



Quality report for RSGAE

There have been a total of nine evaluations of partner meetings and four evaluations of the overall partnership by the QM. All files have been uploaded onto GD: quality > evaluation; including the blank questionnaires that partners were asked to complete.

The collection of replies was either at the end of a meeting when the QM was present or by email/Moodle when the QM was absent. However, as all blank templates were available to partners, the QM also invited replies by email at every evaluation. The replies of the partners were confidential. The overall project evaluations were carried out about every six months.

Main themes:

There are three main themes that are apparent from the collected data:

1) The overall workload:

Many partners felt lost due to the amount of work/tasks that had to be carried out. Partners mentioned that they were not aware at the start of the project how much commitment from them was needed and had difficulties to fit in the project's workload into their daily jobs. The presentation by the IT team at the last partner meeting gave an insight on the vast amount of files that were dealt with; both the new and the old (previous projects) material.

2) Deadlines:

Due to the amount of files that were created to be put online and the time span that was needed in order to find a suitable IT partner the deadlines were altered; for example, the testing only started after the summer break which left very little time to collect enough data and use the results of the testing in order to amend the content of the online material. Not all partners had finished creating the material, so that they were faced with two jobs at the same time: finishing the materials and starting to test it.

On a related note of amended deadlines it was a lot harder for the QM to commit to the project after the summer break as she had been successful in securing funding for new EU projects (Erasmus+ KA2 - Strategic Partnerships) and as a coordinator had to spend a lot of time on these new projects. Thanks to the Spanish team in assisting with the testing phase it was still possible to meet the objectives of the project's application.

3) Communication:

The size of the partnership was both its asset and its challenge. The amount of partners had a lot to contribute to the project and the feedback on the partner meetings is very positive. But as the *whole* partnership to meet only at the start and at the end of the project's cycle it felt more like working with different groups (based on work packages) rather than a partnership. For example, the QM was much more familiar with the Social Care package as she attended all meetings than the other WPs.

The virtual meetings did not work as there were often technical challenges and it became clear that these were not the same as face to face meetings. The communication via Moodle did also not replace the meetings as some partners had not used Moodle before and needed



more support than just written correspondence. Some partners were overloaded with the information that was posted on Moodle and GD. The challenge was specifically hard for all the newcomers to the projects who had to familiarise themselves with the material before they were able to start designing their own.

The coordinator was also not as much available as he would have liked, but his presentation at the last project meeting showed his qualities as a coordinator by admitting certain weaknesses rather than covering up. This was appreciated by the partnership. This shortcoming was not as negative as it could have been as the QM and the Spanish team were able to assist in an active way with the overall coordination of the project.

Concluding remarks:

Despite these challenges partners felt proud at the end that the objectives of the project's application were met and that we have a lot to offer on our project website. There was also a huge interest to continue with this project in a follow-on project; which is always an important indicator of quality assurance. Very appropriately one partner mentioned on the evaluation form: "*Hard work, but great results. Let's do that again!*"

The vast scope of this project is apparent when one reads the summary: *The project produced language material with vocational content in eight languages (Estonian, Finnish, Hungarian, Italian, Polish, Spanish, Swedish and Turkish) to several sectors (general and cultural, vehicle, tourism and hotel, restaurant and kitchen as well as social and health care).*

Individual partner meeting evaluation:

- *November 2013 – Espoo – Finland – first partner meeting – 15 participants:*
Positive evaluation of this first meeting; for example, setting the scene and explaining the website of the previous project and GD. Partners appreciated the hands on sessions and the group work. Some criticism (weakness) about the time management was balanced by a lot of examples of strength of the project.
- *March 2014 – Eger – Hungary – General & Tourism WP – 6 participants:*
There is evidence that partners are confused about the prototype, but some issues were able to get clarified, but not too many additional comments have been added. The cooperation between partners was mentioned.
- *May 2014 – Rovaniemi – Finland – Social Care WP – 10 participants:*
Comments were added to the open questions. Partners were happy with this meeting overall as it gave a chance to clarify a lot of issues and plan ahead for the future design of materials for the WP. Partners were already critical in relation to time management and quality of communication.



- *June 2014 – Eger – Hungary – Vehicle WP – 4 participants:*
Hardly any additional comments, but overall positive feedback; all yes replies to questions.
- *October 2014 – Tartu – Estonia – Social Care WP – 10 participants:*
There were plenty of additional comments; the group work during this meeting was valued by partners in order to achieve progress. Many joint decisions were taken and issues were clarified. Overall majority of yes replies to the questions.
- *April 2015 – Alicante – Spain – Social Care WP – 12 participants:*
Positive evaluation of all questions and plenty of additional comments are evident. The peer review was appreciated. Testing and the final report also featured as part of this meeting. There was a critical attitude towards time management, missed deadlines and the absence of the coordinator. But a lot of positive comments in the “strength” area seem to keep a balance. There is no doubt looking at the comments that the meeting was very beneficial to the partnership.
- *November 2015 – Istanbul – Turkey – Vehicle WP – 4 participants:*
Participants benefitted from working together at this meeting and clarifying issues together. But as the IT partner was not recruited yet, some questions remained unanswered and participants were affected by this. Support by key partners (Mika, Marian & Kristin) was offered as support in form of a Skype call. But it would have been better if one of these could have attended the meeting.
- *February 2015 – Gothenburg – Sweden – General & TS WP – 6 participants:*
Some comments were added and it seems that this meeting was important for the newcomers, the coordinator’s presence was beneficial and a lot of issues were clarified. There is an overall positive evaluation of the meeting by the project partners.
- *November 2015 – Florence – Italy – last meeting – 22 participants:*
Plenty of comments by partners, some critical, but overall positive reflection on partner meeting. Criticism would have been lack of information on dissemination plan and cancellation of invited guests at the launch, but overall majority of yes votes.

Overall project evaluation combining four reports: please see separate file.

April 2014 (12 participants); Nov 2014 (13 participants); April 2015 (13 participants) and Nov 2015 (21 participants) > there is a total of 59 replies in the combined report.