

Evaluation of the transfer of innovation within the framework of the project PAT-TEIN

Please note: 1 answer for each Cross-Border Team but you can also highlight different points of view within you Cross-Border Team

Please cross out the answers which don't correspond

Please write your answers in colors (so that they are easily recognizable)

The 2 original toolkits were designed a few years ago at the franco-german border
Was the understanding of the 2 toolkits difficult?

If yes from which point of view?

1. Language: *No, as English is the working language of our cross-border team*
2. Culture: *Yes, as the franco-german context is very special and not easily transferable to other border areas*
3. Methods: *The theoretical approach is simple to understand, but the methods must be carefully adapted to the border-specific needs. Plus the method was developed by and for a bicultural staff belonging to only one training organization. In other border areas there are more than one organization (one each border) which had to:*
 - *share the method and identify a common understanding*
 - *organize a multicultural team which adapted the method to the specificity of the border area*
 - *organize and train a multicultural team of trainers which had to act together in a coordinated way*
 - *build cases-study for the first time since there are neither experiences systematized before not existing data bases or previous experiences in cross-border trainings (with mix classes) of the training organizations involved.*
4. Pedagogical approaches: *Like the methods they have to be carefully adapted to the border-specific requirements and take into consideration the relatively "little experience in cross-border training" of the training organizations involved (partners).*

5. Other: *none*

Was it difficult to merge the 2 toolkits?

Not in general, but it took a lot of common discussions and adaptations; also the reworking from the EI was very helpful and supportive

Did the project leader help you enough in the understanding of the toolkits?

Yes, very good work and support from the EI was received

Did you face difficulties within your border team concerning the interpretation of the Toolkits for your border?

Yes, because of the specificities of the AT-IT-SI border region (three different languages, English as common working language, differences in the administrative system, etc.) the toolkit (methods, instruments, pedagogical approach, etc.) had to be adapted carefully to the needs of the three countries in particular for the presence of the "three borders". In fact the toolkit, in particular with reference to the "intercultural aspects", always refers to some bilateral situation. When the actors and the cultures are three, the interpretation of one behavior double and the reactions become at least 4! Thus the dynamics to deal with during the training sessions needs specific technics and approaches.

After the common adaptation and the 1st test module (training the trainers) the toolkit became clearer and manageable for all the project partners.

If yes, was it a different understanding of:

- Approach: *Problem-solving approaches differ a lot between AT, IT and SI (one common and single goal but three different approaches to reach it) → necessary solution was to find a „3rd Way Approach“*
- Content: *there were not actually different understanding on the contents but on the use of it in the training: some of us would like to focus more the theories since consider them more effective for a good understanding, others preferred practical exercises as starting point to understand the theory. A mix of theoretical input and practical exercises was necessary. The involvement of the target group was of high importance*
- Methods/Pedagogy: *In a tri-lingual border area like AT, IT, SI, the definition of English as common working language for project work and training was without*

alternative but, of course, also caused problems (active/passive language competences, misunderstandings etc.). Concerning the Pedagogy, it was only of little help for a tri-cultural class since, as mentioned, the dynamics differ and change a lot from a bilateral situation

- *Future use: The toolkit (methods, instruments, approaches) is usable as a „first attempt-approach“, however, further changes – especially in the development of more specialized and targeted training modules – will be necessary. The changes, adaptations and modifications will depend particularly on the respective target group (e.g. civil servants from municipal and/or regional/national administrations; mono-, bi- or tri-lateral trainings etc.) It is a good starting point to develop and introduce some training actions focus on “project management with attention to the intercultural aspects”, in all the European projects which have been developed within the new EU program period. The results obtained by Pat-Tein, the awareness of the importance of these aspects for the success of a project must be used to sensitize actors involved in the new Program period activities of the border area.*
- *Other: none*

Was it difficult to find a common solution?
Scala 1-6 (6 being the most difficult)

5

Comments

- *It was quite difficult and the specific training organized with the expert in intercultural issues of this border area was fundamental. Thanks to that training session the awareness of the differences aroused and the “third way” found.*
- *For more information see: Trilateral case study (difficulties concerning the organization of a trilateral meeting via e-mail → misunderstandings, wrong assumptions, wording, etc.)*

Were the project meetings helpful?

Yes, the main meetings with all the PAT-TEIN partners including the project leader itself as well as the trilateral meetings between AT, IT and SI were very helpful and necessary. In the AT-IT-SI border region a lot of further trilateral meetings and work was necessary to maintain and improve the project work between the partners continuously.

If Yes, for what special reason

- For exchanging with the project leader about their use/understanding of the toolkit: *Yes, otherwise the merging and transfer of the tools would not have been manageable in such a fruitful way.*
- For exchanging with the other border-teams and benefit from their experiences and reflections: *Yes, the learnings and experiences from the network and the partners as well as from the different border regions were very interesting and useful for the further process and cross-border cooperation work also within the AT-IT-SI border area. The exchange of experiences and "difficulties" met by others partners in their border regions and the solutions found, contributed to develop new ideas for facing some situation in our border area or to enrich the tools and methods to be used during the training. In the AT-IT-SI border region the exchange with ForSer and the University of Ljubljana was most important and the basis for an effective cross border work. The exchange with the other partners of our border-area was strategic for building a common understanding and for better knowing the training needs and characteristic of the potential participants/beneficiaries.*
- Other: *for the training on the methods. The meeting in Perpignan and the trilateral meeting and training in Ljubljana were the most effective for a better understanding of the toolkit*

Was it difficult to identify the case studies you wanted to use at your border?

Partly, because the cross-border cooperation still is somewhat underdeveloped in the region and not very well institutionalized. But the special experience of the partners and their involvement in previous cooperation projects (bilateral and trilateral) enabled them to "adapt", e.g., a "real" case/ situation that occurred within the AT-I, and AT-I-SI cross border work between the project partners into a bilateral and a tri-lateral cases study (so far, no other tri-lateral projects exist in the region). They are based on the problems that were identified and had to be managed within the cross border cooperation. For other cases study the difficulty was to find some person aware about some tricky situations happened within his/her project and available to "tell" about it for a systematization.

Was the grid developed by the project leader a help for the writing of these case studies?

Yes as a general framework, but it had to be refined in order to meet all the specificities and needs in the AT-IT-SI border-area

Did you face difficulties in writing the border specific parts?

Yes

If yes, was it a question of:

- Different perspectives/perceptions within your border team?
 - o Pedagogy/methods: *Only partly, however the problem-solving approaches, which differ between the three partners/regions, constituted a big challenge at first.*
 - o Content: *Generally, few reliable material/data is available for the cross-border cooperation in the region. Case studies are almost non-existent; tri-lateral cases had to be developed completely anew.*
 - o Assignment of tasks: *Not problematic, very good cooperation between partners.*
 - o Other: *none*
- Other: *none*

Were the common parts written by the project leader a help?

Yes, the common parts were supportive as they provide the necessary theoretical input and a common base. Moreover, they were helpful for developing a mutual and overall understanding.

The 1st Test Module focused on the pedagogical approach: was it a help for you to make it?

Yes, the 1st Test Module was the basis for further practical work and training. It was absolutely necessary for:

- *creating a general understanding and knowledge of “being and acting” as a CB-trainer,*
- *developing a concept for the 2nd test module (“transfers to the target group”),*
- *discovering problems and obstacles within trilateral cross border work,*
- *“How to deal with problems and different approaches between partners?”, “How to overcome these problems?”, etc.*
- *Arise the awareness of the existence of differences and the importance of making people aware about it*

Was the evaluation characteristics proposed by the Euro-Institut a help?

Yes, it was a good basis for the development/adaptation of a border-specific feedback form.

Would you have preferred another form for this 1st step (expert workshop for example, other)?

We would have preferred to have somebody (trainer) from EI present at our 1st and/or 2nd Test Module” in order to be able not only to understand but to actively experience and practice the pedagogical approach for the further transfer.

The 2nd Test Module addressed the end users/the target group:
Was it difficult to attract your target group?

Yes, there were difficulties concerning:

- *attracting people from public administration to take part in the training (lack of background knowledge; the necessity and benefit of the training was unclear; lack of time; lack of resources in general, etc.),*
- *coordination and time management,*
- *selecting “the right” people,*
- *different target groups and people between AT, IT and SI*

Did you chose to address your entire target group or to have a more focused approach?

The AT-IT-SI-approach was defined by all three partners. Based on this and with focus also on the target group each partner concentrated on selecting the “right” people for the training course. The concept for the training was developed for the AT-IT-SI border area in particular and its specific needs, requirements, obstacles etc. Furthermore the training focused on the final target group/ the people addressed (needs, requirements, usage, understanding, etc.)

Was it difficult to be the trainer of this session?

Yes, because the partners are no professional trainers. Therefore, it was also necessary to get the knowledge and the input required from a professional within the 1st pilot session. Without this professional training (“professionalization”/ “training the trainers”) the partners would not have been able to develop and manage the 2nd pilot test (“transfer to the target group”). It has to be clear that for future training sessions further and ongoing training is necessary and unavoidable. Some difficulties were due also to the fact that each partner had to coordinate his part of training with the other having never had this kind of experience before. It is important to keep in mind the trainers (partners) belong to 3 different organisations!

Was a duration of two days a good duration?

For a “first attempt”-training it was an appropriate duration; nevertheless, for a professional cross-border training session further education for the trainers is required to provide fruitful and effective trainings in the long term. For the transfer of the training to the target group more time would also be advisable. However, it becomes more and more difficult for civil servants to get permission to attend trainings (normal duration: one day).

Could you find an appropriate balance between the administrative part and the content part of this transfer of innovation project?

The content part was largely dominant and very supportive for our tri-regional cross-border cooperation as well as our understanding of other cross-border contexts; although in European projects which encompass such a lot of partners from very different parts of the EU administrative burdens and costs are unavoidable.

What kind of changes do you expect in the near future (Exploitation of Results)?
Will you use the toolkit in training modules in the future?
If yes, precise your first ideas/projects

The training-modules will be presented to the respective regional/national institutions. As politically a stronger emphasis on cooperation in the AT-IT-SI border region is laid, hopefully the necessity for an adequate training of the involved civil servants will also become more and more evident (even if the current economic crisis and the lack of funds is an obstacle).

A training session based on the toolkit will be enclosed in all the future cooperation projects which will be submitted or managed by our organization and in the training courses on “International project management”.

Has the PAT-TEIN Project contributed to a positive (social, economic, environmental, cooperation) change? If so how?

Yes, as the project has not only forged a closer cooperation between the project partners, but has also proved very successful with the target group (see evaluations).

Has your organization benefited from the involvement of the PAT-TEIN project? If so how?

Yes, there were a lot of benefits:

- *Intensive relationship between the partners and with the PAT-TEIN network as a whole*
- *Maintaining and advancing the relation and cross-border cooperation work between AT-IT-SI in particular*
- *Common cross-border project plans*
- *Enhancement of knowledge and intercultural understandings as well as networking between the individuals/civil servants from AT, IT and SI.*
- *Continuing to be part of a EU network of training organizations which is an important opportunity to benchmark thus learning, get information and partners from other Countries, develop other EU experiences/projects, have a privileged observatory and radar on the EU Countries situation/training needs and approaches adopted in order to inclose them at local level in the day-to-day activities.*

Have there been unexpected results or impacts e.g. new relationships with other partners/better cooperation in your 'border team', new project ideas etc.?

- *See points above*

Are there synergy effects between the PAT-TEIN project and other initiatives or programmes?

PAT-TEIN has in the AT-IT-SI cross-border cooperation influenced but also benefitted from another TOI project of the partners (NEXT4PA – Creativity and Innovation for Public Administration). The synergies and learning effects were considerable and very fruitful.

What was/is the added value of PAT-TEIN in doing it on a European i.e. transnational scale?

It was of utmost importance to learn about the experiences/specificities of other European partners in order to develop a better understanding of the special needs of our own cross-border region in comparison to others, especially as the cooperation until recently partly met with political problems. The knowledge about other cultural backgrounds in the region itself but also within partner regions was crucial in identifying differences and similarities, which are very important when “other” models have to be adapted to the own needs or own solutions have to be found (e.g. English as a working and training language, even – or because – it is not the mother language of any of the project partners in our area). Without Pat-Tein project is likely the awareness about the intercultural differences and the possibility to overcome them did not arise. The Pat-Tein was an important opportunity of increasing the knowledge on this matter not only for the partners but, through them and their activity for the whole territory.