

EVALUATION REPORT 1

SAN ANDRÉS DEL RABANEDO Transnational Meeting 29 & 30 November 2012

			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	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	4,80
		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			5,00
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	5,00
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			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			4,80
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	4,80
		Quality of overnight accommodation, if appropriate	4,40
		Evidence of special requirements (dietary for example) being met	5,00
			4,95

METHODOLOGY

The following questionnaires have been filled in:

Country	Number of questionnaires
Hungary	2
Poland	1
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

All the items got the highest scores, except the following ones:

- Relevant mixture of activities e.g. icebreaking activities, didactic sessions, workshops, social activities, free time
- Suitability of the working venue
- Quality of overnight accommodation

More information comes from the comments made by the partners:

1. Partners felt that the **atmosphere during the first meeting was really amicable**. This fact made communication easier and, consequently, contributed to the success of the event. These are some extracts taken from the questionnaires:
 - *“There was a relaxed atmosphere and a workable agenda. The programme content and delivery has been well constructed. All partners were very amicable and able to discuss any issues in a professional manner”.*
 - *“The atmosphere during the meeting was nice and positive”.*
 - *“I want to highlight the social aspects of the meeting; there was a great mixture of humour and welcoming attitude and everybody did their best to create a good partnership”.*
 - *“The attitude of the hosts really helped to break the ice and create a good atmosphere. All the partners seem to be easy to work with”.*

2. **Members of the partnership reached important agreements** during the meeting and this was considered a good starting point for the project itself. Participants believe that the communication was effective and there were not misunderstandings. Next there are some quotes which reinforce this idea:
 - *“The structure of the project became really clear to me; I know which are my tasks and the other partners’ tasks. Deadlines were also agreed”.*
 - *“The roles of the partners have been clearly defined and each partner clearly showed they all understand the objectives of the project”.*

- *“The group worked well together and openly discussed any minor problems”.*
 - *“The hosting partner made a great effort to explain the details of the project and to meet the partners’ needs”.*
3. The **working venue and the accommodation** got lower scores. The reasons also appear in the questionnaires. It was a bit cold in the meeting room and the lighting of the hotel room was not suitable to do work.

Finally one of the participants **suggests** that the partnership should try to *get a deeper insight into the way each institution integrates this project in their daily activities*. And also that to ensure the quality of the project delegates have to *overcome language barriers and become assertive*.

December 2012