



**"IN GREEN SHAPE"  
EVALUATION REPORT  
RETZHOF MEETING FEBRUARY 27-28, 2014**

**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 <b>expectations</b>?</p> <p>COMMENTS: This was my first meeting, so my expectations were not so high. I got a lot of information about the project and it was really nice to meet the partners. It exceeded our expectations- we enjoyed learning about Retzhof and found the innovation shown by the Nordic Walking Trails very good and something we can use as good practice when we are training in rural tourism. I think that Carina has developed a very good meeting. The meeting was good and time enough to organise everything. Yet the absence of the Bulgaria partner was a negative aspect of the meeting. It exceeded our expectations- we were really inspired by the atmosphere and environment at Retzhof and found the innovation shown by the Nordic Walking Trails very thought provoking. Meeting reached my expectations completely.</p>	<p><b>9,1</b></p>
<p>2. Evaluate the <b>way</b> in which <b>information</b> was <b>shared</b> during the meeting, the <b>methods</b> that were <b>used</b> e.g.: presentation; group work; discussion, practical workshop.</p> <p>COMMENTS: The presentations on Thursday were informative and interesting. Partners were diverse in their approach. This is good as it means more ideas and examples. The organisation was good yet some things were not very clear as well as the reasons of the visits that were understood only after. Every partner had something different to share and had a different approach/theme to their work which is great because it will give us a good variety of best practices to share.</p>	<p><b>8,6</b></p>
<p>3. Evaluate the <b>general organisation and administration</b> of the meeting, e.g. information sent in advance, venue, hotel accommodation etc.</p> <p>COMMENTS: excellent organisation - thanks to Carina! Very well organised. There was a misunderstanding in the menus and some oversights in the costs. Very well organised and a warm welcome. We were surprised at how much more communicative participants were after the vineyard tour, which made us think it might have been a good idea to incorporate an ice breaking activity at the beginning of Day 1 to allow people to get to know each other. This is something we have</p>	<p><b>9,3</b></p>



<p>learned through this visit and will be doing this with future groups visiting UK. Everything was perfect. Accommodation: we lived in a calm and lovely place, not in the center of the big town, but in countryside, where we could find how “real people” live. Cultural program was perfect too, restaurant in Graz wonderful, best practice place inspirational. Organization and meeting hosts of meeting very kind and helpful.</p>	
<p>4. Do you believe this meeting has <b>contributed</b> in a substantial way to the planned <b>progress and sustainability</b> of the project?</p> <p>COMMENTS: Yes- we feel much clearer about the aims and the dissemination activities. Of course ...every detail was in the right way with the project. We think that the meeting was productive yet we hope that partners do not disappear until the next meeting now.</p> <p>Comments: Everything at the moment is more than in time. We also already collected ideas for the end-product of the project. I think the discussions in the steering-committee and also the presentation of Nordic Walking Vinotour got as a step further in our project.</p> <p>Yes- we feel much clearer about the aims and the dissemination, Good progress was made on our end product, and we have been in contact with a graphic designer to see how practical it is and to get an indication of cost.</p>	<p><b>9,1</b></p>
<p>5. After this meeting, evaluate how clear it is to you <b>the final tasks of the project</b>.</p> <p>COMMENTS: I think it is getting more and more clear what the project should bring and how to disseminate it.</p> <p>The final tasks of the project became clear after this meeting.</p>	<p><b>8,55</b></p>
<p>6. How do you evaluate <b>the cooperation among partners?</b> (commitment to the project by each partner, communication among partners, sharing roles and responsibilities and etc.).</p> <p>COMMENTS: We are very busy and are conscious that sometime we don't reply as quickly as we should. But we are very committed to the project and it fits in with the training activities we offer on rural tourism.</p> <p>The cooperation is quite good among partners. There must be a more active presence between meetings from UK and it was really a no sense that Bulgaria was not at the meeting since they have known for a long time that the project manager would have been in a maternity leave and they have not taken care of it.</p> <p>I think the roles and responsibilities were shared fairly.</p> <p>We are conscious that everyone is very busy and juggling a lot of roles- (we certainly are!). It was disappointing that the Bulgarian partner could not be there, but it is always difficult when there are staff changes.</p> <p>We apologise if we are sometimes slow to respond- it isn't because we aren't committed or interested- we sometimes go for a few days when we aren't at our desks because we are teaching.</p> <p>Partners are on the right way to make project successful.</p>	<p><b>8,55</b></p>
	<p><b>8,87</b></p>



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

How the printed version of all 5 itineraries will be used- who is the intended audience? (2).

So far I think that the "only" things to understand are the format of the itineraries and how to draw the maps.

No... I think that everything was clear enough.

The end-product: How should we disseminate the routes from abroad in our country? Why do we think that somebody from Bulgaria wants to go to Italy or England to do our developed routes?

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

The presentations of the partners. Presentation in Slovenia - Nordic Walking VINOTOUR. Seeing innovative practice in Slovenia (2). I think it was the visit to the roman cave...I appreciated the guide and the history about this place.

The visits were very effective.

I liked very much the visit to the Slovenian's wine producers. I think it's a good way to live nature, food and job.

I think there were a lot of ice-breakers (presentation Vinotour, together in Graz,...). The group is not like a normal working group anymore. It feels like everybody got to know everybody more and more. There is a good climate between the partners.

Very useful element was the best practice in Slovenia.

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

To say goodbye to everybody.

Not really getting to know the participants until the end (2).

Also if the place where we stayed was very beautiful and comfortable, I think it was too far from the city so without possibility to go out walking.

The absence of Bulgaria.

There was not the possibility to go out alone cause the distance between the castle and other places.

It was not clear enough which presentation every partner should bring along or rather which expectations the second meeting has from the organisations (for the steering-committee).

It's a pity that partners from Bulgaria did not come.

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

We are happy with the projects progress and outcomes (2).

I think there should be more homogeneous projects from each countries...it seemed that not every country had developed the project enough.

Just suggest to give a little free time before leaving the hotel when you know that you are not going back for dinner. It is quite exhausting.

More uniformity between the projects by each country.

#### **SUMMARY:**

- All partners said that meeting fully reached their expectations.
- Participants are happy with project progress after Retzhof meeting, but still they listed some **unclear things**: how the printed version of all 5 itineraries will be used- who is the intended audience, the format of the itineraries and how to draw the maps, how should we disseminate the routes from abroad in our country, why do we think that somebody from Bulgaria wants to go to Italy or England to do our developed routes?



Education, Research  
& Consultancy Center  
Švietimo, tyrimų ir konsultacijų centras



- Absolute majority of participants liked the best practice example in Slovenia - Nordic Walking Trail VINOTOUR. It gave for partners various ideas for future activities in their organizations as well as in the frame of IN GREEN SHAPE project.
- Regarding accommodation participants split up into 2 groups: some of them complained that although Retzhof castle is very lovely place, but there were no possibility to go to the city, shops, because Retzhof is located far away from town. On contrary, other partners loved to live in countryside, not in the city.
- The most negative aspect of the meeting was the absence of Bulgarian partner.
- Participants came to the meeting should to know better each other. The idea - to incorporate an ice breaking activity at the beginning of first day of meeting to allow people to get to know each other.

Prepared by Education, Research & Consultancy Center  
March 2014