

NOVA

Nordic tools for learning Validation

hvj / 03.05. 2011

SUMMARY OF THE INTERNAL EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT IN GENERAL

How good is our project? Evaluate the performance indicators!

Content

EVALUATION SCALE	1
1. QUALITY OF THE TRANSNATIONAL PARTNERSHIP	2
2. PROJECT MANAGEMENT, LEADERSHIP AND QUALITY ASSURANCE	3
3. THE QUALITY OF THE PROJECT PLAN AND WORK PROGRAMME.....	4
4. QUALITY OF THE (FIRST, SECOND AND THIRD) PARTNER MEETINGS	5
5. SUPPORT FOR PROJECT PARTNERS AND PARTICIPANTS.....	6
6. PROJECT RESOURCES AND LEARNING OUTCOME.....	7
7. EVALUATION OF OWN PERFORMANCE/CONTRIBUTION	8

The project leaders from the partnership circle have answered the questionnaire at the fourth and last partner meeting, 11 – 13 May 2011 in Rite, Latvia.

This summary of the general project evaluation

- marks the average values of their answers

- include a summary of their comments to the main indicator

Evaluation scale

1 = *unsatisfactory* - major weaknesses

2 = *fair* - some important weaknesses

3 = *good* - strengths outweigh weaknesses

4 = *very good* - major strengths

1. Quality of the transnational partnership	1	2	3	4
1.1 Strong commitment to the project by each partner	poor	fair	good	very good
Each partner is prepared to commit time and resources as required in line with the jointly agreed work plan				X
Each partner has shown willingness to resolve problems			X	
1.2 Agreement amongst partners	poor	fair	good	very good
Degree of mutual understanding about project rationale, overall aims and short-term / long-term objectives				X
A clear evidence in the workplan of sharing of roles and responsibilities amongst partners			X	
1.3 Effective and on-going communication amongst partners	poor	fair	good	very good
The communication with account being taken of any language difficulties			X	
Degree of clarity of communication, particularly by the project co-ordinator			X	
The range and effectiveness of communications amongst partners.			X	
1.4 Trust and attitudes amongst partners	poor	fair	good	very good
The development of mutual trust throughout the life of the project				X
The development amongst partners of a sense of ownership of the project			X	
The development of positive attitudes towards transnational activities			X	
Possible comments to the quality of the transnational partnership				
<i>Mention 1-3 important weaknesses:</i> Sometimes difficulties with communication due to different language. The differences between the participating institutions (sometimes also a strength).				
<i>Mention 1-3 important strengths:</i> A high commitment to cooperation. A fine and strong project plan and planning procedures. A very good atmosphere.				
<i>Mention 1-3 points that can improve the quality of the transnational partnership!</i> More clear objectives, especially in relation to solve language problems. Better means of common ICT-tools for project cooperation.				

2. Project management, leadership and quality assurance	1	2	3	4
2.1 Quality of project management arrangements	poor	fair	good	very good
Degree of commitment and equitable involvement of all partners			X	
Clear plans for implementation of work plans and administration of budgets				X
The clarity of project co-ordination				X
2.2 Effective management qualities demonstrated by project co-ordinator	poor	fair	good	very good
Professional competence displayed by project co-ordinator				X
The leadership qualities			X	
The quality of relationship with partners and development of teamwork				X
2.3 Effectiveness of the process of monitoring and evaluation	poor	fair	good	very good
The quality of the on-going monitoring and evaluation of the project			X	
The quality of the plan for the evaluation of the impact of the project			X	
2.4 Quality of the dissemination process	poor	fair	good	very good
The quality of the plans for disseminating project information/results				X
The multiplier effect (are main stakeholders reached and engaged)			X	
2.5 Implementation of the workplan	poor	fair	good	very good
The degree of adherence to the workplan by all partners			X	
Are the deviations from the workplan based on well-considered reasons and mutual agreement			X	
2.6 Integration of project activities into the organisations development plans	poor	fair	good	very good
Are the project's activities integrated into the development plan of the participating organisations		X		
Are the project's results integrated into the normal activities of the participating organisations		X		
Possible comments to the project management and quality assurance				
<i>Mention 1-3 points of weaknesses:</i>				
Uncertainty if the project results can be exploited as planned.				
<i>Mention 1-3 points of strengths:</i>				
A high level of commitment from all. A good coordination.				
<i>Mention 1-3 points that can improve the project management and quality assurance!</i>				
Higher level of shared responsibilities for the implementation of the work programme.				

3. The quality of the project plan and work programme	1	2	3	4
3.1 Structure of the project	poor	fair	good	very good
Has the project plan a clear rationale and clarity of objectives			X	
Has the project a realistic timescale			X	
The degree of relevance of topics and activities		X		
How is the consistency of the general design of the project			X	
3.2 Innovation and variety of approach	poor	fair	good	very good
Evidence of a varied range of approaches by all partners within the project		X		
The use of innovative methodology and effective use of new technologies			X	
The partners' opportunity to input own expertise and learn from each other			X	
3.3 Goals completed	poor	fair	good	very good
Did the project met the main goals			X	
Were all activities appropriately conceived for meeting the goals?			X	
Were all activities the right ones in the light of the envisaged goals?			X	
3.4 Quality of project materials/ products	poor	fair	good	very good
The quality and relevance of the survey at the start of the project			X	
The quality of the developed online tools			X	
The quality of the project rapport			X	
3.5 Quality of the project dissemination	poor	fair	good	very good
The quality of the project in terms of its short term impact at local//national/ Nordic-Baltic level			X	
The quality of the project in terms of its long term impact at local/national/ Nordic-Baltic level			X?	
Possible comments to the quality of the project plan and work programme				
<i>Mention 1-3 points of weaknesses:</i> The impact of the results is still uncertain.				
<i>Mention 1-3 points of strengths:</i> The consortium reaches a common agreement of the frame of the tools. The results were innovating.				
<i>Mention 1-3 points that can improve the project plan and work programme!</i> The main stakeholders could have been more integrated in the work programme.				

4. Quality of the partner meetings	1	2	3	4
4.1 Preparatory work	poor	fair	good	very good
Was sufficient information supplied before the meeting?			X	
Was the work load prior to the meeting acceptable?			X	
Did you achieve the tasks you should deliver before the meeting?		X		
4.2 The meeting itself	poor	fair	good	very good
Did the meeting give adequate time to introductions and finding out the background of the partners?		X		
Are you satisfied that you were able to contribute to the discussion and decision making?				X
Did the meeting adhere to the agenda and were any changes discussed?			X	
Were the goals of the meeting achieved?			X	
4.3 Other factors	poor	fair	good	very good
Was the working environment satisfactory?				X
Were the accommodation, food and the social element satisfactory?			X	
We now know each other well (professionally)			X	
4.4 Follow-up	poor	fair	good	very good
There is a clear and reasonable timetable in place			X	
I understand my role in the project				X
Possible comments to the quality of the partner meetings				
<i>Mention 1-3 points of weaknesses:</i>				
The first meeting could have been more focussed on the rationale of the agenda.				
<i>Mention 1-3 points of strengths:</i>				
The focus improved during the succeeding meetings. Fine social and cultural activities. All participants worked positively for the objectives of the project.				
<i>Mention 1-3 points that can improve the quality of the partner meetings!</i>				
A higher level of homework and shared responsibilities regarding presentations.				

5. Support for project partners and participants	1	2	3	4
5.1 Support within each partner organisation	poor	fair	good	very good
Has there been an effective and ongoing support from line management within each partner organisation		X	X	
The level of support for individual participants from their own organisation			X	
5.2 Peer support	poor	fair	good	very good
Has there been an effective peer support from other partners		X		
Has there been an effective support from other organisations involved in similar transnational projects	X			
5.3 Support from external agencies	poor	fair	good	very good
Have you been aware of possibilities for support from external agencies at local/national/ Nordic-Baltic level		X		
Have you during the project used support available from external agencies at local/national/ Nordic-Baltic level	X			
Possible comments to the support for project partners and participants				
<p><i>Mention 1-3 points of weaknesses:</i> Difficult to engage other organisations in the work.</p>				
<p><i>Mention 1-3 points of strengths:</i> The organisations behind the project members gave a fine support to the project work and its objectives.</p>				
<p><i>Mention 1-3 points that can improve the support for project partners and participants!</i> Relations to other organisations can be integrated in the project plan from the start.</p>				

6. Project resources and learning outcome	1	2	3	4
6.1 Provision of project resources	poor	fair	good	very good
How are the sufficiency, range and suitability of project resources		X		
How are the sharing of resources/expertise amongst the partners				X
6.2 Effective use of resources	poor	fair	good	very good
The extent to which technology and other resources are used effectively and innovatively			X	
A clear link between project workplan and cost-effective use of resources			X	
6.3 Personal learning as project member	poor	fair	good	very good
I have learned through being a partner in this project			X	
The transnational co-operation offered input I would never have obtained if I had not been a partner in this project			X	
What impact has the project had on your own professional development?			X	
Possible comments to the project resources and learning outcome				
<p><i>Mention 1-3 points of weaknesses:</i></p> <p>The financial resources from Nordplus did not meet the actual demands of project work.</p>				
<p><i>Mention 1-3 points of strengths:</i></p> <p>High level of transnational cooperation and multilateral understanding.</p>				
<p><i>Mention 1-3 points that can improve the project resources and learning outcome!</i></p> <p>Try to find extra funding to improve the refunding of the real work load. A clearer focus on what each member and his or hers organisation can and have learned during the project.</p>				

7. Evaluation of own performance/contribution	1	2	3	4
	poor	fair	good	very good
My degree of knowledge at the start of the project of my organisations role and responsibilities in the work programme		X		
In the start phase I developed a clear knowledge of the rules of procedure, decision-making and internal communication in the project consortium			X	
My degree of knowledge at the start of the project of the conditions and demands of a Nordplus Adult project.		X		
7.2 Keeping the timetable	poor	fair	good	very good
Have all activities taken place according to your work plan and timing?			X	
Did you respect the deadlines for delivering (sub) products?			X	
Did you communicate (within the partnership) as planned?		X		
Did you communicate (within your institution) as planned?			X	
7.3 Contribution to products and activities	poor	fair	good	very good
Have you undertaken all activities you should have according to your work plan?			X	
Did you deliver all products (material, training day ...) you were supposed to deliver?			X	
Are you happy with the quality of your activities or products?			X	
7.4 Management qualities demonstrated by project members	poor	fair	good	very good
Did you actively seek to fulfil your role and responsibility amongst partners			X	
Did you proactively try to propose solutions and solve unexpected obstacles and problems in the progress of the project		X		
Have you regularly informed your organisation of the progress of the project and asked for support from your line management			X	
Have you attempted to get support from external agencies at local/national/Nordic level	X			
Possible comments to my own performance/contribution				
<i>Mention 1-3 points of weaknesses:</i>				
We could have been better prepared to the kick-off meeting. We did our tasks, but not more than that. Our communication and involvement of stakeholders outside our organisation was too low.				
<i>Mention 1-3 points of strengths:</i>				
In general we kept the deadlines of the work programme. We were responsible and committed to our common project.				
<i>Mention 1-3 points that can improve your project performance!</i>				
We could have acted more proactively when meeting unexpected obstacles or facing problems. We could have been more active as ambassadors for the project in relation to target groups and main stakeholders.				