



**“IN GREEN SHAPE”
EVALUATION REPORT
PADOVA KICK-OFF MEETING SEPTEMBER 23-24, 2013**

Methodology

5 questionnaires have been submitted (1 questionnaire per institution).

All the scores of each question were added and divided by the number of valid answers. The average rate is showed in the table.

To get the final score of each meeting, all the average scores have been added and divided by the total number of questions. The answers with the highest score have been highlighted with green characters, whereas the answers with the poorest score are in red.

Question	Average
<p>1. To what extent did the meeting reach your expectations?</p> <p>COMMENTS: I dare say that the expectations I had were reached. The meeting contributed to project timetable update and definition of each partner role, which is very important for the successful project implementation. We found all partners friendly and good communicators.</p>	8,6
<p>2. Evaluate the way in which information was shared during the meeting, the methods that were used e.g.: presentation; group work; discussion, practical workshop.</p> <p>COMMENTS: During the meeting presentations and slides were used by almost all partners. It was good to go through the application form to get an overview of the project. It is not clear at the moment how we could bring our local activities together to one representative product. Perhaps the ideas are growing during the meeting and the disseminations of the first local events, but there should be filed on the pedagogical background and the main aim, which should be an aim which we are following together. Maybe more work on the aims of each partner before the meeting would have helped to develop the project. A good range of methods.</p>	8,4
<p>3. Evaluate the general organisation and administration of the meeting, e.g. information sent in advance, venue, hotel accommodation etc.</p> <p>COMMENTS: I think that the meeting was ok in the organisation and management of the different moments and activities. All went very smoothly and well.</p>	8,8
<p>4. Do you believe this meeting has contributed in a substantial way to the planned progress and sustainability of the project?</p> <p>COMMENTS: The meeting was absolutely necessary to clarify the project that was written by the Spanish partner that was not selected. We the new coordinator, and the other partners needed to understand the project better but also simplify it. The event was very important for clarification of the main aspects of the project and decisions upon the activities timetable and definition of the responsibilities between each partner. It was a first step for the project in future. It will need</p>	9,00



some more considerations about the local activities of each partner and which aim every partner will follow. Also more interactive methods of management would utilize the discussions and involve the participants.	
<p>5. After this meeting, evaluate how clear it is to you the final tasks of the project.</p> <p>COMMENTS: The objectives, activities and tasks are now clear to me. The Gantt table and the summary project presentation helped in this direction. The tasks for the next two month are nearly clear, but not how to put the local activities together with the common ones. Very clear.</p>	8,8
<p>6. How do you evaluate the cooperation among partners? (commitment to the project by each partner, communication among partners, sharing roles and responsibilities and etc.).</p> <p>COMMENTS: Some partner are better involved and prepared than others. Presentations were asked from all partners even if 4 of the partners already knew each other. Unfortunately the new partner, the UK one, who was the only new partner was also the one that does not have a slide presentation. I think every partner is anxious that the project will be a success in future.</p>	9,2
	8,8

7. Could you list one (or more) item that it is still **not clear** even after the meeting?

Everything is clear. The dissemination activities as they are a new element to the project implementation. How to put the local activities together with the common ones. The local aims of each partners and the ideas of local activities.

8. What was the **strongest element** of the meeting?

Team work, effective conducting of meeting by coordinator, commitment to the project by all partners. The past knowledge of the partners (4 out of 5) allows the meeting to be managed smoothly and the atmosphere was very friendly. In this way it was also very easy to reach agreements and define tasks and activities. Good collaboration and strong partners commitment. Going through the application form. Good planning.

9. What was the **weakest point** of the meeting?

No visits were planned but only because being the first meeting we thought it was better to work on the project and try to understand it better see that none of us knew it very well. There was a lack of Nacho ☺ Specify local and international aims/ target-groups. Making something like an abstract of the ideas. Idea: Maybe more work on the aims of each partner before the meeting would have helped to develop the project.

10. What **comments/suggestions** do you have for further implementation of the project?



Partners have to be present in the communication exchanges and not disappear for months as it happened with another partner in our past project. Partners have also to respect deadlines and respecting deadlines!

Maybe there should be someone, who writes the main-points (which are not clear) down in every meeting where everybody could see it (for example on flip-chart). I think that would be very productive for the meetings and results and could be a basic for discussions.

SUMMARY:

- The highest score got aspect of **cooperation among partners**. Although it was expressed the hope (and wish) that no partner will disappear for months like in previous C.A.F.E project and everybody will respect deadlines.
- The lowest score partners gave to the way, in which **information was shared** during meeting. It was mentioned that not all partners prepared slides for the presentation of organization they represented.
- **The most unclear aspect** of the meeting is local activities of each partner, how to prepare a common product at the end of project.
- All partners were happy with organization and management of the meeting.

Prepared by Education, Research & Consultancy Center
November 2013