

Project product number: R 7

E u r o p e a n
U n i o n
Communications

External Evaluation Report of the project Euro Crafts 21
(LLP-LDV/TOI-08-AT-0015)

Paul Carroll M.Sc.,
Project evaluation expert / Vocational teacher,
EU-Communications,
Repokatu 13,
15950 Lahti,
Finland
Tel: +358 41 4645092
E-mail : euc@irishnation.fi

Introduction

In my capacity as impartial external evaluator of this project I was committed to both participating in part of the proceedings and providing a constructive critical contribution, as well as to presenting this written evaluation summary. In it the internal evaluation will be commented on, alongside the work organisation, the project implementation and the resulting products. I hope, in addition to all these, to call attention to aspects of what I perceive as the wider impact of euro crafts 21, such as the additional benefits to partners that became evident over the course of the project. This report represents one product in its own right, one which can be taken as a structured summary of what was carried out, for what purpose and to benefit whom, while not neglecting the underlying assessment of how successfully this has all been achieved over the project period of the past two years. While the comments below are my own (with the exception of those received and reported directly from involved individuals through written or verbal means), and therefore subjective in nature, I have applied here a lot of what I have learned and experienced over many years involved with vocational education, project management and evaluation. It is therefore hoped that a fair and impartial approach has been acquired on my part and that I have managed to apply it here and bring some degree of useful insight for the benefit of euro crafts 21 and all those involved.

Contents

	Page no.
The partnership and work organisation	3
The overall evaluation process	5
Comments on internal evaluation	
A summary of the results of a questionnaire	
The interviews of a selection of partners	
The final state of the Euro crafts 21 Qualification and consulting concept tool	8
How a hypothetical new user would react to the tool	
Summary of the pros and cons of the tool	
Comments on other products	10
The implementation report	
The brochure	
Additional publications	
Transfer of innovation achieved	12
Reflections /discussion	12
Final word	13
Annexes:	
1. Questionnaire form	
2. Interview outline	
3. Summary of comments	

The partnership and work organisation

The partnership of euro crafts 21 can be summarized as consisting of a central group of organisations who are acquainted through former fruitful cooperation in one or two forerunner projects, together with a couple of new partners. The size of the partnership was ideal for achieving the project objectives, neither being too large and thereby difficult to manage centrally, nor too small to lose any true transfer of innovation character. There was a good geographic distribution of partners, although not alone the sign of a good project it is a positive feature when these organisations are also varied in type but all involved and interested in aspects of the project theme. Involved in the partnership were the main actors in the original German development of innovation project, therefore providing a sound experience basis on which to build further. Since these partners were joined by strategic new ones we had here, in fact, the ideal situation from which to implement a transfer of innovation project, having both sufficient previous knowledge of the topic, and partners motivated to expand on what had been previously achieved.

The meeting in Kuopio, Finland on the (25th &) 26th of March 2010, the second day of which was attended by myself, at the same time in practise marking the beginning of external evaluation process. This helped me to become familiar with both the different participants in euro crafts 21 and with the workings of the project. It became clear already at this stage that the project in question was one with dedicated and motivated partners who themselves all appeared to have a real interest in producing and using the results. There was a lot of focus on the state of development of the website, taking it further than originally planned in that it was decided to make the central tool product (originally only planned in CD-ROM form) available by the end of the project also in internet form with downloading of the contents possible. The technical aspects of this process had been designed by the Finnish partner availing of student involvement, with the material situated in the server of Kuopio Institute of Design and until it was changed in the last month of the project to the public site, partners worked from their internet address. It is a credit to the local partners facilitating this arrangement, as well as a good indication that the management of euro craft 21 was prepared to adapt and go to extra efforts to offer a more practical solution, clearly increasing potential usership of the final products greatly.

By all accounts the meeting in Trencin went ahead satisfactorily as planned and the results were well documented in the minutes. There was a lot of attention paid to agreeing on the elements still missing in order for the project objectives to be completed and although the deadlines were initially fixed, these were adjusted after it became apparent that the date for the final meeting in Vienna would be wiser to postpone towards later the project period. This was a good decision from two points of view: firstly, it demonstrates a high degree of flexibility in the cooperation between the promoters/coordinators and partners in guaranteeing the most favourable timetabling conditions in order to achieve results, then secondly the postponement decision should lead to an improved final meeting in that more of the products will be ready by that date and the emphasis would then not be on worrying about what is missing, but rather on finalising and optimising the overall valorisation process.

The final meeting of the project in Vienna on the 11th and 12th of November had a well structured division of presentations and a review of tasks needed to be undertaken before

completion. It would have been useful if time had permitted to run through the complete version of the CD-ROM, with perhaps each partner drawing attention to the sections they were responsible for producing. It is understandable that this was not possible and it has to be trusted that in using the material in the future, for example in training, that the opportunity will be availed of for each to familiarise themselves with the contributions of other partners.

The Vienna meeting was partly dedicated to preparing for the event of the first evening for stakeholders. This focus was interesting as it is important that no project team should become too introverted and absorbed with the nitty-gritty details of any project for its own merits, but always looking outwards at the wider public, the users and stakeholders. The timing, therefore, was very appropriate, especially as regards the production of the CD-ROMs: in the daytime meeting they were presented to the partners in their final form for the first time, then in the evening they went out to the first group of stakeholders, in other words fresh off the printing press directly to the target groups.

The working atmosphere at the meetings attended by the external evaluator (and the impression obtained from the minutes of the other meetings) was efficiently organised, but in a relaxed way. The meeting could be described as very hardworking and thorough. The task of giving presentations was well distributed and everyone seems to have had their turn to provide input at some stage. The venues and practical organisational details were all well carried out. At times it was observed that the main focus was allowed to slip temporarily with side exchanges going on related to project topics, this did not get out of control and at no stage was the plot lost at meeting, but it was more an indication of the distributed sharing of responsibility where promoter and coordinator roles were represented by different people and then the main emphasis on the sustainable management aspects in handicrafts came from the German partners via the original Development of Innovation project. I would at times have liked to see a clearer division between what was a decision being made (after which to proceed with the next point) and what was intended as a discussion. The way it was carried out was still very good, only resulting at times perhaps in longer meetings than intended, with some topics getting a disproportionate amount of attention.

Meetings were held with suitable frequency to be able to assure the maintenance of a certain dynamism, in other words, so that partners were not likely to get out of touch with the overall progress. An adjustment was made for budgetary reasons from the original plan, with the result that no meeting was held in Wuppertal, Germany. The implementation did not appear to have suffered from this omission.

In between meetings there was a good system in place whereby project implementation tasks were classified as either completed or still "to do" as the case may be. This was both sent to the partners as a reminder periodically and made available on the internal, partners only, section of the website. The latter, however, was observed not to have been particularly well kept up to date at all times, but nevertheless the overall system allowed partners access to a helpful reminder of what they should be doing and what would need to be achieved by when.

The overall evaluation process

The evaluation period started as of second day of the plenary meeting in Kuopio, Finland (March 26th 2010) and was completed at the practical end of the project, just before submission of the final report at the end of 2010. In keeping with the principles of best practise in evaluation it was attempted to be as impartial as possible at all times. This included observing and noting the activities of the project management, then reporting my own interpretations rather than directly reporting things from their perspective. For this reason also the questionnaire was not demanded of the central project contractor and coordinator individuals, nor were they interviewed subsequently.

In order to facilitate evaluation full access was given to the internal area of the project homepage, and I was also included in the e-mailing list with all info going out to partners.

External evaluation consisted of:

- a review of the internal evaluation process
- attendance at 2 meetings with presentations given
- evaluation of the complete range of products produced at different stages
- implementation of two partner surveys; a questionnaire and an interview
- attendance at the final stakeholder event in Vienna
- writing of this report to be presented as a project product (no. R7)

Comments on internal evaluation

The methodology and results of the internal evaluation of euro crafts 21 were made available to the external evaluator and a review of the different aspects and findings from this is given below. The purpose of this review is as follows:

- in order to ensure that internal evaluation was carried out systematically
- to be able to assess if feedback was carried out in order to get honest and genuine comments, rather than only polite answers
- to determine if evaluation feedback was taken aboard leading to concrete action

Internal evaluation centred around the completion of feedback forms at each of the 6 partner meetings. This consisted of a form with numeric grading of opinions on items from the perceived success of the meeting and understanding of the central concepts, to clarity of the management process. There was a good range of questions and it satisfied the condition of being fast easy to respond to.

It was very useful to see the summaries of the results of this self-evaluation feedback presented at meetings where results of the previous 2 meetings were put side by side for easy comparison. Partners were then able to see a development in certain issues as the project progressed. Although it appears that almost entirely only scores of 1 and 2 were given, indicating a range from very successful /clear to fairly much so, it still tells us something useful about how satisfaction developed. The final point referring to *Project success* is interesting as it can refer to either how satisfied the person responding is at that stage with what has been done, or in absolute terms about how they see the overall targets as having been reached.

The whole process of evaluation has the extra merit of providing the right to participate by giving feedback, so this was very systematically performed and therefore can be regarded as a good thing.

In addition to this systematic gathering of feedback from participating partners on project progress and meetings there was a variety of evaluation exercises performed in association with different stakeholder events, such as the Finnish trainers' /users' feedback on the draft CD-ROM layout and contents, also the participant feedback from the final event in Vienna was such an internal evaluation element.

It was important to establish a link between internal and external evaluation within the framework of the entire quality control process. In this way both kinds of evaluation ideally combine to give maximum results. By the final stage of the project I can clearly state that the management (coordinator and contractor) paid quite much attention to the initial external evaluation comments. The selection of comments from the questionnaire (annex 3) were read followed in detail, as was apparent at the time of the final meeting. Some aspects of comments on how the use of the tool might be improved were not fully adapted, but this is understandable due to how the work for this part was under the main responsibility of one of the partners, with other transnational partners being responsible for most of the content aspects.

A summary of the results of a questionnaire sent to the partners in spring 2010

On 18/5/2010 a questionnaire was sent to all project partners, with the intention to get feedback on various aspects of the relevance of contents and effectiveness of implementation of euro crafts 21. For optimal benefit responses were sound on an individual rather than on a partner organisation basis.

Answers were received from 13 individuals. Several participants went to the trouble of writing quite detailed comments, which was a very helpful thing. While a small number gave the "best" score of a) on all points and this may well be how they really feel, there was more insight to true opinions to be gained from those who gave a variety of scores to each different section.

The questionnaire form is enclosed as an annex (1) and a summary of results as annex (2) of this report. In order to maintain impartiality Christopher Manstein of Factor 10 Institute Austria and Sylvie Brenzel of Plenum Austria were not asked to fill in the questionnaire. Also in keeping with best practice in such things, when reporting feedback the names of the individuals answering were not revealed, thus maintaining anonymity. Just to briefly state the main answering trend: All partners without exception answered to question 4 that they thought they had themselves up to the date of responding to the questionnaire done enough ("all that was expected") in the project. Also it was unanimously agreed that (Q. 6) "communication in the project flows well and freely in all directions", this is therefore clearly a very good aspect of euro crafts 21 and plays a major role in assuring successful achievement of the objectives. There also seems to be a high level of confidence that the "results will live on after the project is over and spread beyond the countries of the partnership".

Regarding the question about the website, nearly half of those who responded felt that they do not use it enough (it was not specified at the time whether it was the public website of the tool, but just in general). This point was checked again on a smaller scale at the time of the final meeting in the interviews carried out, and the answers appeared more favourable as the website development was then nearer completion.

The only mildly worrying aspect arising from this survey was under question 9 regarding stakeholder involvement, here the largest number (5) responded choosing the c option “There has not yet been enough response to our efforts at dissemination.....”, but since this answer continues “but we are trying and hope to be more successful with involving stakeholders soon” there is a high likelihood that this situation will improve in many cases in the time remaining in the project, especially since the products are becoming more available in different language versions and in a useable form. This part also led to the highest number of comments being written and these can be read (in English translation where necessary) in annex 3. It should also be pointed out that this point was brought to the attention of the promoter and coordinator prior to the meeting in Slovakia, allowing it to be addressed in good time. Finally, the “prize” for the most active participation in the questionnaire goes to the Kuopio Academy of Design, with 4 individuals answering, indicating a high level of motivation and interest in the quality of the project, well done.

The interviews of a selection of partners around the final meeting dates

An interview of a very qualitative nature was carried out in an around the date of the final meeting and final event in Austria (see form of which it was based as annex 2). This was less rigidly structured than the earlier questionnaire, encouraging useful freestyle comments to be received. It was intended to interview a cross-section of the project partners and as it turned out answers were obtained from six individuals from 5 organisations.

In summary I can confidently say that there were very positive feelings about the project and those involved were glad to share their views. One had not completed the earlier questionnaire.

As a whole, the project was stated to have lived up (and even exceeded) the expectations of them all, in one case where the person had not known what to expect from euro crafts 21 it was as they entered at a later stage than most and added that they proceeded to learn a lot about eco-innovation and vocational education.

Regarding the timetable question, there were mixed feeling. Overall lost time had been made up for, in several cases it involved an extra effort and there were some internal organisational difficulties to cope with and overcome. At the final stage in which these interviews were held all partners seemed to have completed the majority of tasks and none anticipated any stress or rush in submitting contributions for the final report

When asked if new users or beneficiaries had been identified towards the later project stages, three mentioned that they found it better to stick to the piloting organisations during the project period, either for simplicity or because it seemed that the “best” partners were already involved. The others emphasised that the outcomes of euro crafts 21 have been taken on as a welcome part of their normal offering to their enterprise customers. Linked to this was the final question of how difficult it was to get stakeholders involved, to which the answers varied across the range from easier to harder. My conclusion is that this kind of thing depends very much on the type and sector of partner organisation and whether their normal role is to serve enterprises directly or to provide education to those who later deal with enterprises.

At the end of the interview time was allowed for free commenting and the following things were mentioned:

- more translation costs should have been made available in the budget for partners from smaller language groups
- the management method was very satisfactory and discussion was open and easy
- the marketing concept was found to be a good medium to teach sustainable issues
- it helped that the partnership was very professional and experienced
- dimensions of sustainable development were welcome and are already leading to spin-off activities locally

To expand on the feedback last point, a couple of those interviewed mentioned ideas for related follow up activities either locally or internationally, which shows that they found the work done particularly relevant to their own activities.

The final state of the Euro crafts 21 Qualification and consulting concept tool

The usability of the tool is reviewed here from the hypothetical point of view of a new user involved in some aspect of handicrafts and interested in becoming familiar with the latest aspects of responsible activity. It is not attempted here to give any detailed breakdown of the merits and possible faults of all the different materials produced under the different topics covered in the tool, but rather to comment of their relevance and usability. Suffice it to say in general that the basic modules were initially produced, tried and tested under the German Leonardo da Vinci Dol project and that this Tol project went further than only transferring innovation, it went on to create new modules (S9 –S14) as well as elaborating on the basic modules through providing summaries in different partner languages and translating key sections of the working material. Euro crafts 21 also went on to develop a range of new valorisation materials and carry out all the transfer activities in new geographical areas as such projects should do.

It is assessed here how well the tool is presented in the final versions of the supporting valorisation material produced, and how the final contents of this tool correspond with what it claims to offer any interested users, especially new ones. This was carried out on the on-line form and based on its final state in week 49 of 2010. The modules are laid out as general ones (basic) and more specific ones. At least the English version of the self-check tool for sustainable development in (handicraft) enterprises is new and dated accordingly, described as having been created specifically for this transfer of innovation project.

Regarding the appearance of the front webpage: this is attractive to look at and has a practical layout that is initially easy to use via the headings *Basic modules*, *Special modules* etc. The contents of the modules are extensive and if the user were to consider that they contain too much material for a course of limited length, they would have the option of choosing some sections to adapt to their own needs without missing the overall message, which is perhaps that sustainable practises in handicrafts involve much more than only basic environmental aspects.

A good point of the tool is that under the main heading *Contact* the addresses given are those of the local partner in that country, which is much more realistic in terms of usability potential. Those interested in different countries are much more likely to contact a local number and person than for example the overall project management. This same point applies to the flyers produced in the various languages: while the content is otherwise the same, just in translation, the contact details are local and therefore more accessible.

How a hypothetical new user would react to the tool

To return to how the hypothetical typical user, let us imagine that it is a man and he is from the Netherlands and first read about euro crafts 21 after receiving literature on the proceedings in the Learning for Sustainable Innovation event held in Delft. This Dutchman is somehow involved in the handicraft industry and through his work responsible for some aspects of developing new methodology in their own field. The mention of training in sustainable practises and handicrafts attracts this person to access the website. This is how he would maybe proceed when opening the site for the first time. Well, he would probably read background information, this is easy to find under the heading *Project*. If he were to first look under *Introduction* an explanation of how to use the material would be available. On the starting page of course the choice of language would first have to be made. This person would notice that there were no Dutch partners and so would be likely to look at the next best thing for them, either German or English, in which case he would soon realise that using both of these languages they could avail of the whole range of materials. Our imaginary Dutch person learned German in school, but knows that many of the people they work with or provide training material to know better English. He might therefore download the most interesting module material in both languages, or make a note to do so another day. On noticing that the basic modules provide a very good starting point, he is very glad to find such a good presentation on sustainable development, then on discovering the self-check he decides to try it out on himself (possibly getting so involved that a lot more time is used than initially intended) and he is pleasantly surprised by the results and so decides to use it with a familiar group of handicraft workers the next time they meet.

Being very satisfied with the contents of the basic modules our Dutch user would tend to open the heading *Special Modules* and be interested to find as many as 14 different ones. Proceeding to look at the summaries they would find the outlines very clear and logically laid out. On testing the downloads from the special modules from the English summaries he or she would notice that for S1, S2, S5, S6 and S7 the language was only German, this would not be a bother, they only might consider which customers to use it with possibly as training material later. He would then notice that modules S4 and all of S9-S14 are in English, fair enough. He would probably notice that a few of the modules offer language versions he does not know (Slovakian, Hungarian, Finnish and Spanish), but understanding that this is the nature of a transnational projects under the Leonardo da Vinci fund, would accept this as normal. Being flexible himself about the language versions this sample European user would be more interested in the high quality of the contents and realise how sustainable development and practises have never been covered in such a thorough way for the handicrafts sector before, making this site and project a valuable "find" indeed. Being a good colleague who believes in sharing things that are freely made available, he finally sends e-mails with links to the euro crafts 21 website to 3 Dutch vocational trainer contacts and to an English and a Spanish partner that he has worked with before and who he is sure would appreciate the contents.

Although my little account above is only imaginary, it is based on the outline of the tool and on some knowledge of how people in working life deal with new things they come across, making use of good things and rejecting unnecessary ones. The central point is that for potential users to act as our Dutch friend just did it would really be a **success story scenario** for a transfer of innovation project. The euro crafts webtool is designed to enable such success to come about and the dissemination activities facilitate this.

A useful aspect of the availability of this central product at the end of the project is that what was all along the website for the project becomes one and the same site as that of the tool. For the users this makes it much simpler and increases the likelihood that it will be accessed and used.

Summary of the pros and cons of the tool

Positive:

- excellent visual presentation on line
- technically sound with existing links working
- logical structure which unfolds easily to the user
- a good variety of languages
- contacts in the different language versions are local, rather than central for project
- available both in CD-ROM and in downloadable internet format
- background documents and further details are linked and easy to access

Negative

- interlinking within the modules between different language versions is sometimes inflexible
- a slight potential for confusion between national flags and languages
- unclear how to access some the different materials referred to in the modules

*An interesting feature of the German version of the on line tool (and in practice the final project website) is that there is also a link via an Austrian flag to what for the most part is the exact same material, with the notable exception that the contact section contains the details of the three Austrian partners involved, while the link via the German flag brings the user to pages with contact details of the two German partners. This distinction is both realistic and practical.

Comments on other products

The brochure

The final version of the brochure appeared in Germany and soon after in English very near the end of the project in December 2010. It is both informative and visually appealing. It gives an easy to read and follow account of the concept, rather than remaining fixated on the project, this is a very good thing and perfectly in keeping with the purpose of this product as originally planned. It was observed that production of the brochure was left for finalising until rather late in the project period, however, lost time appears to have been made up for through an extra effort on the part of several principal individuals. It is clear that where there is a large range of products that when listing them at application and contracting stages of a project it is not always realised how much work is really involved if they are going to be completed later. This is true especially when such products are then produced at as high a standard as the partners of euro crafts 21 set themselves. The resulting brochure could well be called a handbook or users guide to the project outcomes. In fact, in order to have a longer "shelf life" and thus a more lasting effect, it is important that such printed material should be of size and appearance that it would not likely be soon discarded as advertising brochures are. Rather it should be something that those receiving it should want to literally keep on their shelf for further reference. I think that the euro crafts

21 brochure fulfils these requirements, especially attractive I found the illustrations and real quotes.

Additional publications

The partners were obliged to all produce at least one publication in addition to the central project deliverables. These products, aimed at complimenting what was being done and produced in euro crafts 21, bringing it all to the attention of a wider user range. These publications were produced often for the purposes of the partner organisations and associated with their own activities and different events participated in. In this regard I found the most informative and useful publication (especially as regards highlighting the benefits of the project) to be the most recent one associated with an event in Delft, the Netherlands in late October 2010 entitled *The 14th European Roundtable on Sustainable Production and Consumption*. A central message well conveyed in this paper is that (quoting) "The development of a European Qualification and Consulting Concept should be consistent in structure with the Euro Crafts 21 product". As well as critically presenting the results of the project to relevant users from at least one new country not in the partnership, this presentation and the publication served to open the stage for further activities on the same topic. The timing was also particularly appropriate. Other useful publications served to provide a background to euro crafts 21 and what preceded it, thus helping to justify what is now being done in the transfer of innovation project. Then there were publications in various different partner languages containing either references to the project or articles about its objectives. A podcast from Austria represents an interesting modern approach to valorisation.

The implementation report

As exemplified by that produced by the Finnish partners, this was a very useful and well presented summary of all that was done over the course of the project. I feel that this project product, although certainly demanding an effort to complete, served the double purpose of acting also as internal reporting in the partner organisation and could be used to make their own management and other colleagues aware of all the benefits of euro crafts 21 to their own organisations and what good work was performed by those responsible for their part of the project.

There were other project publications and events carried out elsewhere besides Vienna. Some of these items were published and the events held as late as the last month of the project period. These include an entry from Finland from as late as December 2010.

Comments on translation needs in hindsight

It appears that to a certain extent the total scope of possible translation needs arising was not sufficiently anticipated in the budget. This did not necessarily cause any major difficulties among the partnership, but rather resulted in a large share of staff time having to be used for partners to carry out their own translations of projects and also in some products not appearing in the languages Hungarian, Slovakian, Finnish and Spanish in cases where it might have been useful for the national user groups to have their own version.

I would not list this as a shortcoming of the project, simply a point which came to light during the final meeting. It is especially understandable considering the very extensive

range of products produced by euro crafts 21. A budget which contained the complete costs of professional translation of all the possible products (including the publications under R9) as a sub-contract would need to be significantly higher, and all things considered, would not represent improved value for money. Having the partners either produce their own products in English, or first in their own language and then translate them amounts to showing further commitment to the project; what was produced this way was and is possibly even more likely to be used in the future as compared to professionally produced language versions.

It was, in fact, the existence of the CD-Rom /DVD which helped to make it clearer what elements are available in what languages. This is explained by the layout of folders on a country-by-country basis. In attempting to assess this aspect from the point of view of the potential user, it was found that the handiest approach to accessing all the material in the user's own language is through the national language folder in the DVD's "outer" section. Overall the impression is that considerable effort has been made to maximize language availability of the different products under the circumstances.

Transfer of innovation achieved

Dissemination reports cemented this crucial part of all ToI projects; getting what had already been developed on to a wider audience and more user groups. This project went beyond just that, it actually improved previous products, turned out a range of translations and added special training units as well.

This project adhered to a wide range of guidelines that are in keeping with good practise for the success of the transfer of innovation. One of these was being present on the Adam project and produce portal from a very early stage. Another activity to increase visibility was the variety of events participated in and publications with mention of the project and its concept. All such efforts give the impression of there being a genuine need to spread the message of the Eurocrafts 21 concept and the resulting material to promote sustainable management to as large a potential usership as possible.

Reflections /discussion

This project achieved and even surpassed its objectives. Comparing the original application form and the final results this becomes evident in many ways. It was ambitious in the range of products in that it went on to produce them at a high quality with a large range of languages for some, leading at times to allotted and estimated working times being exceeded. It was well understood at all times what is involved with transfer of innovation and the partnership did not remain satisfied with only transfer, but, as outline in the previous section, really continued with a certain amount of further development and refinement of the products of the DoE project on which it was based. It is a good sign of commitment to the objectives that the partners were prepared to continue and make an extra effort because they really wanted to have and be able to use the products themselves for the most part. This again confirms that the choice of partners was particularly appropriate. From my experience with European projects I have come to appreciate most those which involved a lot of activity, especially where the activity has a strong transnational nature. It goes without saying that this needs to be beneficial activity of some sort, aimed at addressing a real need. The whole approach of making the

sometimes challenging concept of sustainable development more transparent, and then adapting it to a specific sector, is indeed such a worthwhile one. Euro crafts 21 went about doing this and certainly found over the course of the two year project that it was not easy task. There was a lot of activity carried out on many fronts, fruitful transnational activity. The results turned out to be all the better for having had to overcome difficulties along the way. I think that the Leonardo Programme grant for this project represented money well spent.

Final word

To conclude, I would like to say what a satisfying experience it has been to have been involved in such a truly useful and worthwhile project concept, one with a fresh and dynamic implementation. I remain honoured by being invited to participate in the capacity of external coordinator and although all good things must come to an end, I am confident that what has been achieved in euro crafts 21 will continue to serve the target groups and beyond in some form for a long time to come.

Paul Carroll

December 17th 2010

Annexes

1. Questionnaire form
2. Interview outline
3. Summary of comments

The author and external evaluator, Paul Carroll is employed and qualified as a vocational teacher-trainer with twenty years of experience in the natural resources and environmental sector. He holds a Master of Science degree in Environmental Technology and is particularly interested in adapting innovative developments in the field to the practical level of education for working life.

Since 1996 he has been involved with European project funds, most of all with different aspects of the Leonardo da Vinci programme; this has been as in the roles of project partner contact person, project applicant and responsible coordinator, and most recently for the last few years directly for the European Commission as expert evaluator of applications and reports on the Lifelong Learning programme for LdV Development of innovation and other calls. In 2010 Paul participated in evaluation of the 7th Framework programme for R&D sub-section *Science in Society* and has also contributed to the Austrian Federal Ministry for Science and Research *Sparkling Science* programme. He has also been involved in the development of vocational education curricula in Finland. Being capable of working in Finnish, German, French and English has helped greatly in being able to perform all these activities.

Paul Carroll is Irish by nationality and is based in Lahti, South Finland. He is the owner of the company EU Communications (Finnish Business I.D. 1906032-9) For contact details see p.1.