2012-1-HU1-LEO05-0582 in accordance with the requirements and the best of their abilities in order to perform at a high level. For the successful of implementation of the project, the coordinating, leading activities are performed by Várnai Ltd. who constantly strives for taking into account the quality assurance principles.

The **2nd meeting of project** was realized in Brussels, the 3-4th of April, 2013. The coordinator partner of the project is Hungarian Várnai Oktatási és Könyvvizsgáló Kft. During the meeting, a questionnaire - divided into 3 parts - was handed out to the partners to be filled out. **The objective of this questionnaire was to gain useful conclusions and feedback about the progress of the project in order to ensure the improvement of cooperation and efficiency of quality insurance.** The main 3 parts of the questionnaire are the following:

- *General survey about overall project satisfaction (scale-mode questions about administration, assistance, communication, IT services and coordinator’s partner quality management measures)*
- *Detailed written responses about the implemented preparatory research of professional figures in the field of health-tourism (possibility for detailed description, additions, explanations from partner’s side)*
- *Questions about the financial aspects (administration, financial report)*

There were seven partners from five different countries who had to fill the questionnaire in. (The coordinator partner did not fill one, and one partner (P5) has left the program in the meantime). So, from the seven partners who had to fill the document, **there were nine filled out questionnaire** (some partners filled one together, some of them one of each person). The countries participating in the project are: **Belgium, Italy, Hungary, Romania and Slovakia.**

According to the results of quality assurance survey, **the project teams have been selected based on their professional competences**. Out of nine responders, eight have chosen this explanation. Furthermore, three of them have marked the **knowledge of language** as an important factor in creating the team. In one case the **career possibility** was the decisive factor.

1. The scale-mode questions

Regarding the overall project satisfaction, 98% of the responders were very satisfied with the progression of the project (only one partner chosen the option “satisfied”).

In terms of guidelines from the coordinator partner, 96% of the responders claimed he/she gets any help without problem, one considered it moderately.

The same question about help from other partners brought different results as only 55% of responders thought they got every help from other partners of the project. The rest of them were moderately satisfied, only one partner claimed he/she didn't get any guidelines from others.

The administration work and IT services were approximately the most **critical factor** in the scale-mode survey. 33% of the partners were absolutely satisfied, 56% satisfied while 11% moderately satisfied with the administrative operation. Regarding IT services, it gave similar results as 67% is absolutely satisfied, 22% is satisfied, 11% is moderately satisfied. Based on these feedbacks, it could mean more options for explanations: on one hand, the partners have difficulties dealing with administration work and the IT services are not entirely available for them during the whole project. On the other hand the administrative tasks are slightly complex and they do not have enough time for fully implementing it.

For the **project communication, 78% were entirely satisfied** while only 11% - 11% were well and moderately satisfied.

Similarly to IT services, the satisfaction with the coordinator partner's quality management measures resulted the following: 67% very satisfied, 22% satisfied, 11% moderately satisfied.

Regarding the **activities realized in order to ensure the quality of the project**, two responders did not indicate any information. Seven persons mentioned the **data services about their research, interviews and systematization they implemented**. One partner gave detailed explanation about the requirements they structured in an educational program and integrated in operative plans as this is a well-functioning quality assurance system coming from Japan.

Three responders **suggested further measures and activities** for quality assurance in the future. One of them suggested the utilization of outcomes of the Japanese assurance system mentioned above. The rest of them supported the **exchange of work experience as well as constant contact via e-mails and skype**.

2. Analysis and preparatory researches on the field of professional figures in health tourism

The second part of the questionnaire contained questions giving the possibility for analysis and detailed explanations, additions from partner's side. The major part of the questions was directed to the source of research and data, the nature of interviews they made as well as the problems they faced during the process.

Generally speaking, the majority of the sources were coming from national, regional and European official documents, internet, officials from professional organizations, interviews with professionals working in health tourism (physiotherapists, thermal bath assistants etc.), from educational programs of national vocational institutions, national profile framework, secondary research.

Besides these, other institutions have been asked and visited, such as national, international training institutions, EU websites, professional institutions, universities, colleges as well as trade unions, thermal bathes and tourism ltd-s.

The most visited websites were the following:

www.nive.hu, www.efeb.hu, www.kormany.hu, www.rubinian.hu, www.asistenta-juridica.eu, www.felvi.hu, www.itthon.hu, www.meme.hu, www.google.com, <http://www.siov.sk/statne-vzdelavacie-programy-platne-od-192010/11930s>, <http://www.sustavapovolani.sk/>, <http://www.thermalcorvinus.sk/>, <http://www.kupeledudince.sk/>, <http://www.thermalpark.sk/>, <http://www.vadas.sk/>, <http://www.kupelepiestany.sk/>, <http://www.hotel-therma-dunajska-streda.com>, <http://www.pozicie.sk/>

The partners examined not just their own trainings but other's too, regionally or in some cases nationally by their own admission.

Out of nine responders, six have made interviews with trainers, marketing and HR managers of the institutions concerned, directors, people who work in Spa, Wellness, Cliniques, Hotels etc. For the interviews, six responders used an interview questionnaire or guideline. In terms of time, also six persons claimed they had enough time for performing their research.

Regarding the problems the partners faced during the research, generally speaking it was difficult to systemize the different information and sorted them in a proper way. Other main problem was the availability and - in some cases - the geographical distance between the partners and the stakeholders concerned. As a consequence, it led to a lack of diversity concerning the research area.

However, - according to partners - these problems were mostly solved by collaborating via e-mail and telephone because of the tight financial frames, as well as exchanging the information through calling and meeting people (if it was possible). The good, day-to-day communication and networking was definitely a strong condition for every partner participating in the project.

Every partner, who asked for help from the coordinating partner, received adequate assistance and information from Hungary, showing that we fully complied our task for giving aid.

3. Financial administration aspects

Furthermore, **all partners received the first installment of the support and the financial – administrative brochure on time. Besides, they also finished the financial report of the first period.**

The feedbacks about the experience in ways of communication are absolutely positive. Most of them indicated that the coordinating partner was helpful and available, the different channels for information exchange (e-mail, skype) was working well.

The average of satisfaction level for the financial – administrative help in the last period is satisfied. More concretely, the reason for satisfaction is the **help and support provided by lead applicant**, and so the elaboration and details. The **questionnaires and charts related to the project organization and management are easily assessable and meet the requirements of today's standards**, the accountings related to reports are well understandable and not too difficult unlike many other application. On the other side, the main **reason for some dissatisfaction was the too much paper work, the difficulty of the process and the time spent to financial – administrative part.**

Regarding the suggestions of change for this part in the future is the need for examples and sample forms which would make their financial – administrative work much easier and clear.

4. Conclusions

Overall, it is remarkable, that the partners are clearly satisfied with the collaboration and support provided from the lead country during the project. However, the administration work and IT services needs to be better defined and ensured by providing examples and forms for easier orientation.