

## EVALUATION REPORT 4

### LODZ Transnational Meeting 24 & 25 February 2014

			AVERAGE
<b>1. STRUCTURE, CONTENT AND DELIVERY OF THE EVENT</b>			<b>4,74</b>
1.1	Organisation of the transnational event	Evidence of clear planning	4,71
		Realistic timescales	4,57
		Appropriate selection of delegates	4,86
1.2	Effectiveness of content and appropriate range and balance of activities	Appropriate content, clearly related to the aims and objectives of the event	4,67
		Relevant mixture of activities e.g. icebreaking activities, didactic sessions, workshops, social activities, free time	4,57
		Appropriateness of the social programme	4,71
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	4,86
		Evidence of on-going assistance to participants, if appropriate	4,83
1.4	The quality of project management	Clarity of project coordination	4,83
		Quality of the management of monitoring and evaluation by the project coordinator and introduced to administrative staff	4,83
		The project partners are made aware of the administrative structure of the project	4,71
<b>2. QUALITY OF THE TRANSNATIONAL ELEMENT</b>			<b>4,75</b>
2.1	Input into the event by the project partners	The extent to which each partner contributes to the event	4,86
		The evidence of partners sharing roles and responsibilities during the event	4,86
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	4,57
		Clear evidence in the event programme of real synergy with the overall objectives of the project	4,71
<b>3. QUALITY OF THE PARTNERSHIP</b>			<b>4,67</b>
3.1	Transnational Partnership	Commitment to the project by each partner	4,67
		Agreement amongst partners	4,67
		Effective communication amongst partners	4,67
		Development of trust and positive attitudes	4,67
<b>4. QUALITY OF THE DOMESTIC ARRANGEMENTS</b>			<b>4,83</b>
4.1	Quality and appropriateness of the domestic arrangements and the comfort factor	Attention to practical details and catering	4,83
		Suitability of the working venue	4,83
		Quality of overnight accommodation, if appropriate	4,83
		Evidence of special requirements (dietary for example) being met	4,83
			<b>4,75</b>

## METHODOLOGY

The following questionnaires have been filled in:

Country	Number of questionnaires
Hungary	2
Poland	1
Spain	1
UK	3
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>7</b>

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

Next there is a list of the items with the best scores:

- Appropriate selection of delegates
- Quality of the mechanism for evaluation both short term and long term including follow-up activities, if appropriate
- The extent to which each partner contributes to the event
- The evidence of partners sharing roles and responsibilities during the event

On the other hand, the following items got the lowest scores:

- Realistic timescales
- Relevant mixture of activities e.g. icebreaking activities, didactic sessions, workshops, social activities, free time
- Mutual understanding amongst partners about the project and event rationale and the short term and long term objectives of the event

During this meeting there was a combination of workshops and activities for students and staff and also the coordination activities of the steering group. Questionnaires have been filled in by members of the steering group and also by some students. In general terms, scores given by students are slightly lower than those given by staff. This is the main reason why the final score –a brilliant 4,75 out of 5- is not as high as it used to be in previous events.

These are the comments got from the questionnaires:

1. The **dance workshop** and the **theatre performance** were the 2 activities that participants enjoyed the most. The atmosphere was good and this made easier the success of both initiatives:
  - *“We loved the dance workshop and we learnt dancing, improvisation and relaxation techniques”*
  - *“I liked practicing ballet”*
  - *“I liked the dance teachers and also the warming up”*
  - *“The performance was interesting to see”*
  - *“I enjoyed drama improvisation with others”*
  - *“All the students were able to do joint workshops”*
  - *“Everybody was trustworthy enough with each other while taking part in the exercises”*

2. The **meeting of the steering group** was also one of the best rated parts of the event. Partners believe that it is easy to reach agreements:

- *“It is a pleasure to work with such competent and agreeable partners”*
- *“I can’t imagine a better working partnership: there is very good understanding and smooth communication. It was very easy to agree on all important points”*
- *“The communication amongst the partners is excellent and all of them are 100% about sustaining the programme”.*

Although communication is good there is a comment that suggests that the commitment to the project by each partner is not equal. This would explain that the item “Mutual understanding amongst partners about the project” gets a poorer rating. Nevertheless, there are other connected items such as “The extent to which each partner contributes to the event” or “The evidence of partners sharing roles and responsibilities during the event” which got the highest scores. Evaluation shows contradictory statements at this point.

3. The items “**Realistic timescales**” and “**Relevant mixture of activities**” got also lower scores. However there is no one quote that can justify this rating. Moreover the opinion expressed by the partners show that they were happy with both aspects: *“The timetable was very good, there was time for working, socializing and resting equally”.*

4. All the opinions about **domestic arrangements** were good. Partners liked the hotel, the catering and there is a special mention about the vegetarian menu. They were grateful for this.

5. Students remarked that the **cultural exchange** during the meeting was a positive aspect. One of them demands *“knowing more about the culture”* and realised that need *“much more studying about languages”*. And there is a couple of suggestions which demand more interaction during the meetings:

- *“It would be good if there were more direct programmes for the students to get to know each other”*
- *“There should be more contact between actors and visitors”.*

April 2014