

EVALUATION REPORT 2

BUDAPEST Transnational Meeting 21 & 22 March 2013

			AVERAGE
1. STRUCTURE, CONTENT AND DELIVERY OF THE EVENT			4,97
1.1	Organisation of the transnational event	Evidence of clear planning	5,00
		Realistic timescales	5,00
		Appropriate selection of delegates	5,00
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	4,67
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			4,83
2.1	Input into the event by the project partners	The extent to which each partner contributes to the event	4,83
		The evidence of partners sharing roles and responsibilities during the event	4,83
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	4,67
		Clear evidence in the event programme of real synergy with the overall objectives of the project	5,00
3. QUALITY OF THE PARTNERSHIP			5,00
3.1	Transnational Partnership	Commitment to the project by each partner	5,00
		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			4,92
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	5,00
		Evidence of special requirements (dietary for example) being met	5,00
			4,93

METHODOLOGY

The following questionnaires have been filled in:

Country	Number of questionnaires
Hungary	1
Poland	2
Spain	2
UK	1
TOTAL	6

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

Most of the items got the highest scores. The lowest ones were achieved by the following items:

- Appropriateness of the social programme
- Mutual understanding amongst partners about the project and event rationale and the short term and long term objectives of the event

More information comes from the comments made by the partners:

1. All partners agree that there was a **very good understanding among all** during the meeting. This especially applies to the members of the steering group:
 - *“The steering group ‘gel’ very well together”.*
 - *“The steering group meeting on day 2 was very effective and there was very good cooperation”.*
 - *“Very clear objectives were agreed at the meeting”*
 - *“Communication was great and it was easy to agree all issues”*
 - *“There was a good atmosphere and also very good communication”.*

2. **Teachers and trainers** met for the first time, so the meeting was a great opportunity to **better know each other and set up the basis for future cooperation**. It was a good starting point for the staff involved in running the project, as the following quotes show:
 - *“Teachers and trainers set up the basis for future cooperation”*
 - *“The meeting allowed teachers to know each other. Different points of view arose when talking about the scripts and the best practices. This little controversy enriched the debate”*
 - *“What I liked the most was the interaction with all teachers and steering group members”.*

3. The site visits were also mentioned by the partners. The **drum session** was really successful and it was considered a good ice-breaking activity, as playing music is good to overcome language barriers. *“It enhanced integration and created a good atmosphere”*. On the other hand the **psychodrama workshop** was not so well assessed. Some partners think that *“it is a good method of therapy but it made no sense to try it on the project managers. Besides time schedule was too short”*.

4. The meeting was **well organized**, hotel and working venues got really good scores and *plenty of time was given for each subject to be discussed*. Just one person demands more free time for a rest between the end of the working time and the dinner.

There is final comment to be highlighted, because it shows the contribution of these partnerships to lifelong learning. *“I have been working for years in training projects, but Rogers Foundation showed us a methodology that is brand new for me. Flexibility and adaptability to the students’ needs are the key points of their daily activities”*.

May 2013