



NMD-PRO General Evaluation Report of the Project

Craiova, Romania, July 2013

Evaluation activities were coordinated by the University of Craiova with the participation of all partners, mostly choosing instruments that made internal perspectives of the people involved visible at once, so that results could be used immediately for further work. Some instruments were based on reflection and feedback.

PURPOSE AND GOALS OF THE EVALUATION

We believed that evaluation is a valid form of quality assurance and quality development of the project. By these means we hoped to optimize the progress of the project. We also have to account towards the EU-commission

EVALUATION FIELDS

1. Quality of the project plan
2. Quality of implementation plan
3. Learning process of project partners in project meetings
4. Quality of products

Quality Criteria

1. Quality of the project plan

- The project plan answers a need in European adult education.
- The project plan contains clear goals and concrete objectives.
- The project plan is accepted by all partners.
- The project plan can be implemented well in the partner institutions.

2. Quality of the partners' cooperation as a team

- Partners communicate well in a multi-national context.
- Partners communicate well in the time between the meetings
- Partners are willing to share their expertise and learn from each other.
- Partners understand the common goal and their tasks and contribute accordingly.
- Partners learn with regard to group process.
- Organisation is adequate for productive work.

3. Quality of the implementation in partners' institutions

- Partners are able to communicate the idea of the project well and win the support of their institution.
- Partner institutions benefit from the project
- Partner institutions produce the expected outcome

5. Quality of the project products

- All the products promised in the project plan exist.
- The products are useful in a European LLL - context
- The products are sustainable
- The products support the idea of adult learning



Lifelong Learning Programme

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication [communication] reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

What did the evaluation focus on, how was evidence collected, who was asked?

The evaluation activities were mainly carried out during the partner meetings, but the partners were also asked to write down reflections in the time between whilst filling in their timesheets, and for a common reflection at the end.

There were interviews with the participants at the end of the project, and partner reflections on impact of the project within the organisation.

Overview of Evidence Collected			
Information	Focus	Instrument for collecting evidence	When
1. Project plan			
Partners	Acceptance of the project plan	Reflective talk based on Continuum Interviews	End of each project meeting
2. Process of cooperation			
Partners	Learning of the group and organisation of meeting	Meeting Evaluation form	All Meetings
Partners	Implementation of the project, monitoring work	Timesheets + reflection column	Before interim report and final report
Partners	Impact on their own institution	Memo	June. 2013
3. Products			
a) Training events - workshops			
Partners	Quality of work of the partners	- Feedback	End of each training event
Participants	Satisfaction with process and product	- Feedback (continuum)	During and at the end of each training event
b) Project booklet			
Participants	- satisfaction	- Systemic representation	End of final meeting
c) Manual, tools, website			
NMD-PRO Gudebook for parents/patients	- project approach and material	- Report/feedback of participants	June, 2013
Participants Final Meeting	- Quality of the NMD-PRO products - professional usefulness	- Questionnaire	End of meeting, June 22, 2013
Partners	Satisfaction with products	Reflective talk	End of project, July 2013



Findings

1. Quality of the project plan

The project plan answers a need in European adult education.

As pointed out in the interim report the results of the research presented in the first project meeting, as well as the needs analysis by participants in Romania, clearly show that there is a need for this kind of training in adult education.

The project plan contains clear goals and objectives and is accepted by all partners

Already at the end of the first partner meeting all the participants showed a very high acceptance of the project plan.

The project plan can be implemented well in the partner institutions

Even though after the first meeting there was high acceptance of the plan, the reflections during the project life showed some difficulties with implementing the project at home. In all cases communicating the idea and vision of the project to the people in the institutions seemed difficult. So it was necessary to undergo a process of sharing the new idea while at the same time starting work on it.

At the end of the project the last partners reflections shows that the project plan was well implemented in most partner institutions. In all of them there was a responsible person who made sure that the tasks were done.

2. Quality of the partners' cooperation as a team

Partners communicated well in a multi-national context

Four of the partners have to communicate in a foreign language. That always presents a problem, but for some more than others. In one meeting two partners mentioned difficulties in contributing due to the language problem.

In addition, it is a multi-national context and the project idea is new to some of the partners and some have different experiences. So it was not easy to achieve a common approach on the main topics, but all the partners worked on that problem since the very first meeting.

The results of the partner last meeting in Craiova show that 80 % of the participants were very satisfied with the communication and 20 % less satisfied but nobody seems to be really unhappy.

The meetings were very productive and more and more a common approach on the main topic became visible. Some communication problems due to language stayed to the end.

Partners communicated well in the time between the meetings

Most of the communication takes place per e-mail and some phone-calls. In addition a yahoo group was established at the start of the project. Judging from the number of e-mails and their time-line there is little communication between the meetings apart from the preparatory work before/after the meetings. In general you can say tasks and papers are sent very much last minute.

Summing up you can say there seem to be some deficiencies in communication between the meetings but partners are reliable and flexible and they mobilise while facing tasks.

Partners were willing to share their expertise and learn from each other

From the very beginning the meetings were organised in a way that all partners had the possibility to show their expertise. Most people took the chance and were open and willing to share.

Some partners prepared different material for the others or prepared suggestions for the programme and workshops, prepared local training days/seminars/workshops, gave advice or supported the monitoring of members institutions etc.

There was sharing of reflections on the working process and exchange about the experiences of the others.

Concluding we can say that partners were very willing to learn from each other and to share expertise and the project facilitated learning.

Partners understand the common goal and their tasks and contribute accordingly

In the first part of the project evidence suggests that all partners understood their tasks and contributed accordingly. In the second part of the project a survey shows that 80 % of the partners believe that most partners do so but not all of them. At the end of the project all partners achieved their expected outcome. That can be taken as proof that they understood the common goal and their tasks and contributed accordingly.

3. Quality of the implementation in partners' institutions

Partners are able to communicate the idea of the project well, win the support of their institution and implement the project

It can be said that most partners were able to communicate the idea of the project in their own institutions.

Partners' institutions benefit from the project

All partner institutions point out that they learned a lot and profited on different levels by participating in the project.

Apparently there were similar benefits in all partner institutions.

In the last partner reflection most partners mention satisfaction with the learning in their own institutions, they use words like "rich, fruitful, successful". New processes were started, good teamwork took place. Some learned about the content, others about their organisation, one mentioned that there was a lot of change, but some people in the institution did not accept the information offered.

Partner institutions produce the expected outcome

The NMD-PRO website, the Partners' websites, EST database show that all partners worked at producing the expected outcome so that the products are available in partner languages, and on the website all partner countries are represented.

4. Quality of the products

All the products promised in the project plan exist.

As mentioned above everyone fulfilled almost all their tasks and so the products exist according to the project plan.

The products are sustainable

Most **members and project participants** suggest that the NMD-PRO-approach will survive the end of the project.

The **website** remains online and can be used even world wide after the project end. As there are contact addresses people have the possibility to ask for advice or even trainings later on as well.

The Project Booklet and The NMD-PRO Guidebook are available as **booklets** in English and on the websites in partner languages. So guidelines, support, practical tools and examples from practice in the field are accessible to everyone.

Craiova, July 30th, 2013

Dr. Eugenia Rosulescu, Dr. Mihaela Zavaleanu

University of Craiova

Faculty of Physical Education and Sports

Department of Physical therapy and Sports Medicine

Attachment: Instruments

1. Partner Meeting Evaluation Form

Partners received a questionnaire to fill in after the each project meeting; partners scored and comment the following aspects: expectations on the meeting, well prepared agenda in advance and possibility to comment it, documentation and supporting material used during the project meeting, communication among the partners, activity, organizational aspects (venue, timing etc.) and further steps in the project, where 5=excellent, 4=very good, 3=satisfactory, 2=not too bad, 1=bad.

If you give 1 or 2, please explain why and if it is possible give an advice, using the remark lines!

Evaluation Form
of the
----- PARTNERSHIP MEETING
_____, _____, _____

Place _____ Date _____
Institution _____

1. Meeting general evaluation questionnaire

Meeting general evaluation (by partners)				
Evaluated aspects/meeting	4	3	2	1
Meeting took place at the agreed times and locations.				
Meeting follow an agreed agenda circulated beforehand.				
The supporting documentation used during the meeting was:				
All partners are given the opportunity to contribute to the meeting.				
Meeting encouraged open and clear communication.				
Meeting encouraged everyone to contribute to discussion.				
Meeting supported the less experienced and make everyone feel valued.				
Meeting discouraged strong or opinionated individuals from dominating discussion.				
Further steps in the project are clear.				
The objectives of the meeting are achieved.				
To what extent did the meeting reach your expectation				
Personal remarks, if any: 				

4=excellent, 3=good, 2=satisfactory, 1=bad



2. Evaluation of structure, content and delivery of the event

Structure, content and delivery of the event						
No.	Themes		4	3	2	1
1.	Organisation of the transnational event	Evidence of clear planning				
		Realistic timescales				
		Appropriate selection of delegates				
2.	Effectiveness of content and appropriate range and balance of activities	Appropriate content, clearly related to the aims and objectives of the event				
		Relevant mixture of activities e.g. icebreaking activities, workshops, social activities, free time				
		Appropriateness of the social programme				
3.	Effectiveness of the process of monitoring and evaluation	Quality of the mechanism for evaluation both short term and long term				
		Evidence of on-going assistance to participants, if appropriate				
4.	The quality of project management	Clarity of project coordination				
		Quality of the management of monitoring and evaluation by the project coordinator and introduced to administrative staff				
		The project partners are made aware of the administrative structure of the project				
Personal remarks about the theme:						

4=excellent, 3=good, 2=satisfactory, 1=bad

3. Evaluation of the Quality of the trans-national element

Quality of the trans-national element						
No.	Themes		4	3	2	1
1.	Input into the event by the project partners	The extent to which each partner contributes to the event				
		The evidence of partners sharing roles and responsibilities during the event				
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				
		Clear evidence in the event programme of real synergy with the overall objectives of the project				
Personal remarks about the theme:						



4=excellent, 3=good, 2=satisfactory, 1=bad

4. Evaluation of the Quality of the Domestic arrangements

Quality of the Domestic arrangements						
No.	Themes		4	3	2	1
1.	Quality and appropriateness of the domestic arrangements and the comfort factor	Attention to practical details and catering				
		Suitability of the working venue				
		Quality of overnight accommodation				
		Evidence of special requirements (dietary for example) being met				
Personal remarks about the theme:						

4=excellent, 3=good, 2=satisfactory, 1=bad

5. Evaluation of the Quality of the Partnership

Quality of the Partnership						
No.	Themes		4	3	2	1
1.	Transnational Partnership	Commitment to the project by each partner				
		Agreement amongst partners				
		Effective communication amongst partners				
		Development of trust and positive attitudes				
Personal remarks about the theme:						

6. Evaluation of the Partnership achieved results

Every partner should fill the table according to its general satisfaction with the project outputs till now, where is a scale 1=not satisfied at all, 2=lowly satisfied, 3=moderately satisfied, 4=quite satisfied, 5=very satisfied

Satisfaction with the project outputs (by partners)					
Outputs	5	4	3	2	1
NMD-PRO Yahoo Group					
Best practices					
Workshop					
Project Logo					
Website www.nmd-pro.ro					
Evaluation Plan					



Lifelong Learning Programme

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication [communication] reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Dissemination and Exploitation Plan					
NMD-PRO Poster/Leaflet					
Personal remarks:					

2. Implementation in partners' institutions

Memo on Quality of Implementation in our own Institutions

Craiova, June 20, 2013

Dear colleagues,

In our evaluation concept we also decided to take a look at our own institutions and how they were affected by the project. We ask you to find evidence for changes and write a memo on that.

Please submit your memo by end of June.

Yours,
Eugenia

We propose the question:

What are the benefits of the NMD-PRO project for our institution?

3. Interview Guidelines for partner institutions

Dear colleagues,

One part of the evaluation of the project focuses on the **quality of cooperation** with our partner institutions. As we discussed at the 1st Project Meeting we will find out about this by carrying out interviews with the participants. We are providing the following interview questions which cover only the most important items of cooperation. Please feel free to add questions you are personally interested in.

We ask you to sum up the results of the interviews in a memo and forward this memo to us by the end of June.

Yours,
Eugenia

Questions:

- What was the benefit of participating in the project for you/your institution?

- Have we been able to communicate the idea of the project clearly? Beginning situation, Craiova 1st meeting, monitoring ... workshops/conference trainings...consultancy...?

- Were you satisfied with the information flow between “us” and other institution? Did you feel well informed about the needs of the project?

- When things were unclear or difficult in the process, did you get the necessary support and advice?

- Do you feel you got the necessary know-how to do what you were supposed to do within the project?

4. Evaluation of Workshop, Questionnaire:

Dear participant in the NMD-PRO Grundtvig ___ workshop/conference/seminar,
we are interested in your opinion on the quality of what you have heard and seen today. You will help us form a data-based opinion by answering our questions.
Thank you very much.

1. The content of the conference/workshop/seminar was for me:

very good	good	satisfactory	poor

2. The NMD-PRO material presented today was for me:

very useful	useful	not really useful	not useful

3. Professionally this day was for me:

very good	good	satisfactory	poor

4. What I would like to tell you:
