

**Summary of answers to Questionnaire  
for the Project Coordinator and Project Executive Committee members**

<b><i>Project origin stage</i></b>		
	Was an analysis carried out of the existing status of curricula in the area of production management and other areas related to the project topic at participating (and eventually other) Thailand universities?	<b><i>Mainly all said that an analysis was conducted.</i></b>
1	Were there any problems identified to be solved with the project realization? What those problems are?	Were there any problems identified to be solved <b>with</b> the project realization? <b><i>I am afraid that apart from the PC the PEC members did not understand the question. It was about the problems to be solved BY the project realization not WITHIN the realization.</i></b>
2	Is there any document prepared as a result of such an analysis of the current status of those curricula?	<u>Yes.</u> <a href="https://msie4.ait.ac.th/wpcontent/uploads/sites/5/2018/06/List-of-MS-IE-in-Thailand.pdf">https://msie4.ait.ac.th/wpcontent/uploads/sites/5/2018/06/List-of-MS-IE-in-Thailand.pdf</a>
3	How were a Project Coordinator and a project team appointed/selected? Based on which criteria?	<u>The project team was selected based on the competency and commitment of the members in improving the teaching and curriculum.</u> <b><i>Project teams were selected based on the location of each university to cover the whole country.</i></b>
4	Is this project a continuation of another project(s)?	<u>No. This is a new project.</u>
5	Is it expected that another project will follow and therefore it is conditioned by this project success?	<b><i>Partners have already discussed a potential to propose a new project as a follow-up to this one.</i></b> <b><i>One of the ideas is for the new project to be within the Erasmus Mundus program as a Joint Master between Thai and EU Partners, or ERASMUS+ KAI between Thai and EU.</i></b>
<b><i>Project design stage</i></b>		
6	Who and how approved the project objectives?	<b><i>PC drafted the proposal and sought opinion of partner leaders prior to the submission of the proposal.</i></b>
7	Who set up the organizational structure of the project?	<b><i>PC set up the organizational structure which was later on approved by PEC after the project started.</i></b>
8	Were the responsibilities and competencies of the project team members at this stage determined?	<u>Yes.</u> <u>During the proposal preparation, the PC listed WPs and tasks for all the WPs and asked partner leaders to express their</u>

		<i>interests in the tasks according to their expertise.</i> <i>From responses and the human resources each partner indicated, the PC summarized and identified roles, WP leaders and budgets for all partners.</i>
9	How did you define and analyze the risks at this stage?	<i>The potential technical and managerial risks that can occur were defined by the PC in consultation with partners' leaders (and all the WP leaders) and then they have been assessed and analyzed by the PEC.</i>
10	Did individual team members know their competencies and responsibilities at this stage?	<i>The PC was not sure on this point. He assumed that the partners' leaders knew how to select their teams.</i> <i>According to all the PEC members, the team members did know their potential tasks. They were asked to study the project at the beginning and individual responsibilities were defined after the meetings.</i>
<b><i>Project planning stage</i></b>		
11	Was there a defined and approved detailed plan of the extent of the project and what will be created by the project - work packages, outputs, deliverables and products?	<i>Yes. The leaders of WP1, 4, 5 and 6 were asked to come up with a plan for their WP.</i> <i>The plan was reviewed for each WP by its members before submitting to QCMB for approval and to PEC for final approval.</i>
12	Was the risk register updated?	<i>The PC said that the WP leaders were asked to update the risk register. Some of the PEC members said YES, some did not answer to this question (citing N/A), some said that they were not involved in this action and some were not quite sure whether it was updated.</i>
13	Did the composition of the project team change with respect to the previous stages? If yes, who was replaced and why?	<i>Not at the project level, but it was changed at individual partners' level. The PC filled in the role of WP2 co-leader who is taking a long sabbatical leave with no clear plan of coming back.</i>
14	Did all the members of the project team know the updated plan at any given moment?	<i>WP leaders informed their members who attended general assemblies about updated plans that were made available on the project website, as well as by communications by Line, WhatsApp and Zoom applications.</i>

15	How did you estimate the length of activities, the overall length of the project duration?	<u>Based on the nature of tasks, the numbers of days were identified and used along with interdependency of tasks to schedule an execution plan of the proposal. The WP leaders were asked to review the initial execution plan and adjust it for their parts.</u>
16	How did you identify the key project activities?	<u>From deliverables planned in the Proposal and at the potential PEC members meeting.</u>
17	How was the project budget put together? Who participated in putting the budget together? Where there any problems when putting the budget together?	<u>During the proposal preparation, PC identified the WPs and their tasks.</u> <u>Partner leaders were asked to express their team interests.</u> <u>PC estimated the number of days need for each task and allocated to the partners expressed their interest to participate in that task.</u> <u>Budget was allocated based on their roles and responsibilities.</u> <b>There was no issue on the budget. ???</b>
18	Is the documentation from the project plan stage available?	<b>Yes.</b> <a href="https://msie4.ait.ac.th/outcome-1-1-gapanalysis-working-plan/">https://msie4.ait.ac.th/outcome-1-1-gapanalysis-working-plan/</a> <a href="https://msie4.ait.ac.th/quality-controland-monitoring-plan-v3/">https://msie4.ait.ac.th/quality-controland-monitoring-plan-v3/</a> <a href="https://msie4.ait.ac.th/dissemination-plan/">https://msie4.ait.ac.th/dissemination-plan/</a> <a href="https://msie4.ait.ac.th/projectmanagement-and-communication-planpmcp/">https://msie4.ait.ac.th/projectmanagement-and-communication-planpmcp/</a>
19	Did individual persons know which activities they were responsible for?	<b>Yes, they mainly did at this stage.</b>
<b>Project implementation stage</b>		
20	Was the project team communicating without any major problems?	<u>No. Communication has remained a major problem for the project. Members have not communicated enough. PC has encouraged WP leaders to call meetings to move project forward. Members have been encouraged to communicate as well.</u> <b>Somewhat different opinion (actually a plausible explanation):</b> <b>"At the beginning, there were some problem in communications because the semester periods at Thai and European universities are different".</b> <b>And additional:</b> <b>Later on, the PC distributed equipment for Video conference to all the partners. That made communication much easier.</b>

		<p><b><i>The best explanation is this:</i></b>  <i>In such large projects the communication is always a major issue. At the meeting we did not have problems and everything was OK. Between the kick-off meeting and the second meeting, the communication was not so easy. We were using email, WhatsApp and shared repositories in the website and in google drive.</i>  <i>This asynchronous communication was not easy.</i>  <i>After the second meeting and before the third we started using Zoom for facilitating almost weekly meetings. At this point we do not need weekly meeting but we still use Zoom. This was a great add to our project team communication.</i>  <i>In my opinion, we are communicating without any major problems (UMinho).</i></p>
21	Did the Project Executive Committee meetings take place in accordance with the adopted rules and plan?	<b><i>There were no problems with this item. All the PEC members agreed that meetings were held according to plan.</i></b>
22	Did the project team meetings take place in accordance with the adopted rules and plan?	<b><i>There were no problems with this item.</i></b>
23	Did the composition of the project team change with respect to the previous stages? If yes, who was replaced and why? Please, elaborate.	<p><i>There were a switch of roles role between WP1 leader and co-leader at the beginning of the second year. The leader was unable to deliver to results as planned and the progress was slow.</i>  <i>In addition, there was a replacement of WP2 co-leader as the old one has taken a long sabbatical leave during after the project started.</i>  <b><i>Some of the PEC members did not know about this????</i></b>  <u><b><i>An excellent example, which will go in Auditing report as an example of good practice:</i></b></u>  <i>In UMinho team, one member was added because he could add specialized knowledge in ergonomics for I4.0.</i></p>
24	Was the quality and quantity of achieved outputs monitored? How? Please, elaborate.	<p><i>WP leaders were asked to update the progress of tasks under their supervisions. ??</i>  <b><i>They are supposed to execute their tasks, not to monitor the quality of outputs!</i></b>  <b><i>Another very good explanation:</i></b></p>

		<p><i>Yes, they were. The quality, quantity and dimension was evaluated by several teams and committees.</i></p> <p><i>As an example, as the leader of the WP1, responsible for the main outputs of that work package. Before developing WP1 we approved the plan. After that, every report followed the plan. The approval of each output was first approved internally in my institution team. After that it was approved by the WP1 team. After that it was approved by the Quality committee.</i></p> <p><i>Finally it was approved by the PEC.</i></p> <p><i>WP1 delivered 7 reports, which had 28 versions. This number of versions resulted from reviewing the reports and developing the corresponding actions of quality improve.</i></p>
25	Do you know what <b>you</b> can make decisions about and what is the task of each of the project team members?	<u><i>Yes, all the PEC members and the PC knew what they can make decisions about.</i></u>
26	Do the members of the Project Executive Committee know about their tasks and competencies?	<b><i>Yes, all the PEC members knew what their tasks were.</i></b> <b><i>PC was not sure about their awareness of their own competencies.</i></b>
27	How does the risk management take place?	<p><u><i>There is an Action plan written in PMCP and PEC members were reviewing it.</i></u></p> <p><u><i>WP leaders report on potential risks once a month.</i></u></p> <p><b><i>Some PEC members are putting too much emphasis on the role of the PC and actually transfer their responsibilities to him.</i></b></p>
28	Why do you monitor risks? How do you work with identified risks?	<p><i>To take prompt action if it actually occurs and to create awareness of WP leaders to try to prevent it from happening and take actions when it happens.</i></p> <p><b><i>Good explanation by the PC.</i></b></p>
29	When, how and to whom do you communicate the risk development or arising new risks?	<p><i>WP leaders communicate possible risks to PC and other PEC members.</i></p> <p><b><i>Some PEC members did not answer questions related to risks at all (# 27 to 30)???. (Answered as N/A???)</i></b></p>
30	Which measures have been taken in the project, based on the risk register, or as a part of the project risk management?	<p><u><i>Keeping an eye on potential problems and focusing on key activities.</i></u></p> <p><b><i>An example of proper measures (action taken by PC):</i></b></p>

		<u>Extra online meetings were conducted to complete WP1 and with the lesson learned, I pushed the WP2 leader to be more active when we started the WP2 and stepped back once we were on track.</u>
31	How the project budget was monitored and reported (changes, drawing down of the budget, drawing down of the reserves)?	<u>Through the defined procedures for the financial management.</u> <b>According to the PMCP, all the members were asked to record their timesheets and submit to their partner leaders.</b> <b>The partner leaders were asked to submit their financial update to the PC on a monthly basis.</b>
32	Were there any problems recorded related to compliance with contractual obligations? If yes, what are they? How were those problems eliminated? If not, why? Please, elaborate.	<b>There were no major problems related to the contractual obligations, aside from some problems related to the schedule of the project and some delays in delivering the outputs. Schedules were being updated and outputs delivered with some delay with respect to the original one.</b>
33	What project records do you keep? How are they kept? Are you backing up your data?	<u>Project documentation and soft copies of all partner documents are kept in both PC's personal server, his computer and the project website. Hardcopies are kept in his office.</u> <b>Other PEC members keep their own records and documents, as well.</b> <b>Detailed list is as follows:</b> <b>Partner financial reports, members time sheets and project sheets, responsibilities declaration, travel reports and their documentation, project draft and final outputs, work in progress files, dissemination outputs and records, meetings reports, and other.</b> <b>All the financial documentation is kept in Project Office in paper and in electronic version and by Partner leaders in electronic format.</b> <b>Some draft outputs are kept by members.</b>
34	Who has access to the records and to whom do you pass information/reports on the current development of project management/realization?	<u>All the PEC and project team members have access to documents on the project website. The project secretary also has an access to the hardcopies.</u>
35	Who makes the decision to move / not to move the project into the next stage?	WP leaders, PC and PEC members.
36	Is the documentation from this stage of the project management in available?	<b>Yes. (See answer to question #33.)</b>

<b>Project mid-term evaluation stage</b>		
37	<p>Were all the outputs, planned to be realized thus far, implemented, in what amount and quality? If not, why? Please, elaborate.</p>	<p><u>At the time of mid-term evaluation, deliverables were completed according to the plan. The progress after the submission of the mid-term report, however, has been slowed. Task 2.1 and Task 2.2 should have been completed a couple months after the submission.</u></p> <p><b>Some PEC members think that the quality of delivering the results can be seen from the quality reports.</b></p> <p><b>Some delay was also recorded in acquiring equipment.</b></p> <p><i>In addition some overlapping of WP2 with WP1 was noticed due to delay in WP1 realization "due to its complexity, which was higher than anticipated".</i></p> <p><i>Yet, another opinion:</i></p> <p><i>"In practice, it appeared the outcome 2.1 could not be achieved without outcome 2.2 and therefore some further delays appeared".</i></p> <p><b>This could point to not quite a proper selection of outcomes. Please, elaborate on that!!!</b></p>
38	<p>Which parameters of the defined project objectives (to be achieved thus far) were met / were not met? If not, why? Please, elaborate.</p>	<p><b>PC:</b> <u>"Five focuses under the objective have been implementing. First focus on modernization of a curriculum has been unofficially completed. We are waiting for WP2 leader to submit a report. Second and third focuses on courses and technology are being developed. Fourth focus on quality and EQF have been implemented. Fifth one on partnership has been implemented since day one".</u></p> <p><i>As for now, most of the parameters are met. It is still ongoing activity and all the parameters should be possible to be achieved during implementation.</i></p> <p><b>Again, three PEC members answered with N/A???</b></p>
39	<p>Were all the products, planned to be realized thus far, implemented? If not, why? Please, elaborate.</p>	<p><u>All of the tasks were executed according to the plan and most of the tasks were completed.</u></p>

40	Did the project management (Coordinator/PEC) propose recommendations for improving the organization of work?	<u>Yes. WP leaders were normally invited to attend PEC meeting to update the progress and PEC members asked, discussed and suggested, if there was any concern.</u>
41	Which measures to improve the project organization were proposed/ implemented? Please, elaborate.	<p><u>PEC offered suggestion on issues. PC communicated with members at large on progress of tasks and deliverables.</u></p> <p><b>Another good explanation:</b> "The follow up of the PC through WP leaders and members help improve both organization and implementation. Normally, we discuss by E-mail and online – meeting".</p> <p><b>And another:</b> There were 3 versions of the Project Management and Communication Plan (PMCP). Examples: Monthly WP reports; Team reports; Reviewing and approval of outcomes by several teams; Creation of systematic Zoom meetings for content and for management.</p> <p><b>And another:</b> Enabling the use of internet platform for documentation flow, enabling multi-side access to output documents, creating the mixed Partners teams.</p>
42	How were the project outputs (realized thus far) promoted? Please, elaborate.	<p><u>The project outcomes were presented in various capacities, including introducing the project and presenting outcomes at both national and international conferences, published promotional materials, organizing workshop and public seminars, talk to industry and communicating with target audience via website, Facebook and YouTube.</u></p> <p><b>The actions are described in the Dissemination reports.</b></p> <p><b>And another view:</b> Project meetings usually include open seminars for general public, big social media campaign is being introduced, several papers on the project were presented on the conferences, dedicated seminars are organized for different stakeholders in Thailand, associate partners participate in promotional events and activities.</p>



43	<p>Were the project outputs (realized thus far) duly promoted to stakeholders? At which stakeholders was the promotion aimed? Please, elaborate.</p>	<p><u>Project aims at different stakeholders groups including universities, students and academics, companies, educational institutions and researchers, public authorities and all of these groups are addressed with different dissemination activities.</u></p>
44	<p>Do you consider that the project is a success <i>thus far</i>, i.e. are the project objectives met within the planned deadline(s) using the planned funds? Are all the predicted indicators and outputs (thus far) met? Please, elaborate.</p>	<p><b>PC:</b> <u>Somewhat. I wish it could be better but what we have completed is acceptable.</u></p> <p><b>Other PEC members:</b> <i>Somewhat success. The project is still in progress.</i> <i>I consider the project is quite success, even though some works are a little delay but we can cover them to meet the deadline and the quality of the deliverables.</i> <i>Not completely.</i> <i>Yes, the project is a success so far. At this point we can say that are meeting the objectives in the planned deadlines with the planned funds.</i> <i>Project is a success for the moment due to its high visibility, raised interested among its key stakeholders and sound outcome flow. It seems that the major output, namely MSc in IE curriculum is innovative and attractive enough to meet the predicted expectations of the project.</i></p>
45	<p>Is the documentation from this stage of the project management available?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
46	<p><i>Is there anything you would like to add?</i></p>	<p><b>PC:</b> <u>Familiarity of members to the procedures and requirements needs to be improved.</u> <u>Mid-term report and Annex C are available on the project website.</u> <u>We are not yet at our best. I have not yet been able to bring up the best of every single member.</u></p> <p><b>Other PEC members:</b> <i>Somewhat success. The project is still in progress. However the communication of the current WP seems to be slow and not clear.</i> <i>I admire EU partners. They gave many ideas through discussions that make our success.</i></p>

		<p><i>Currently, it is in the last stage of the project, the serious action need to conduct.</i></p> <p><i>The way in which the work was structured and divided between different teams it may look a little bit too complicated.</i></p> <p><i>This is being a challenging and motivating project so far.</i></p>
--	--	--