



**"IN GREEN SHAPE"
EVALUATION REPORT
KLAIPĖDA MEETING JULY 14-15, 2014**

Methodology

10 questionnaires have been submitted by steering committee members and learners.

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: The Lithuanian partner managed a very good meeting. They showed best practice examples to all other partners and learners, so all could get an insight into their future ideas of their itinerary. The presentations of the state of the project from each organisation where very helpful to document the project progress.</p> <p>It will be interesting to get more information about the organisation ERCC.</p> <p>Good organization, never boring.</p> <p>The meeting was very well organised and prepared.</p> <p>It met all of my expectations and clarified outcomes.</p> <p>I understood everything about the project and I was informed about everything.</p>	<p>9,0</p>
<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: The project meeting was a very practical one. All partners started with the theoretical input of the state of the project for their organisation. After that we got a lot of insides into the ideas from the Lithuanian partner through visiting best practices. The steering committee meeting on the second day was good to discuss fundamental ideas for the common product.</p> <p>The presentations were informative and interesting. I also liked the discussion about the design of the map.</p> <p>Information was shared in a very clear way.</p> <p>The work methodology had already been used in the previous meetings so everything was effective.</p> <p>Excellent sharing of information through presentations, debate and sharing knowledge.</p> <p>There were very good presentations via power point, use of maps and brochures.</p> <p>Interesting and useful examples of best practises were held in Baniuliu farmstead and Tikusiene ecological farm.</p> <p>I liked practical part of meeting the most, i.e. observing best practice examples.</p> <p>The most useful and interesting method -practical workshops in best practice places (for instance, herbal tourism in Zofija Tikusiene ecological farm).</p>	<p>8,8</p>
<p>3. Evaluate the general organisation and administration of the meeting, e.g.</p>	<p>8,75</p>



<p>information sent in advance, venue, hotel accommodation etc.</p> <p>COMMENTS: The Lithuanian partner was very anxious to manage the meeting in Klaipeda. They managed to provide a successful meeting for all partners (excluded Bulgaria - they were not there). They did a really good job! It would have been nice to get more information about all the places we visited during the meeting. I missed the guidance in that way. Will all the places be in the Lithuanian Itinerary? What was the background idea why we visited exactly these ones? Some more information had to be sent regarding the location of restaurant and if partners were taken back to the hotel or not before dinner. All very good with no problems. All information clear. Very well organised, a great meeting!</p>	
<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 contributed to go further in the project progress. The Lithuanian partner managed made the meeting in Klaipeda productive for all partners. Many things we saw and try that should be the way of the progress for a more healthy future We visited for the Lithuanian best practices and this was very important to understand their territories and realities. Yes with open, honest and flexible approach to achieving our outcomes. It confirmed all partner tasks and made sure we had deadlines and targets.</p>	8,6
<p>5. After this meeting, evaluate how clear it is to you the final tasks of the project.</p> <p>COMMENTS: All partners work very well together. Sometimes discussions need to be deeper - so that every partner knows what to do, what to send, how to work on,... It is sometimes not clear enough what future expectations of everybody are. Probably it could be managed better in future, when we would prepare something like a to-do-list. <i>Example: For the final brochure we have to: -send our own draft of the map in jpg to the English partner, - collect information about all points of itinerary, -create a version as example for all other partners etc.</i> As well thoughts would should the presentation of each partner in the next meeting be like? What is our common aim in the period from one meeting to the next one? What would be helpful for the project progress? All very clear with agreed timescales. Very clear and all partners know what to do.</p>	8,1
<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: The cooperation between all partners except Bulgaria is very good. Every organisation seems to be motivated for future activities.</p>	8,5



<p>Very good cooperation and communication with everyone at the meeting. The cooperation is very good. Still really missing the presence of the Bulgarian partner. This makes the project difficult to develop. Cooperation was excellent. Those partners present cooperated well, however no cooperation from Oscar! All partners were friendly and cooperation between partners run smoothly, except the situation of the Bulgarian partner. Very friendly partners.</p>	
	8,63

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

-It does not seem to be clear for every organisation what to do on local basis.

-It is not clear how we should involve unemployed people now

-It is not clear how to arrange workshops to help unemployed people to integrate in employment market (and how one workshop should help with that).

Everything is clear (2).

What Oscar is going to do?

Itinerary maps. The final product of the project.

The design of itineraries. The dissemination of final product. The role of learners in the project.

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

The strongest element was the steering committee meeting, because it was possible to get a more clear conception what the common product should be look like and what everybody has to do.

Meeting and discussion with partners. Amber drops.

The first day of the meeting was very beautiful for the great cooperation between every person of every role (project managers and trainers)

Visits. Communication. Honesty and clear communications between partners.

All the partners did their tasks.

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

Bulgarian partner was did not attend the meeting. It was not possible to get to know them and to get to know how they would like to go on with the project. To say goodbye to everybody.

The herbal tourism homestead . The manager has good knowledge and aims but in practice she is not doing something very efficient !

Missing partner. The absence of Bulgarian partner.

How it will look like the final product of the project.

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

It would be interesting to learn more about the other organisations.

If possible plan the days with less appointments.

Just keep up the excellent partnership working.

During 2nd year of project implementation partners should give more attention to local/international workshops for adults, according to initial application partners have to compare local experiences on sustainable tourism services.



SUMMARY:

- All partners said that meeting fully reached their expectations and this aspect of the meeting got the highest score.
- The honest and smooth communication among partners and commitment of them to the project - other positive aspect of the meeting and partnership.
- The meeting was a practical one. Partners wrote that best practices gave them ideas about Lithuanian reality, the state of the project and touristic routes of Lithuanian partner.
- The theoretical part of the meeting also was useful, especially the presentations about the state of the art of project. But still there are some unclear things, especially about final product of the project - touristic itineraries and their maps (particularly the design of maps).
- Other not clear thing is the role of learners and how to involve unemployed people into the project. What partners should do on a local basis?
- It was expressed the opinion that steering committee discussions (and/or other debates) should be a deeper with to-do-list at the end. Also it would be great to set up a common aim for the period till next meeting.
- Partners should give more attention to local/international workshops for adults, according to initial application partners have to compare local experiences on sustainable tourism services.
- It is not good situation with Bulgarian organization, which didn't attend the second meeting in a row.

Prepared by Education, Research & Consultancy Center
September 2014