LOAC - Template, evaluation of first meeting, Version 1

Evaluation of the First Partner Meeting, 14 – 16 December 2009 in Copenhagen

The evaluation is focussed on the following performance indicators

Evaluation scale

1 = *unsatisfactory* - major weaknesses
2 = *fair* - some important weaknesses
3 = *good* - strengths outweigh weaknesses
4 = *very good* - major strengths

Background information	
My name	
My organisation	
My position in the project team	
Date of filling out this evaluation questionnaire	

1. Preparation of the partner meeting	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**
1.1 Preparation of the content of the agenda	poor	fair	good	very good
Evidence of clear planning and realistic timescales of the meeting				
Was the work load prior to the meeting acceptable?				
Appropriate division of tasks among the partnership at the meeting				
1.2 Preparation of practical issues	poor	fair	good	very good
Appropriate prior travel and accommodation information issued to participants				
Appropriate information on accommodation and course venue				
Appropriate prior information on other practical questions issued to participants				
1.3 Information on tasks and materials before the meeting	poor	fair	good	very good
Sufficient information on the content and objectives of the meeting				
Sufficient information of the tasks you should deliver before the meeting?				
Relevance and quality of materials issued before the meeting				
Possible comments to the preparation of the meeting				
Mention 1-3 points of weaknesses:				
Mention 1-3 points of strengths:				
Mention 1-3 points that can improve the preparation of the meeting:				

2. Quality of the content of the programme	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**
2.1 Links between aims of the meeting and the overall project aims	poor	fair	good	very good
Mutual understanding amongst partners about the project rationale and the short term and long term objectives of the meeting				
Clear evidence in the meeting programme of real synergy with the overall objectives of the project				
Appropriate content, clearly related to aims and objectives of the meeting				
2.2 Completion of the agenda	poor	fair	good	very good
Did the meeting adhere to the agenda and were any changes discussed?				
Were the goals of the meeting achieved?				
Did the meeting have a realistic timescales				
2.3 Input to the meeting by the project partners	poor	fair	good	very good
Each partner plays a role in the preparation of the meeting according to an agreed prior division of roles and responsibilities				
The extent to which each partner contributes to the content and delivery of the meeting				
Are you satisfied that you were able to contribute to the discussion and decision making?				
The evidence of partners sharing responsibilities for the meeting				
Possible comments to the content of the meeting				
Mention 1-3 important weaknesses:				
Mention 1-3 important strengths:				
Mention 1-3 points that can improve the quality of the meeting programme:				

3. Quality of other factors	1	2	3	4
3.1 Meeting venue and equipment	poor	fair	good	very good
Was the meeting room comfortable and conducive to learning?				
Was the standard of the equipment including ICT-tools satisfactory?				
Extent to which equipment including ICT-tools were used effectively and with innovation?				
3.2 Quality of the domestic arrangements	poor	fair	good	very good
Attention to logistic questions, including quality of transport to and from the meeting place				
Was the overnight accommodation satisfactory?				
Were the meals and coffee breaks satisfactory?				
3.3 Appropriate balance of activities	poor	fair	good	very good
Was the working environment satisfactory?				
Relevant mixture of activities e.g. presentations, discussions, social and cultural activities, free time				
Appropriateness of the social and cultural programme				
Possible comments to the quality of other factors				
Mention 1-3 points of weaknesses:				
Mention 1-3 points of strengths:				
Mention 1-3 points that can improve the other factors:				

4. Multilateral attitudes and follow-up	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**
4.1 Effectiveness of shared ownership of meeting	poor	fair	good	very good
Evidence that the expectations of participants have been taken into account				
Evidence that participants have the opportunity to contribute with own expertise				
Clear evidence of a collaborative approach with strong team work				
I felt encouraged by the other members to engage in the discussions				
4.2 Development of positive attitudes to multilateral cooperation	poor	fair	good	very good
We now know each other well (professionally)				
The extent and quality of consideration to intercultural challenges				
The meeting promoted positive attitudes towards multilateral activities				
4.3 Development of positive attitudes towards European cooperation	poor	fair	good	very good
Opportunities to share information about own countries and education systems				
The extent and quality of the European dimension				
Development of positive attitudes towards transnational European activities				
Possible comments to the quality of follow-up and multilateral attitudes				
Mention 1-3 points of weaknesses:				
Mention 1-3 points of strengths:				
Mention 1-3 points that can improve the evaluation and follow-up procedures!				

5. Evaluation, follow-up and overall rating	1	2	3	4
5.1 Procedures of evaluation	poor	fair	good	very good
We completed a comprehensive evaluation of the preceding project phase and its work packages.				
We completed a sufficient evaluation of the meeting				
The results of the evaluations on the meeting were used for improvements of the succeeding work programme of the project				
5.2 Follow-up	poor	fair	good	very good
The minutes gave a clear and comprehensive summary of the content and conclusions of the meeting				
There is a clear and reasonable timetable and task plan in place for the remaining tasks of the project				
Evidence of on-going mutual assistance to project partners for the coming tasks.				
I understand my role in the remaining work programme of the project				
5.3 Overall rating of the meeting	poor	fair	good	very good
This meeting lived up to my expectations.				
Was the content suited to your requirements?				
How satisfied are you with the overall experience of the meeting?				
Possible comments to the quality of follow-up and multilateral attitudes				
Mention 1-3 points of weaknesses:				
Mention 1-3 points of strengths:				
Mention 1-3 points that can improve the evaluation and follow-up procedures!				