

EVALUATION REPORT 5

SAN ANDRÉS DEL RABANEDO Transnational Meeting 14 & 15 May 2014

			AVERAGE
1. STRUCTURE, CONTENT AND DELIVERY OF THE EVENT			4,98
1.1	Organisation of the transnational event	Evidence of clear planning	5,00
		Realistic timescales	5,00
		Appropriate selection of delegates	4,80
1.2	Effectiveness of content and appropriate range and balance of activities	Appropriate content, clearly related to the aims and objectives of the event	5,00
		Relevant mixture of activities e.g. icebreaking activities, didactic sessions, workshops, social activities, free time	5,00
		Appropriateness of the social programme	5,00
1.3	Effectiveness of the process of monitoring and evaluation	Quality of the mechanism for evaluation both short term and long term including follow-up activities, if appropriate	5,00
		Evidence of on-going assistance to participants, if appropriate	5,00
1.4	The quality of project management	Clarity of project coordination	5,00
		Quality of the management of monitoring and evaluation by the project coordinator and introduced to administrative staff	5,00
		The project partners are made aware of the administrative structure of the project	5,00
2. QUALITY OF THE TRANSNATIONAL ELEMENT			4,95
2.1	Input into the event by the project partners	The extent to which each partner contributes to the event	5,00
		The evidence of partners sharing roles and responsibilities during the event	4,80
2.2	Links between the aims of the event and the overall aims of the project	Mutual understanding amongst partners about the project and event rationale and the short term and long term objectives of the event	5,00
		Clear evidence in the event programme of real synergy with the overall objectives of the project	5,00
3. QUALITY OF THE PARTNERSHIP			4,95
3.1	Transnational Partnership	Commitment to the project by each partner	4,80
		Agreement amongst partners	5,00
		Effective communication amongst partners	5,00
		Development of trust and positive attitudes	5,00
4. QUALITY OF THE DOMESTIC ARRANGEMENTS			5,00
4.1	Quality and appropriateness of the domestic arrangements and the comfort factor	Attention to practical details and catering	5,00
		Suitability of the working venue	5,00
		Quality of overnight accommodation, if appropriate	5,00
		Evidence of special requirements (dietary for example) being met	5,00
			4,97

METHODOLOGY

The following questionnaires have been filled in:

Country	Number of questionnaires
Hungary	1
Poland	2
Spain	1
UK	1
TOTAL	5

All the scores of each item were added and divided by the number of valid answers. The average rate is showed in the table (page 1).

To get the final score of each meeting, all the average scores have been added and divided by the total number of items. The items with the highest scores have been highlighted with green characters, whereas the items with the poorest scores are in red colour.

Qualitative evaluation arises from the remarks and comments given by the partners through the evaluation forms.

CONCLUSIONS

The last meeting of the project has been the **final touch of this quality partnership** and most of the comments show this point:

- *“The partnership is the strength of the project”*
- *“The partners have always <<geled>> together to form a quality partnership”*
- *“All partners have made very positive contributions”*
- *“I think all partners are wonderful to work with, very easy to communicate with everyone. Even difficult and tough subjects –for instance, the video- are handled in a good atmosphere”*

Partners think that the **meeting was well organized** and have highlighted the following activities: **the performance, the workshop and the dinner with students.**

- *“The performance was wonderful, the students are lovely actresses!”*
- *“What I liked the most was seeing the play being performed by the students”*
- *“The performance was a happy end for the work done by Eva and their students. It was good to check the evolution of all of them”*
- *“The workshop in which were involved both the members of the Steering Group and the students was an enriching activity. Staff members were actively involved asking questions to the students to know their opinions. It was a useful tool for evaluation purposes.”*
- *“The dinner at the first night was excellent, with the students also involved. There was a great atmosphere, good food...”*
- *“I enjoyed the participation of performing students in other meeting activities”.*

At the same time **all important issues raised clearly defined at the meeting**. Partners say that *“there was enough time to discuss all the project issues”*. Furthermore *“we got the compromise from all partners to complete the project outcomes in time”* and even *“there was an insightful discussion about the long term aims of the project and the perspectives for future cooperation”*.

There were a couple of **suggestions** coming from two questionnaires, but they focus on the same subject:

- *“It was a shame that some partner institutions were represented only by 1 person, although it is totally understandable because of the budgetary restrictions”.*
- *“We would have liked that students from other countries had attended the meeting to share their experiences with our players”.*

July 2014