

Evaluation of the project process, reporting to meeting in St. Brieuc (FR), 26-27 May 2014

prepared by  **ECAP** Research & Development

EVALUATION AFTER SOFIA IV PROJECT MEETING

The evaluation of the project at the post-Sofia meeting (held on 6-8 October 2013) stage is referred to the result coming from the on-line survey and as well to the contents discussion and impact evaluation worked out from the ECAP's evaluators Furio Bednarz and Filippo Bignami during the project meetings and from the analysis of documents.

In this after-Sofia evaluation, to the usual questions proposed have been added some more items (from 11 on) based on contents and organisation of internships as agreed during the meeting.

On the on-line questionnaire have been counted 9 responses.

1

How do you evaluate the role played by the coordinator, in terms of leadership, capability of involving the partners, synthesis of results?

	Responses	Percentage
1) Poor, bad	0	0%
2) Limited	0	0%
3) Quite good	3	33.33%
4) Perfect	6	66.67%

The first question has a very positive reaction. If we consider the responses given after the previous meetings (in Malaga and Kouvola) the result is indeed better: the percentage of "perfect" is the highest.

2

How do you evaluate your contribution to the project until now?

	Responses	Percentage
1) Poor, bad, we are not so motivated	0	0%
2) Limited, we are not involved and considered enough	0	0%
3) Quite good, we feel part of a team	7	77.78%
4) Perfect: I think we play a fundamental role	2	22.22%

The second question is as well very positive considering the two previous meetings' reactions. In the two previous occasions there were answers rating limited contribution. Now all contribution are referred in the positive area.

3

How do you evaluate each partner contribution to the project until now?

	Responses	Percentage
1) Poor, bad	0	0%
2) Limited: only some partners have been active	1	11.11%
3) Quite good	5	55.56%
4) Perfect: all the partners made excellent efforts	3	33.33%

Looking at the others' contributions is measured a positive balance, with only one answer on limited contribution, but probably motivated by an effective division of tasks and roles, that not during the all project activities plan activities for all partners.

4

How do you evaluate the preparation of the meeting (information delivered, preparatory work, agenda...)?

	Responses	Percentage
1) Poor, bad	0	0%
2) Limited	0	0%
3) Quite good	3	33.33%
4) Perfect	6	66.67%

The preparation of the meeting is fully appreciated. Also the comparison with other two questionnaires is higher. This is a clear indicator of how the partnership has now reach a positive and satisfactory engagement and how the coordinator is effective and efficient in preparing the meetings.

5

How do you evaluate the balance of different activities realized during the Meeting, including work groups or other social activities?

	Responses	Percentage
1) Poor, bad	0	0%
2) Limited	0	0%
3) Quite good	5	55.56%
4) Perfect	4	44.44%

In Sofia the balance of the meeting activities is referred as wholly well planned.

6

Do you know now clearly what your organisation is expected to do next months?

	Responses	Percentage
1) Poor, bad	0	0%
2) Limited	0	0%
3) Quite good	4	44.44%
4) Perfect	5	55.56%

This question is important for contents and clear roles from each partner. During the three meeting the responses on this item was always positive, but after Sofia meeting is the best one among the meetings held. This is another confirmation of the very good arrangement of the tasks and roles planned.

7

How do you evaluate the attitude of the coordinator in order to allow all participants contribute with their own ideas and expertise to the meeting results?

	Responses	Percentage
1) Poor, bad	0	0%
2) Limited	1	11.11%
3) Quite good	2	22.22%
4) Perfect	6	66.67%

The coordinator is highly evaluated in allowing partners' idea implementation. Only one answer reports a limited attitude in this. Perhaps one partner feels to be a bit hampered in contributing and/or in make his proposal realised.

8

Did the needs and expectations, as well as doubts or questions of participants have been taken into account during the meeting?

	Responses	Percentage
1) Poor, bad	0	0%
2) Limited	1	11.11%
3) Quite good	4	44.44%
4) Perfect	4	44.44%

The sentiment on needs and expectations well treated and processed is high, also considering this after-Sofia meeting compared with the previous two. Only one partner (perhaps the same of the previous question n.7) claims a limited care for needs and expectations.

9

How do you evaluate the organisation and realisation of the Meeting (program, logistics, meals...)?

	Responses	Percentage
1) Poor, bad	0	0%
2) Limited	0	0%
3) Quite good	3	33.33%
4) Perfect	6	66.67%

The general logistic and organisational matters are judged as very positive in this like in the other two meetings.

10

Have you received during the meeting further relevant information on the project and the upcoming work? Do you have now a clearer idea of aims, deliverables, work packages of IT:BSE?

	Responses	Percentage
1) Poor, bad	0	0%
2) Limited	0	0%
3) Quite good	3	33.33%
4) Perfect	6	66.67%

The Sofia meeting is intended from the partnership as very important moment where to clear definitely ideas about deliverables, WPs and work to be done for internships in particular. The results of this item are the best out of the three meetings. Therefore all partners are now clear on this side for the work to be done from Sofia on.

11

After the Sofia meeting you agree on the three levels of competences and responsibility to plan your Country internships?

	Responses	Percentage
Totally agree	8	88.89%
Partially agree (explain in the following box where do you see the little problem)	0	0%
Mainly disagree (explain in the following box where do you see the considerable problem)	1	11.11%
Totally disagree (explain in the following box why)	0	0%

This is the first additional question. It's related to level of sharing for the three steps of competence development contained in the VQTS Matrix: operating, executive and management levels. These three competence levels seems very notable to plan in a homogenous and effectively comparable dimension the internships planned. The reactions are very positive except for one partner, that mainly disagree on this competence division. This only one negative reaction could be anyhow considered in order to understand why (if for VET system characteristics or for own organisational problems or whatever) this partner claims problems that could shed a potential risk on internships.

12

Could you list a maximum of 3 positive aspects of the Meeting (strong points)?

- organization, coordinator
- Organisation of the meeting; attitude of the coordinator; partners attitude to each other.
- Meeting and discussion with new colleagues - Exchange of work and evaluation methods - Choice has been made of the partners for students mobilities
- Meeting and discussion with new colleagues - Exchange of work and evaluation methods - Choice has been made of the partners for students mobilities
- good working atmosphere, learning from other experiences, know another country and customs
- Team work, Team spirit, Better communication
- Preparation and organisation of the meeting; the attitude of the project coordinator towards the project partners and the way they make clear the project tasks.
- Interest, activity, effective working
- good results, good climate between Project members, good organization

The positive aspects (reported as given) indicate in general a collaborative and cloudless project setting, underscoring the good organisation of the meeting, the effective role of coordinator, good team-work and also, and it's matter, good results.

13

Could you list a maximum of 3 negative aspects of the Meeting (weak points)?

- Too short time to agree on concrete details -Sometimes unclear objectives about what the groups had to do during the session -Difficulties to integrate the project as it has been running for months
- Too short time to agree on concrete details - Sometimes unclear objectives about what the groups had to do during the session
- Nothing important but the second night restaurant service was disappointing.
- Long presentations, Not everyone participate in discussions, Not visiting VET schools institutions.

- Different countries have so different curriculums. Sometimes discussion is only making things clear between countries.

The negative comments (reported as given) are mainly linked to lack of time to go more through the topics to see details in concrete. Another important comment is about differences in countries' curriculums, and this has to be attentively considered for internships in order to obtain successful experiences in term of tasks and functions performed by trainees during these sessions.