



CEO Project
Project number 2013-1-NI1-Leo05-12232

WP 7: External Evaluation Final Report

Work Package:	7	Quality assurance and evaluation
Description	External evaluation Final Report	
Prepared by:	Antonio Mocci (sub contractor of KCH International)	

Final Version

February 2016

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This note reflects the views only of the author and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use may be made of the information contained therein.

Foreword.

This report is about the external evaluation of the Coach for Entrepreneurial Opportunities (C-EO) Leonardo da Vinci project at the end of its life cycle. The rationale of the C-EO project is about the challenges faced by those demographic groups that are underrepresented within the entrepreneurial population and especially founders of start-ups such as young people, women, disabled and/or migrants. Europe has to open up for them paths into entrepreneurship to create jobs, empower them economically and socially and leverage their creative and innovative capacities.

These paths should be sensitive to the needs of different groups, their expectations and their norms with regards to how advice and information is delivered and received.

Aim of the LdV TOI project C-EO was to prepare and train those persons who are involved in recognizing, promoting, counselling and guiding.

These persons are:

- Unemployed persons
- Senior workers
- Youngsters in VET-institutions

who are interested in becoming an entrepreneur.

These persons to be trained are 'coaches for entrepreneurial opportunities'.

Background of the project.

Apart from constructing a profile of the 'Entrepreneurial Coach' and developing training for the Entrepreneurial Coaches, the partnership aimed at developing an Entrepreneurial Passport and a web tool for the aim group of unemployed, senior workers and youngsters.

Based on an extended inventory, the partnership analysed the national legislations, training and educational programs and facilities for upcoming entrepreneurs (tasks accomplished in the first year of project implementation).

All this information was published on a web portal for Entrepreneurs, which was designed during the first year of the project.

To sum up, CEO's objectives were:

- to transfer the profile of "entrepreneurial teacher" and create a profile of "entrepreneurial coach", based on the EQF structure;
- to transfer the Certification Module Entrepreneurship;
- to construct a training programme for entrepreneurial coaches;
- to create a professional network of entrepreneurial coaches in each partner country, through carrying out the pilot training for entrepreneurial coaches;
- to get insight in the national training opportunities and facilities for starting entrepreneurs;
- to develop an "Entrepreneurial passport" for starting entrepreneurs.

C-EO consortium consisted of 6 partners from 5 countries (see table on the next page) and was built to include the necessary expertise to successfully reach the project goals. Competences were multidisciplinary and have been integrated in a consistent way with the

tasks and phases of project development. The project was articulated in 9 WPs with Quality Assurance taking place in parallel to check the quality of deliverables. The core WPs aimed at supporting and facilitating the adaptation and transfer of the profiles to the partners to best fit country specific labour markets and needs of their target users. In the short term, impact is limited to the countries in which partners operate and encompasses the organisations directly involved in pilot activities. Throughout the lifetime of the project other labour market key actors and stakeholders have been directly exposed to project outcomes through their

Partners

P0	NL	KCH International (lead partner)
P1	PT	ISQ Instituto de Soldadura e Qualidade
P2	UK	NCFE - The Newham College for Further Education
P3	IT	CPV - Centro Produttività Veneto
P4	FR	AGEFA PME - Association de gestion de formation en alternance pour le PME
P5	PT	CECOA - Centro de Formacao Profissional para o Comércio e Afins.

practical application. Here is the partners' list.

All partners committed to set out dissemination and exploitation plans to reach other stakeholders on EU and national levels.

Terms of reference from the project: aims of evaluation.

According to the approved application, external quality assurance and evaluation have taken into account the following aspects: impact and quality of the product in relation to the objectives defined in the project; sustainability and transferability of the presented results. The external evaluator conclusions have been included within interim and final LLP NA reports.

During the kick off meeting in Ede, the external evaluator proposed an evaluation strategy and tools, which were accepted by the partnership. Let us consider synthetically the main issues of the strategy.

Having the before mentioned objectives as terms of reference, the proposed specific aims of external evaluation were to:

- a. Build on the project's internal evaluation that has been carried out throughout the duration of the project by partners.
- b. Undertake an assessment of whether the project has achieved its objectives or not, what has worked well and what has not, for whom and under what circumstances.
- c. Assess the original rationale for the project, and whether this rationale is/is not still valid (including how it fits with current priorities and those of other local, regional, national and European strategies).
- d. Assessment of the added value realised through coordinating activities that result in project outcomes, with specific reference to EU policies for enterprise.
- e. Gather and disseminate best practice and innovatory elements that can be embedded within the future work of the partnership and shared more widely.
- f. Identify gaps & issues.

g. Identify non expected effects.

The external evaluation within the quality securing policy.

The external evaluation was part of the quality securing policy of the C-EO project which encompasses different types of aims:

1. To support the project management, establish mechanisms for quality control and provide continuous evaluation reporting of project progress, focused on 3P's evaluation model¹: (i) process and project management; (ii) partnership; (iii) products.
2. Monitor, track and assess each WP and report at least twice during the project, via interim and final evaluation reports.

These aims encompassed several activities:

- 1.1. Development of a quality management plan and evaluation strategy with quantitative and qualitative indicators to each WP, focused on 3P's evaluation model.
- 1.2. Development and launch evaluation tools and methodologies (e.g., online surveys), in EN with cross information methods (for the same indicators) and focus groups (e.g., transfer workshop, national pilot sessions, Final Conference).
- 1.3 Carrying out a mid-term and final evaluation and reporting, for the identification of possible risks and needs of project re-engineering and improvement actions, including the analysis of project impact.

According to the approved application form, the quality securing policy was carried out in the C-EO project at two levels: internal and external.

As for the internal level, it implied that project evaluation strategy was focused on an internal evaluation approach (IEA), developed in close collaboration with all partners. IEA was mainly related to the monitoring of the effective implementation progress in comparison with the planned work plan, with special reference to the project milestones. Thus, the internal evaluation was considered a continuous process generated in real time by each project partner.

- Evaluation constituted a continuing activity accompanying the project activities. It supported the project management and involved the entire project partnership.
- The quality management plan contained and described all methods and instruments that were used to carry out successful evaluation in the project. Furthermore, the quality management plan stated measuring points and deadlines for the partners progress reports.
- The 3P evaluation model adopted allowed a tri-dimensional assessment of project progress: i) process and project management; (ii) partnership; (iii) products. This model aimed to:
 - develop clarity and realism about the project objectives;
 - recognize the importance of a partnership in creating value;
 - develop an environment of knowledge sharing;
 - increase motivation and confidence;
 - monitor and measure;
 - identify strengths and weaknesses;
 - implement improvement measures just in time;
 - create useful products and values for end-users.

¹ The 3Ps evaluation model was explicitly mentioned in the application form.

The internal evaluation and monitoring enabled an appropriate management of activities and it was functional to achieve phase objectives, to comply with the project timetable, to account the expenses. Thereby the lead partner and the WP-leader were in charge of design a suitable monitoring and evaluation plan by setting out indicators and procedures. The Quality assurance WP leader was P 2, NCFE.

As for the external evaluation, it was planned in the project to have a neutral and independent point of view, both on the process of C-EO implementation and on the project's products and results. As for the distinction between internal and external evaluation, the internal evaluation and monitoring enabled an appropriate management of activities and it was functional to achieve phase objectives, to comply with the project timetable, to account the expenses.

The external monitoring and evaluation let an external evaluator analyse project outcomes; it provided for an external point of view on the capacity of the project to meet its objectives and produce planned results.

Therefore, evaluation was designed to assess the relevance, the efficiency, the sustainability, the innovation and the transferability of the project. Thereby the finality was to review the real project results if compared with the planned and expected ones.

External evaluation strategy.

Having this in mind, the external evaluation strategy for this project can be formulated as follows:

- To have an ex post validation of the project methodology and strategy. This validation was based both on the degree of achievement of the project results and on the estimation of long and medium term impact of project activities.
- To check that projects results meet the requirements considered relevant to reach the major objectives of the Leonardo da Vinci sectoral Programme (and is in line with other EU overarching policies i.e. Europe 2020).
- To support project outcomes' mainstreaming, e.g. providing useful suggestions on how to transfer projects' results into training policies and approaches for the national and regional competent institutions, for the European bodies, and for all relevant stakeholders, in general.

More in detail, the external evaluation strategy considered the following dimensions, and evaluation questions:

1. **relevance:** "Are project outcomes relevant with reference to the Lifelong learning Programme objectives?"; "Are results able to create benefits for end users?"
2. **efficiency:** "Have tasks been divided amongst partners in a balanced and efficient way?"
3. **sustainability:** "Are the network or the outputs going to survive the project life cycle?"
4. **transferability:** "Are the methodology and project best practices easy to be transferred in different context/countries, and what are the adaptations required?"
5. **innovation:** "To what extent project results contribute at innovating the state of the art on the subjects tackled by the project?"

In addition to that, in consideration of the ex post perspective adopted, two more dimensions were considered:

6. **impact:** “To what extent project results will be used by end users and by regional and national competent bodies ?” “What is the impact on partners organisations ?”
7. **transnational cooperation:** “To what extent are the products a result of common activities ?”, “Are they shared by the Partners ?”, “Can they influence Entrepreneurial Education in Europe ?”.

So, at the end of the kick off meeting partners agreed that from a general point of view, evaluation would consider the C-EO project according to seven dimensions: impact on partners and reference systems, innovation produced, sustainability of results, transferability of results, effectiveness of the transnational co-operation; efficiency of work organisation; relevance.

External evaluation outputs.

The evaluator was expected to produce an interim paper 12 months after project inception. At the end of the project, a final evaluation report had to be produced. As the approach to evaluation was participatory, the evaluator attended all project meetings realised.

Results produced at the end of the project lifecycle.

Having summed up the evaluation design and the project background, let us consider project outcomes at the end of the project lifecycle. As already done in the interim report, we distinguish here two typologies of results: structural and content results. Structural ones are those outcomes that make possible the project functioning, such as organisational mechanisms, design and preparation of operative tools, adoption of procedures, agreement on tasks, articulation of communication and evaluation strategies,...

Content results are those outcomes produced during project activities and through which project objectives are met. Contents results are the benchmark against which the quality, innovation, and success of the project will be assessed, but without structural results it is doubtless impossible to produce them.

Structural results.

The structuration of the partnership was the first important structural result. The kick of meeting was dedicated to settle down partnership's organisational and functioning mechanisms. After the inception meeting in Ede (22/23.11.2013) the partnership found agreement on the following procedures: **administrative issues, communication procedures and project identity, monitoring and evaluation, schedules and milestones**. More in detail, all work packages were analysed, identifying for each of them the responsible partner, activities to be done, expected outputs and contributions from all partners. One of the structural results was the establishment of a cooperative network, which included the provision of a clear set of rules to manage the project. Due to the extension of the time needed to realise some of the outputs, it was necessary **to organise a non planned partners' meeting** (London, April 2015). So the total number of meetings was 6 (Ede, Vicenza, Paris, London, Lisbon and Ede). In addition, two on line Skype conferences were organised, one on February 2014 and the other in November 2015, the latter mainly dedicated to the preparation of the final event, scheduled at the beginning of 2016.

Following previous experiences of some of the partners, it was decided that the main tool for communication among partners would be **a online platform** with protected access, usable for discussion, files and documents management, and to work at a distance between the meetings.

The use of the Redbooth platform was not a daily habit for all partners, and, in addition, it was not that easy to retrieve and download documents. As a matter of fact, traditional e-mail was the main communication channel between partners. The project web site was more a window to the external world rather than a communication tool within the partnership.

The structural actions established at the beginning of the project were not changed during the lifecycle and this confirms that transversal activities were set up correctly.

Content results.

Generally speaking, some of the content results scheduled for the two years of the project have been produced in due time, while for others there was a delay. As a consequence, there was need for postponing project's end and the overall length was 30 months.

To be specific, the main project results envisaged in the project are:

WP1 Transfer and adaptation (responsible partner: **KCH**) **By**

R4 – Module for “Certification of Entrepreneur”	31/12/2013 Ok
R5 – Profile of Entrepreneurial teacher	31/12/2013 Ok
R6 – Training referential for Entrepreneurial competences	31/12/2013 Ok

R 4, 5, and 6 have been systematized by responsible partners and translated into English (from Dutch and Portuguese). Within the WP1 a Transfer product evaluation report was realized to analyze with experts the transferability potential of the translated products. Analysis was done on the basis of answers to a questionnaire.

WP2 Inventory & analysis - **CPV**

R7 – State of the art report	30/08/2014 Delayed.
R8 – SWOT – analysis	30/08/2014 Ok

Partners realized their description of national scenarios on entrepreneurship strategies (including funding means, regulatory frameworks, infrastructures, education and culture). A SWOT analysis was carried out as well on national / regional policy, instruments and practices to support entrepreneurship. The final report on both issues was delivered at the beginning of October 2014. It is a thorough document, written with great care and completeness. During the Paris meeting, all partners reflected on the section “Conclusions and recommendations” and brought out some clues to improve C-EO’s implementation in the second year. Main findings were: there is not an ideal entrepreneurial environment. Every context in every country differs from each other. Moreover,

- To assess financial possibilities to stimulate entrepreneurs remains a big challenge;
- Simplification of entrepreneurial environment is also a big challenge; there is need to make it easier to become an entrepreneur;
- There should be a shift from entrepreneurship from ‘how to build up a company’ to entrepreneurial skills which are more soft (e.g. intrapreneurial skills like mind-set, having right motivation).

WP3 Profile of entrepreneurial coach **CECOA**

R9 – Profile Entrepreneurial coach	31/12/2014 Delayed
------------------------------------	--------------------

In order to prepare the profile, it was agreed during the meeting in Vicenza the realization of an enquiry in partner countries. A questionnaire was developed to be used with practitioners and stakeholders. The delivery of the questionnaire brought out many conceptual difficulties in filling it in. At the Paris meeting, a very long discussion took place, as to some partners it seemed that from the questionnaires already completed not many useful indications were coming. The decision taken was to consider beside the three translated profiles, two additional profiles from the projects Inside - Out and Intent. The results of the questionnaires have been used to control the profile, adjust it and also pre validate the final version with the stakeholder’s contributions. Nevertheless, the final WP3 report contains the «Outcome of the Questionnaire from each partners countries» and also the «Results of the Outcome of the Questionnaires from all partner countries». In the meanwhile, after the development of the profile, it was used in a focus group that partners realised also with key actors and experts, using a common template. Once again, the final WP3 report assembles the « Outcome of the

Focus Group in each partner country» as well as the «Synthesis Results Outcome of the Focus Groups». The focus of the new profile was set on intrapreneurial and entrepreneurial skills, while the training to test the profile was only on intrapreneurial skills. The profile completion was doubtlessly the most significant challenge for partners.

The working guidelines to realize the profile have been completed. The questionnaires application and analyses were done. The focus groups for the validation of the profile have been realised in IT, PT, FR, UK and NL.

WP4 Transfer workshop **NCFE**

R10- C-EO Training Programme for Entrepreneurial coach	31/12/2014 Delayed
R11 –Common Transfer Workshop	31/12/2014 Delayed

During the meeting in Paris (and considering the delay of profile completion) it was decided to postpone the training programme for entrepreneurial coach and the common transfer workshop till the end of February 2015, when these products have been presented during the extra meeting in the UK. The meeting in London (which actually took place in April) was almost completely dedicated to show and discuss the structure of the training programme, while the meeting in Lisbon was actually the transfer workshop, where partners tested the exercises to be used during the pilots.

WP5 National train the coach workshop **AGEFA**

R12- National Train-the-coach workshop	30/06/2015 Delayed
R24- Webportal for e-learning opportunities in the Train-the-coach workshop	30/09/2015 Cancelled

The national train the coach workshop was organised in I (29.10.15), NI (16.11.15), Pt (21.01.16) Uk and Fr (24.11.15). Partners adopted different ways to realise workshops, especially as for the part of the training to test. As an example, CPV involved 11 operators from the New enterprises Desk of the regional Chamber of Commerce, the Employment services of the Municipality of Vicenza and Youth Information Centers. The pilot was about Units 3 and 4 of the training and all in all 4 exercises were tested. As for AGEFA PME 6 people who work with youngsters were involved. The Units tested were 2 and 3, totalling 6 exercises. The workshop in the Netherlands was attended by just a few people, so KCH decided to transform it in a mainstreaming meeting and to organise another pilot in January 2016. In the Uk 2 pilots were realised, articulated in three sessions and focussed on Units 2 and 4. So, no matter for the delay, the National train-the-coach workshops covered all the 5 countries of the partnership and were able to involve stakeholders and key actors. Finally, CECO and ISQ involved 14 operators, trainers, counselors, coaching experts from Portugal. The Portuguese pilot tested the 4 training units, and covered 9 exercises. The training was promoted by the two Portuguese partners, on the 21 of January 2016. The training session was held in CECO facilities, during 1 day. The participants' evaluation was very positive.

The web portal for e-learning opportunities was substituted by training exercises that can be done online and off line. This change was authorised by the Dutch National Agency in an amendment.

WP6 Entrepreneurial passport **KCH**

R13- Entrepreneurial Passport	30/09/2015 Delayed
R25- Webtool for Entrepreneurial Passport	30/09/2015 Delayed

The entrepreneurial passport was finalised in December 2015. It provides employers and employees, trainers and trainees with a record of progress in key attributes of the learning outcomes of the entrepreneurial coach. It is structured in three parts:

1. A Biography of the Entrepreneurial coach experience in which assessees may record personal experiences and encounters that may have contributed to their (entrepreneurial) coaching development. Assesseees create their CV.
2. A Passport of the Entrepreneurial coach competences which summarily records all formally assessed learning outcomes;
3. A Dossier of Evidence of the Entrepreneurial coach competences in which assesseees may keep any documentary or recorded evidence of their progress and actual competence to date.

The web tool for the entrepreneurial passport was designed in the final weeks of the project. Under proposal from the lead partner, the entrepreneurial passport was transformed in electronic format, to be hosted in C-EO web site and made available for self filling in.

WP7 Quality assurance NCFE

R14- Quality Report	31/12/2013
R15- Interim and final evaluation report	30/09/2015

The external evaluator has been identified and cooperation with the C-EO partner responsible for quality securing has been set up. The external evaluator produced an interim note, at half of the project lifecycle. An overall document on quality securing was created by NCFE in 2014. Partners' appreciation on meetings and Wps' implementation were analysed (see beyond). This report is the external evaluator's final document.

WP8 Dissemination and exploitation ISQ

R16- Project website	31/03/2014 Ok
R17- Project (electronic) leaflet	30/09/2015 Ok
R18- Dissemination Plan	31/03/2014 Delayed.
R19- Dissemination Portfolio	30/09/2015 Delayed
R20- Exploitation Plan	31/03/2014 in R 18
R22- Mainstreaming committees	30/09/2015 Delayed
R23- Partnership communication platform	01/12/2013 Ok

The dissemination general plan has been uploaded in the platform and regularly updated. The DP was a reference document to guide partners' action to disseminate and valorize results and presented a general planning with roles and deadlines. Besides that, partners filled in a template with precise information on target groups, means and calendars. Although unevenly, partners have updated the original template with events and activities they have carried out. Exploitation plans (from partners) were uploaded in the platform, but their updating was uneven as well. R18 and R20 have been melted in one single document. and, as a matter of fact, it seems that exploitation and dissemination actions have had very similar characteristics. Moreover, partners have produced a Stakeholders Catalogue in which key actors and stakeholders at local and national level are identified. R16 has been done with some minor delays: it is a window web site and partners are aware that it should be used also

to communicate with the external world (<http://www.cfeo.eu/>). It contains general information on the project, dissemination material (the leaflets, the poster) and the C-EO profile. Mainstreaming committees have been created as well: they are groups of stakeholders and practitioners who have been involved in the dissemination and exploitation actions. These committees are formed in different ways according to partners. In some cases, their members are mainly from the same partner organisation, while in other cases they are from different bodies. Mainstreaming committees are a way to support project sustainability and the transferability of benefits produced.

R 19 was produced in several drafts and the final version was available on February 2016. It presents in a single document the products that were used in the dissemination activity: the web site, the logo, the flyers and the poster (in 5 languages) and the newsletter. The Portfolio is useful to have a comprehensive idea of the communication materials used by the partnership.

In the beginning of 2016 one number of a project newsletter was issued. It is a one page document on project outcomes and its purpose is to support project sustainability.

Although it was not foreseen by the project, at the end of C-EO an analytical report was produced by the partner ISQ on the results of the dissemination and exploitation actions. For more information on these see beyond.

WP9 Project management	KCH	
R16- Project identity and logo		31/03/2014 Ok
R1 - Meeting Agenda's and Minutes		31/10/2015 Ok
R3 - Interim and final reports		31/10/2015 Ok
R21- Final conference		30/09/2015 Delayed

The activity of project management was carried out appropriately and in due time. Periodical surveys on Wps' completion showed partners' satisfaction on the way C-EO was managed. All planned outputs were realised according to schedules. Minutes were always available immediately after the meetings.

Partners' appreciation.

The Quality plan was produced by NCFE in spring 2014, with a few months of delay. It contains the strategy to assure quality to project implementation and the modalities to make internal and external evaluation complementary.

One of the tasks of internal evaluation included into the Quality plan was to monitor regularly the opinions partners had on meetings and on the realisation of WPs. Opinions were collected through the delivery of a questionnaire, which investigates topics like the achievement of meeting objectives, the structure, content and delivery of the project, the clarification of tasks, and the work methodology. There is also a section on partners' contribution, on mutual understanding and on logistic aspects (accommodation, meeting location, timing).

Here, a few indications referring to the first three Steering Committee meetings (Ede, Vicenza and Paris) are summed up.

The kick off meeting was appreciated by participants, who had an overall opinion of it in terms of *Excellent* and *Very good*. In particular, all partners rated the structure, content and delivery of the meeting to be *Excellent* 75 (%). The effectiveness of content and appropriate range and balance of activities as well had very high judgement: appropriate content, clearly

related to the aims and objectives of the project scored 87,5 % of Excellent and there was no negative remark. Also logistic issue were fairly appreciated, and the input into the meeting by the project partner was considered relevant by most of participants. Transnational partnership is deemed to commit to the project and the KOM seemed to have developed trust and positive attitude.

As well, the overall appreciation on the meeting in Vicenza was *Excellent to Very Good*. In particular, all partners rated the structure, content and delivery of the meeting *Excellent, Very good and Good* and the same was for effectiveness of content and appropriate range and balance of activities. Practical and domestic arrangements were ok and the input into the meeting by project partners was mainly Excellent. Links between the aims of the meeting and the overall aims of the project proved to be evident, especially as far as the mutual understanding and the clear evidence of real synergy with the overall objectives of the project are regarded. Transnational cooperation was esteemed committed in the project and overall atmosphere is good.

As for the meeting in Paris, again the structure, content and delivering of the meeting were highly appreciated (Excellent or good) especially referring to the evidence of clear planning and the appropriate representation of partners. The effectiveness of content and the balance of activities was esteemed good, especially for the relevant mixture of working activities. The social program was excellent for 57,1 % of respondents. The quality of practical arrangements was ok, excepting for the suitability of the working venue (1 fair). The input to the meeting by project partners was good for all the items. Particularly appreciated was the quality of documents, presentations and working materials. As well, the links between the aims of the meeting and those of the project were evident to all. As a consequence, the cooperation in the transnational partnership seemed good in most cases and excellent for the development of trust and positive attitudes. Communication between partners got the highest score, while the whole meeting as such was highly appreciated.

The final conference was evaluated as well and 23 persons out of 27 participants expressed their opinions. The overall appreciation was high, as some 60 % of respondents liked the conference in general, as well as the format and the logistic aspects. As for the workshops, the most appreciated was "Entrepreneurship for social inclusion" followed by "From the Yebisu perspective". As for comments, they were all positive, concentrating on technical aspects (location, format, facilitators), on content issues (the three workshops, the profile, the training, EQF) and on good possibilities for networking.

Dissemination and exploitation.

According to the terms of reference contained in the project, dissemination and exploitation activities were considered central to make C-EO implementation a success and to support the improvement of strategies to support entrepreneurship in partner countries. The dissemination was considered the activity for spreading wide and far project outcomes, while exploitation was a process leading to the transfer of benefits into the working routines of policy makers, organisations and companies, bringing a real change in the lives of individuals and influencing systems and policies. Considering this remarkable role, a specific section of this report is dedicated to dissemination results, besides the paragraphs already focussed on WP 8.

The results of the dissemination and exploitation activity are presented and analysed in a document produced in February 2016. It is a very rich text which introduces a dissemination activity overview, an exploitation catalogue of stakeholder, an overview of exploitation key actions and activities and a section on national mainstreaming committees. Hyperlinks connect the text to documents and dissemination tools that are uploaded either in the project platform or in partners' web sites. Actions are distinguished as for their level, i.e local / national or European wide. Dissemination actions are clustered in five categories: Information events, capacity building, development of promotional material, creating synergies with other projects and initiatives, and stakeholders' meetings. For each partner, the document lists information and data on events realised. The picture emerging from the document is impressive for the quality and quantity of dissemination and exploitation events. All partners have spread information on the C-EO project and its results and have involved key actors and stakeholder, building links and networks.

Summing up the information contained in the document, C-EO has envisaged and realised several types of dissemination and exploitation actions:

Information through the web; the web site was available from the first year of project lifecycle. Besides a part that contains documents (download area), it contains all the information on the project, its results and main outcomes. Partners' institutional sites had information on the project as well.

Organisation of focus groups with practitioners. In order to have quality feedback during the construction of the profile, in all partner countries focus groups were organised. Information provided, though not always homogeneous, was useful to fine tune the profile and design the training.

Organisation of national train-the-coach workshops to raise awareness in practitioners and policy; all planned national seminars have been organised. In general, appreciation was very good and participants provided for quality feedback that was useful for fine-tuning project outputs.

Organisation of a final transnational conference and of national dissemination events in some partner countries; several dissemination events were realised to spread information on the project and its outcomes. Two national seminars were organized in Portugal: in October 2015 and January 2016. The Portuguese seminars were promoted in CECOIA facilities, having as target national stakeholders and key actors. Those two events were organized under the umbrella of the National network RSO PT, a corporate social responsibility network, the «Entrepreneurship responsible group». CECOIA also presented a paper about the profile at the Ciem 2015 Conference (Conferência Ibérica de Empreendedorismo) in October 2015. In November 2015 CECOIA promoted the project during a Peddy Paper organized in Lisbon and did a presentation at Universidade Europeia for BA Management students (Governance models).

The final transnational conference was organised on January 28th 2016 involving the envisaged targets. In particular, it was attended by 27 persons: besides partners, stakeholders were invited from Pt, F, Uk and I. Dutch practitioners were present as well. The conference was articulated in a general presentation of the project; three workshops (organised in a way that participants could attend them all) were set up to show project results. The first was about the question "How entrepreneurial are you ?" and focussed on the diagnostic tools and the profile. The second was about the "Yebisu project and EQF", having as mains focus the

sustainability of C-EO training materials. The third workshop was about “Entrepreneurship and social inclusion”.

The conference allowed C-EO to exploit results sharing them with practitioners, policy makers and key actors. It also allowed stakeholders comment on C-EO outcomes and on the specific characteristic of the entrepreneurial coach.

Use of (multimedia) communication tools; as said, C-EO produced several communication tools that were used both in paper and in electronic format. The leaflet, one issue of the project newsletter, a teaser, the poster were able to support the staff with a rich and entertaining set of tools that stimulated awareness on the project and its results.

As already noted, the catalogue of stakeholders is a very useful tool to continue the dissemination and exploitation actions. Each partner (with the exception of NCFE) produced a list of key actors, containing the organisation, the contact person, the type of stakeholder, the relevance for the project and type of involvement. These catalogues are very useful lists of selected contacts and may be used after project’s end to support C-EO sustainability.

The exploitation actions Report as well describes a very rich mix of activities that partners set up to exploit project benefits. Though comparatively less in number if compared to dissemination actions, exploitation was anyway dealt with appropriateness and consistency.

As a conclusion referring to dissemination and exploitation, the program of sensitisation and valorisation of the project and its results was carried out without distorting its original aims and characteristics. Targets that were identified were addressed, involved and stimulated to provide comments and feedbacks. Their suggestions contributed to develop the final outcomes of the project and the proposals C-EO made for improving strategies for entrepreneurship in the EU.

Evaluation questions.

Having commented the project implementation by analysing results produced in the project life cycle and considered the appreciation of partners for meetings and their outcomes, let us try to answer the evaluation questions we have identified at the beginning of the project.

1. **relevance:** “Are project outcomes relevant with reference to the Lifelong learning Programme objectives ?”; “Are results able to create benefits for end users ?”

A first point to mention is that at the end of the project all planned outputs were realised. While the first year was dedicated (as the approved project planned) to preparatory activities such as the survey on partners’ countries situations on policy for entrepreneurship, in the second year partners used the results of this investigation to produce the profile, design the training materials and test them. The final comparative report presents in a thorough way the current state of implementation of policies for entrepreneurship in partners’ countries, some highlights on national legislations and permeability conditions, the state of learning outcome, success factors, challenges and constraints.

In the second year, results (especially the profile and the training) were confronted with the opinion of stakeholders and key actors, during focus groups, national pilots and the final conference. Their feedback testifies interest and possibility to factively use outputs in the working routines of teachers, trainers and coaches. Another point to mention is that the link with the target group (trainers and coaches who work with unemployed persons, seniors and youngsters) seemed more evident for those stakeholders who normally work with youngsters. Anyway, all pilots underlined positive elements in the project results.

2. **efficiency:** “Have tasks been divided amongst partners in a balanced and efficient way?”

Throughout project implementation, no one among partners behaved as a silent partner. This means that all partners accomplished their tasks according to plans, with a partial redefinition of tasks for the profile design. This testifies the commitment of partners, but also the correct redistribution of the workload according to partners’ skills, that led to the completion of results. The mutual trust between partners proved consolidated, as the appreciation questionnaires have shown. On the other hand, it was clear that project activities tended to concentrate when partnership meetings were approaching. Moreover, some outputs were produced late, thus slowing down all the partnership. In particular, the production of the profile has encountered several difficulties, making it necessary to partially change the operational strategy to realise it. This slowed the production of the national workshops and the pilot training. An amendment was necessary to complete all results and to redefine some of the outputs. The production of the C-EO profile proved to be very challenging. As there was need for an extra meeting, it seems that the budget will be completely spent.

3. **sustainability:** “Are the network or the outputs going to survive the project life cycle?”

The communication actions for awareness raising and for demand support have been planned and realised. They are crucial for making outputs survive the project life cycle. The project identity has been developed, flyers have been designed and translated in partner languages, posters and a teaser have been produced.

During the second year of the project, several dissemination actions were realised, such as the events in Lisbon or the mainstreaming workshop in the Netherlands. The final conference was as well an occasion to spread information on the project’s outcomes and results. Generally speaking, it seems that partners will definitely continue to use the training materials in their working routines: in fact, the pilots were successful and feedback from participants always positive. The profile as well - or parts of it - could possibly be exploited in the future. Sustainability of the profile and training depends also on the characteristics of the coach profession in partner countries. As it was evident during the survey and in the profile construction stage, the professional contents and tasks of the coach may vary greatly in different contexts.

As for the web site (<http://www.cfeo.eu/>), it has been done, but it was used only as a window for the external world, in a static way. Moreover, it has to be stated that the use of the

communication platform (Redbooth), was not efficient and user friendly. In fact, partners were not keen to use the platform intensively and the email channel was still predominantly used to exchange information and documents.

4. **transferability:** “Are the methodology and project best practices easy to be transferred in different context/countries, and what are the adaptations required ?”

The dissemination and exploitation plan dealt also with transferability, as project results have to be adopted by partner organisations. Actually, this action already started with the adaptation and translation of the module for certification of entrepreneur, the profile of entrepreneurial teacher and the training referential for entrepreneurial competence. The hard work of adaptation of the original profiles (which followed the results of the survey and of the questionnaires) made a final output that has been tested with practitioners in 5 countries. This allows to say that C-EO profile can now be used in other contexts. A new impulse for transferability came from the realisation of the common transfer workshop, and from the pilots, in which stakeholders were involved. In Portugal, CECO and ISQ will promote the transferability of the training course for the entities of the National network RSO PT, a corporate social responsibility network (planning informative actions even after the end of the project). Moreover, the final conference was also an occasion to spread the project and its results. Practitioners who attended it had very positive feedbacks on the profile and on the training.

5. **innovation:** “To what extent project results contribute at innovating the state of the art on the subjects tackled by the project ?”

The profile and the training materials are innovative, as they have been developed for this occasion. In particular, the profile was developed taking into account the characteristics and content of other profiles realised within other projects. Their usefulness has been underlined during the pilots. Moreover, innovation seems linked to the concrete development of a holistic approach towards a new professional figure to support enterprises. Besides that, as the comparative report on national surveys has shown, project actions (especially related to the adaptation and transfer of existing profiles and to the design of the new entrepreneurial coach profile) fit in the European policies and efforts to support existing enterprises and new created ones with skills and services to support creativity and innovation. A specific reference may be done to the EU flagship Initiatives that implement the Europa 2020 Agenda, like Innovation Union and New skills for new jobs.

In addition to that, in consideration of the ex post perspective adopted for evaluation, we consider here two more dimensions:

6. **impact:** “To what extent project results will be used by end users and by regional and national competent bodies ?” “What is the impact on partners organisations ?”

As usual, it is difficult to say if project results will be used by end users and by regional and national competent bodies. This will be seen after project end and in the following months. Anyway, during the pilots, partners have started to use part of the training materials developed during the project. Moreover, the activities carried out so far indicate some elements of impact on partner organisation. First of all, to realise the policy analysis involved

partners made an in-depth insight referring to the situation in their countries regarding activities, regulatory framework, infrastructures and funding to support enterprises. This has certainly improved their knowledge of the field in which companies operate and has concretely prepared the transfer stage. Second of all, as the SWOT analysis showed, partners have now clear the many challenges that should be overcome to implement C-EO outputs in a steady way. Third, the involvement of stakeholders and key actors in pilots has cleared the expectations they have from this project's results. The pilots at national level have shown to partners which part of the main results (i.e. profile and training) is more appropriate to be further used and developed locally. Finally, the quality and quantity of dissemination and exploitation actions allowed the involvement of many key persons and stakeholders. As appreciation was always high, it can be envisaged impact on training policies for entrepreneurship and on methodologies for coaching.

8. **transnational cooperation:** "To what extent are the products a result of common activities ?", "Are they shared by the Partners ?", "Can they influence Entrepreneurial Education in Europe ?".

Final results have seen the contribution of all partners, who acted according to plans and performed scheduled actions (although with some delays). The results of the policy analysis, the preparatory stages for realising the profile of entrepreneurial coach, the dissemination and exploitation plan preparation and implementation, the development of the profile and the training materials have seen the active involvement of all partners. Roles in the partnership have been fixed at project inception and responsibilities have been respected in general, though roles in developing the profile were partially modified. The Entrepreneurial Coach profile has the potential to improve the quality of training offer to support entrepreneurial culture and practice, as pilots have clearly showed.

Final conclusions.

At the end of the project life cycle, C-EO partnership proved able to realise planned outputs and results. The overall schedule of the project has been respected with minor changes (in terms of results to produce) and this testifies the hard work for the realisation of second year activities. The second half of the project was really a challenge for the implementation staff: as a matter of fact, C-EO completion implied the realisation of activities that proved to be more complex than expected, especially the profile and the training. Moreover, the involvement of stakeholders and key actors was intensified and made more concrete in the second half of the project, thanks to an intense and capillary activity of dissemination and exploitation.

Having said that, the external evaluation final judgement is articulated in the following points:

First of all, internal and external communication activities could have been more incisive and smart if the project web site was used in a different way. Ever since it was available, it was used as a window towards the external world and interaction with other organisations not belonging to the partnership was rather limited. Moreover, it was evident that the Redbooth platform could not substitute a web site as a communication tool. Without a very active and dynamic use of the project web site the communication potential of the partnership was concentrated to the events, to the national seminars and to the conference in Ede.

Besides that, internal communication was from time to time fragmented, as the interaction between partners was concentrated in the meetings, which represented a “peak” in the activity of the partnership, but were followed by long periods of silence. Two on-line meetings were organised, but maybe more occasions to interact would have eased the whole process.

Despite these two points, dissemination and exploitation actions were varied and rich. The involvement of stakeholders and enterprise key actors brought out very interesting feedbacks and contributions to the finalisation of the profile and training, although the number of participants to workshops and focus groups was uneven between partner countries. The sustainability of C-EO benefits depends also on the capacity to spread information on results and outputs. Referring to that, it has to be underlined that dissemination and exploitation activities were far-reaching and plentiful, producing great quantity of feedbacks. This is a very positive point in terms of sustainability and transferability of benefits.

Finally, if we turn to the most outstanding results of the project - that is to say the profile and the training - we may consider to what extent they have been innovative and what is their added value comparing to existing profiles and training approaches. Probably this answer can be linked to three key concepts. The first is flexibility of the approach. C-EO's way is multi disciplinar and blended, in the sense that the approach combines different training methods (at presence, on line) as well as contents, since the skills in the profile are mainly soft skills. This increases the level of transferability to other economical sectors and territories, with no need for massive adaptation. Flexibility is a strong point also if we turn to the project's target group (coaches who work with unemployed persons, aged people and youngsters), as these coaches may find in C-EO's results new tools to support those who find it difficult to enter or remain in the labour market.

The second key concept is the relation between entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship skills. This relation is one of the outstanding characteristics of the project because - as the pilots and

the focus groups with stakeholders already showed - it allows adaptation of the profile and of the learning material to the characteristics of a particular coach or a group of coaches. This is with no doubt an innovative element which can contribute to the sustainability of the benefits produced.

The third key concept is about the potential for further development. Most likely, the potential is high: as emerged clearly in the dissemination events in Portugal (two national seminars, the Peddy Paper, the Conferência Ibérica de Empreendedorismo, etc), in the national workshop in all countries and in the final conference in Ede, there are many environments related to entrepreneurship and training with which cooperation potential is promising. As an example, certification systems for trainers (and coaches), the networks of professionals and the programs to develop entrepreneurship.

In conclusion, potential for further development is high as the profile and the training program are wide and extensive enough to be understood and applied (even partially) by all the partner countries of C-EO.