

## EVALUATION REPORT 3

### LONDON-NEWHAM Transnational Meeting 10 & 11 October 2013

			AVERAGE
<b>1. STRUCTURE, CONTENT AND DELIVERY OF THE EVENT</b>			<b>4,77</b>
1.1	Organisation of the transnational event	Evidence of clear planning	4,50
		Realistic timescales	4,33
		Appropriate selection of delegates	4,67
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	4,67
		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
<b>2. QUALITY OF THE TRANSNATIONAL ELEMENT</b>			<b>4,83</b>
2.1	Input into the event by the project partners	The extent to which each partner contributes to the event	4,67
		The evidence of partners sharing roles and responsibilities during the event	4,67
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
<b>3. QUALITY OF THE PARTNERSHIP</b>			<b>4,96</b>
3.1	Transnational Partnership	Commitment to the project by each partner	4,83
		Agreement amongst partners	5,00
		Effective communication amongst partners	5,00
		Development of trust and positive attitudes	5,00
<b>4. QUALITY OF THE DOMESTIC ARRANGEMENTS</b>			<b>4,85</b>
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	4,40
		Evidence of special requirements (dietary for example) being met	5,00
			<b>4,85</b>

## METHODOLOGY

The following questionnaires have been filled in:

Country	Number of questionnaires
Hungary	2
Poland	2
Spain	1
UK	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6</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

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

- Realistic timescales
- Quality of overnight accommodation
- Evidence of clear planning

Next are the main comments gathered in the questionnaires:

1. Partners keep on thinking that there is a **good level of cooperation** between them:
  - *“There were a perfect cooperation between partners, understanding and good atmosphere”*
  - *“I liked the way the Steering Group agreed on the way we have all dealt with the project”*
  - Even one of the students points out what he liked the most –*“cooperation with partners from other countries”*.
  
2. This was the first meeting where students from the four countries met for the first time. In this sense, **the theatre play and the recording of a song** were the most popular activities:
  - *“The theatre play was really great”*
  - *“The performance was excellent”*
  - *“I enjoyed the song recording”*
  - *“The studio of Newham College was great”*
  - *“There was a unique moment when we were singing together: the Polish guy played the guitar, Tomas the piano and Bruce the drums –it was exceptionally great”*

The visit to Newham College was also useful to appreciate the way this institution works. As someone says *“we enjoyed getting to know Newham College –how it works, who are their students...”* One of the teachers also says that the sightseeing tour with students was an enjoyable activity.

3. Even though the visit to Newham College was an accurate activity, some comments suggest that **the timescale should have been more clearly planned**. Next there are a couple of examples: *“There were moments where we felt alone and it was not clear what we were supposed to do”* or *“time gaps should have been better managed”*.
4. One of the partners reports a problem with the night shift staff at the hotel. This seems to be the reason why the item “Quality of overnight accommodation” gets a lower score.

Finally there is a suggestion which should be considered when organizing next meetings. *“The teachers could be involved during the Steering Group meeting, especially when discussing about the scripts and the handbook”*.

December 2013