

Project No «2007-1957 / 001-001 »



TOP+

***Training Older Persons - Pioneer
model Usable for older adult
trainerS***

EXTERNAL EVALUATION

Final Report

Arne Kullbjer, ICDC, Sweden

January 2010

Table of contents

1. Executive summary
 2. Status of the report
 3. Background – older workers in Lifelong Learning in Europe
 4. Project details – consortium activities
 5. Evaluation framework and methodology
 6. Results of “questionnaire” regarding organisation, operative process and dissemination
 - 6.1 Organisation/communication
 - 6.2 Operative process
 - 6.3 Dissemination and impact
 7. Results of “interviews” regarding organisation, operation and dissemination
 - 7.1 Organisation/communication
 - 7.2 Operative process
 - 7.3 Dissemination and impact
 8. Partnership, outcomes, innovation and impact of the project
 - 8.1 Innovation – authenticity
 - 8.2 Transnationality
 - 8.3 Transferability – teachers and trainers or older adults
 - 8.4 Learnability
 - 8.5 Partnership
 - 8.6 Validity
 - 8.7 Promotion/dissemination and sustainability
 - 8.8 Valorisation
 9. Sustainability
 10. Conclusion – successes/failures
- Appendix 1: Report Poland**
- Appendix 2: Questionnaire for external evaluation**
- Appendix 3: Interview for external evaluation**

1. Executive Summary

This document contains the project's evaluation, focusing on structural organization, trans-national context, operational procedures, the results of each work package, and impact.

The report is based on:

- Information obtained from discussions conducted with the project coordinator, project manager and some partners.
- Information obtained from questionnaires and interview documents distributed to all partners.
- Information obtained from meeting minutes and the web platform used for the project management and project work
- Reports and data available on the web and Multimedia compendium produced.

The main objectives of the TOP+ project were to:

- Identify best and worse practice in lifelong learning, when addressed to older adults
- Creating a framework of knowledge on key-question to lifelong learning at later stages of life
- Analyzing the needs of teachers and trainers of older adults in order to produce a study on the learning opportunities
- Defining a vocational expert profile to older adults trainers and foster an European standard
- Designing and developing a vocational training model to older adults teachers and trainers
- Creating an innovative multimedia compendium

The results of the project are expected to be:

- **A Multimedia Compendium.** The interface and key-documents translated in 22 EU languages and Norwegian, and distributed in all 27 Member States (MS) and Norway. Other relevant outcomes of the Project:
- **Comparative Study** that will produce a framework of knowledge on key-questions concerning lifelong learning in later life. This study also identifies both the 'best' innovative lifelong learning programs and 'worst' practice, and factors behind them.
- **Catalogue of Skills and Competencies**, as a result of a need analysis of trainers/ teachers
- **New training curricula** addressing the needs and learning opportunities of trainers, teachers and older adult counselors
- **Identification of new skills and competences** for VET teachers, trainers and other learning facilitators
- **Definition of a vocational expert profile:** a contribution to foster an European standard and certification

After assuring the **pan-European visibility** (through the website of the Project and the distribution of the multimedia compendium, in 28 countries), the **pan-European impact**

of the project will rely upon the Marketing and Dissemination Plans. These include the enrolment of all Networks and working Groups, where the partners participate or are members, and a Final Conference in Brussels to specific decision-makers.

Overall the TOP+ project has achieved its objectives. The evaluation has shown that the target group, even though the sample is limited, is in general satisfied with the outcomes and the test workshops that have been organised. The study of the Multimedia compendium is in accordance with the objectives and involves a sufficient quality.

There are, however, key areas to be addressed now at the very end of the project when the final product is available to further enhance the potential of the the TOP+ model, the individual curriculum model, and profiling tool that have been developed. Further dissemination and transfer of the substantial results are needed and to make these easily available on a wide scale. Workshops, similar to the two workshops organized as part of WP5, should be organized to new participants.

The project partners/consortium all comprises organizations standing long experience of involvement in national and European projects. Each partner work with adult training as part of their normal business and have good understanding of the problems related to training of old people. The consortium contains considerable networks with adult training organizations and stakeholders to enable promotion of the dissemination, exploitation and finally the sustainability of the project on national and European level. However, it is important that this is initiated by the project promoter where partners are actively involved in the strategy and plan for the dissemination and exploitation of the results.

2. Status of this report.

This report is the final evaluation report which evaluates the performance and final outcomes of the TOP+ project until the end of December 2009. During the work with this report a number of recommendations have been given to the coordinator and/or to the work packages leaders.

The report contains the performance up to the end of the project, but also includes recommendations for further activities after project duration and its official completion.

3. Background – Older workers in Lifelong Learning in Europe

The low enrolment of older workers in Lifelong Learning in Europe represents a waste of individual opportunities. The European Commission recognizes “**that a change is needed in the way education and training is provided**” to be more flexible regarding time and place, recognition of prior learning and more attractive in general. Trainers, teachers and Guidance counselors **must have the skills to offer attractive training and guidance orientation.**

The TOP + intended to develop a new solution to all Member States and Norway to cope with a common challenge (low participation of older adults in lifelong learning programs), through a new strategy to reinforce the skills of older adults trainers and teaches.

The TOP + targets trainers and teachers who wish up-skill or re-skill their competencies in order to better address older adults’ training needs. Under the TOP + “older adults” are considered to be those above the age of 45.

4. Project details – consortium – activities

Project name: TOP+ Training Older Persons. Pioneer model Usable for older adult trainers

Name of Project coordinator: Fernando Martinho

Coordinator Address: Complexo Intercooperativo da Cooperativa dos Pedreiros
Rua da Algeria, 598
4000-037 Porto, Portugal

Phone number: +351 225 180 973

e-mail: epesajms@epesajms.coop

website: www.trainingolderpeople.eu

Project consortium:

EPES – Academia José Morerira da Silva (coordinator)	Portugal	PT1
BYWEB Training and Informatics, Lda	Portugal	PT2
Philean Consult SRL	Romania	RO
International Research Institute of Stavanger AS	Norway	N
Syndesmos Ekpedevsis Enilokon, Kuprou	Cyprus	CY
Swedish Telepedagogic Centre	Sweden	S
Arbeit und Leben DGB/VHS	Germany	D
Wroclaw University of Economics	Poland	PL
SBIE – Centre of Vocational Training	Greece	EL
GIS – Groups International Solidarity Italy	Italy	I
My-XML SA	Luxembourg	LU

Main activities in TOP+;

Workpackages

	Outcomes
WP1 – Project management and coordination	Management, monitoring, communication
WP2 – Literature review and Cooperative Benchmarking	Database and report on lifelong learning for older adults
WP3 – Catalogue of skills and competences	Catalogue of skills and competencies
WP4 – Pioneer model Usable for older adult Trainers	Model of training and curricula
WP5 – Test the new curriculum	Database of teachers and trainers in older adult lifelong learning at EU-level. Hands on workshops. Evaluation report
WP6 – Multimedia Compendium	Multimedia compendium for training. Wide distributed in all member states and Norway.
WP7 – Promoting and disseminating the TOP+	Promotion and dissemination kit.

5. Evaluation Framework and Methodology

5.1 Objectives

Qualitative and quantitative evaluation

Data about the project was analyzed and interpreted to identify areas of strength but also of weaknesses. Information was gathered for consistency and in order to give a clear and true picture of the project results. A **quantitative** analysis was made on all possible quantitative outputs, complemented with an equally important **qualitative** analysis.

Evaluation of outputs and process

The evaluation of the outputs and processes is as important to determine project successes and failures. The evaluation of **outputs** focused on project achievements while as the evaluation of the **process** concentrated on the operation of the transnational partnership, quality of the project, dissemination and impact of the project.

5.2 Evaluation

The following aspects have been considered, also being the fundamental criteria of a Leonardo da Vinci project:

Innovation - Authenticity – What is innovative in the TOP+? Engagement of learners to solve real problems in adult education.

Transnationality – Quality of the operation of the transnational partnership

Transferability – Learners are provided with skills and knowledge to translate the problems into their own environment as trainers of older persons.

Learnability – The methods are easy-to-learn

Partnership – Management and administration of the TOP+

Validity – Have the needs identified been met?

Promotion and Dissemination – Have a wide group been addressed and reached?

Valorisation – Have the TOP+ managed to achieve a multiplier effect through mainstreaming activities?

Additionally the following aspects have been considered;

Measurable outcomes, number of brochures, reports etc, according to the list of measurable objectives to be produced within the project.

How did the products/outcomes fit into the needs of **the beneficiaries** of the TOP+.

Changes in work plan/outcomes/products during the project implementation?

5.3 Methodology

Information used for the analysis was:

- Opinions from the transnational partnership through electronic communication with all partners including questionnaire.
- Analyses of minutes from meetings and other project documentation as well as participation in one partner meeting/workshop and the final meeting.
- Opinions from selected beneficiaries and target groups
- List of measurable objectives evaluated according to the achievements

- Performance indicators were used consisting of output indicators, key targets and objectives of the project, mostly quantitative, and process indicators, how and why targets were or were not met, both in quantity and in quality.
- Review of all Reports and outcomes produced.
- Reports and input from all national and international activities, workshops etc.

The Questionnaire (Appendix 2) sent out included a series of indicators which have been scored from 0 to 5 according to following:

0	1	2	3	4	5
Don't know / Not applicable	Strongly disagree	Don't agree	Indifferent	I agree	Strongly agree
	Rarely			Quite	
	Never	Not much/often	Sometimes	Enough	Always
	No				Yes

The objective of this questionnaire was to achieve quantitative information about:

Organisation:

- Communication
- Participation level
- Meetings

Operative process

- Tasks
- Scheduling
- Website
- Working areas
- Feedback from partners

Dissemination and impact

- Dissemination strategy
- Promotion material
- Use of website
- Impact; better pedagogy and methodology in adult learning
- Contribution of better adult learning methodology in a European context

The answers to the questionnaire is found in section 6.

Interview

Another type of questionnaire was provided covering the same subject; organisation, operative process and dissemination/impact. This questionnaire was called **"Interview"** (Appendix3), where the partners had to answer the questions verbally giving a more qualitative aspect of the project. Results of the "Interviews" is found in section 7.

6. Results of "Questionnaire" regarding organisation, operative process and dissemination

The results and conclusions presented in this chapter are mainly a result of discussions and a questionnaire distributed to the partners.

Please rate indicators from 0-5 according to the following characteristics:

0	1	2	3	4	5
Don't know/ Not applicable	Strongly disagree	Don't agree	Indifferent	I agree	Strongly agree
	Rarely				Easily
	Never	Not much/often	Sometimes	Quite Enough	Always
	No				Yes

6.1 Organisation/communication

The partners have rated the organizational aspect according to following:

<i>Organisation</i>						
Criteria	<i>Rating</i>					
	0	1	2	3	4	5
There is a sound ongoing communication between partners and project coordinator			N,PT2		S,PL, CYP	EL,RO, D
The dialogue between partners is fruitful				N,PT2, CY	S,D, PL	EL,RO
Members of the partnership take active part in tasks foreseen			N	PT2,CY	RO,S, D,PL	EL
Content, format and addresses of external messages pass via the project coordinator			N,PT2	EI,PL, CY	RO,S, D	
Deadlines are promoted by the coordinator and properly followed			PL	N,PT2, DE	RO,S, D	EL
Partnership meetings are notified long enough in advance				PT2,D	N,S, PL,CY	EL,RO
The minutes are well prepared and sent out following the meetings			PT2	N,PL	S,D, CY	EL,RO

6.2 Operative process

The partners have rated the operative process according to following:

<i>Operative process</i>						
Criteria	<i>Rating</i>					
	0	1	2	3	4	5
Tasks conform to the initial work			PT2		N,RO,CY, S,D,PL	EL
There is sufficient time set aside for tasks' performance			PT2		N,RO,CY, S,PL	EL,D
Meetings are efficient and useful	N			PT2	S,D,CY	EL,RO,PL
Relevant issues are addressed at meetings				PT2	NO,S,CYP	EL,RO,D, PL
The TOP+ project website is continuously adjusted and updated				N,CY	RO,S	EL,PT2, D,PL
The website information is relevant					RO,S, CY	N,EL, PT2,D,PL
The private website area is regularly used by partners	N,PT2			D,CY	EL,RO, S,PL	
Information and documentations needed for meetings are adequately considered by the partners	N			CY,PT2	S,D PL	EL,RO
Important feedback to support the project is provided			N	PT2	S,CY	EL,RO, D,PL
Partners share their problems and seek solutions			N	PT2	EL,S,D, PL,CY	RO
Reports/outcomes are produced according to plan	PT2			N,D,CY	S,PL	EL,RO

6.3 Dissemination and impact

<i>Dissemination</i>						
Criteria	<i>Rating</i>					
	0	1	2	3	4	5
Strategies of communication, marketing, and dissemination are fully developed	N			CY	S,PL	EL,PT2 RO,D
Adequate promotion material and outputs have widely been disseminated both on national and European level.			N		EL,S, D,PL, CY	PT2,RO
The newsletters produced have been widely distributed.	N				S	EL,PT2 RO,D,PL
The project web site is an effective tool for dissemination				N	S,PL, CY	EL,PT2, RO,D
Well attended seminars- /activities showing good results have been organized for the purpose of dissemination	N				PT2,S D,PL, CY	EL,RO

<i>Impact</i>						
Criteria	<i>Rating</i>					
	0	1	2	3	4	5
The project will provide a better pedagogy and methodology in adult learning in the partner countries				N,PT2	S,D,CYP	EL,RO, PL
The project will contribute to successful adult learning in a wider European context				N,PT	S,D,CY	EL,RO, PL

Comments:

In fact information from 2 partners as well as from co-ordinator is missing i.e. the background information is not complete. Specifically is seen the Norwegian partner seems more negative than others as regards the operative parts and dissemination while the Portuguese partner no. 2 is not satisfied with the use of the communication website, and expresses views of delays in delivery of work packages.

7. Results of “Interviews” regarding organisation, operative process and dissemination

The results and conclusions presented in this chapter are mainly a result of discussions and the “Interview” distributed to the partners.

7.1 Organisation/Communication

1. *What means of communication do you mainly use within the partnership? E-mail and phone*
 - E-mail and phone (N)
 - Email, website (EL)
 - E-mail, telephone, face to face meetings, regular post (PT2)
 - e-mailing, website/partners’ protected area, partners’ meetings (RO)
 - e-mails, website, telephone, personal meetings
 - yahoo-group, Quick Place, virtual community added to TOP-website, Moodle (D)
 - e-mails, website, telephone, personal meetings (PL)
 - Emails and telephone calls. (CY)
2. *How could contacts, if necessary, improve within the partnership?*
 - more frequency, more systematic responsibility, i.e. all partners take part in communication (N)
 - Create a mailing list, All correspondence should be sent to the whole consortium. (EL)
 - It was good with some and inexistent with silent partners. The communications with the project coordinator and project manager was rare and scarce therefore could be highly improved (PT2)
 - Templates used for feedback, reporting one common group or platform is enough (RO)
quicker reactions, some other possibilities could be: usage of skype, teleconference (D)
 - quicker reactions, some other possibilities could be: usage of skype, teleconference (PL)
 - There is ground for improvements (CY)
3. *Which work package have you been responsible for (if any). Each work package has defined outputs/results/reports!*
 - WP2 – Literature review (N)
 - WP5
Results are: database of trainers, workshop program, evaluation report and recommendations to trainers
The database will be available soon through the TOP+ web site.
The draft report with the WP5 results is being sent. (EL)
 - Deviation and the reason for it
WP7- Communication Platform: According with application a yahoo group should be created, and indeed it has been created in 8th November. Since that date till 10th March, 77 messages have been created between partners. REASON OF CHANGE: By suggestion of partnership during kick-off meeting a more complex platform has been created by Byweb (partner responsible for the task). An E-learning / Communication Platform Moodle (<http://moodle.byweb.pt>) is settle since 24 March, but communication under this platform is extremely scarce.
WP7- Marketing and Dissemination Plans- REASON OF CHANGE: Following EACEA suggestion in the Project evaluation very strong and detailed plans have been produced by Byweb. Newsletters will be produce trough Project’s life spam. (PT2)
 - N/A (Shadow partner WP6) (RO)

- We were shadow leader for WP3 i.e. *Catalogue of Skills and Competences*. Working consultations with the leader (Wroclaw University) were performed. The essential results are available on the DVD product (D)
 - We were responsible (leader) for WP3 i.e. *Catalogue of Skills and Competences*. The essential results are available on the DVD product, see Appendix 1, and presented in the table at the end of this document. We were also shadow leader of WP2. Working consultations with the leader were performed. (PL)
 - I am not responsible for WP (CY)
4. *To what extent have other partners supported in the work package that you are responsible for?*
- Most of them – not all – filled in the additional survey questionnaire for their country. This was an extra task, not included in the original workplan. As to the literature review itself, no help received from any partner. Even the “shadow lead partner” did not send a word/any response before the work was finished. (N)
 - Good support by the rest partners, as planned. (EL)
 - Some partners had a low level of participation, others none. (PT2)
 - Partners gave helpful suggestions and representations – especially the Swedish TeleLearning Academy- when developing the questionnaires. The suggestions were partially integrated into the questionnaires by the WP-leaders (D)
 - The cooperation with the partners was sufficient. At the beginning there were some problems with communication with Greek partner but they were overcome by Christodoulos Akvrivos. (PL)
 - I have no WP (CY)

7.2 Operative process

1. *How do you evaluate the usefulness of the TOP+ website?*
- Useful as a resource site for relevant activities, events, publications. Perhaps less so to get information from/learn about the TOP+ project itself (N)
 - Very useful. (EL)
 - We have no available data. Note that the official site of the project is <http://www.trainingolderpeople.eu> and the communications platform <http://moodle.byweb.pt/>. (PT2)
 - Providing information and contact with interested people (RO)
 - As a relatively successful project (S)
 - The website was sufficient for communication among partners and for dissemination process. (D)
 - The website was sufficient for communication among partners and for dissemination process. (PL)
 - I prefer e-mails (CY)
2. *Were the initial objectives and tasks set for your work package feasible so that you could continue as planned? Or were adjustments made? If so why were they introduced, and what kind of modifications occurred?*
- Yes, as a literature review. However, the challenge was the limited availability of the literature on the topic strictly speaking. For modifications made, see the answer to the question nr 4 above. (N)
 - Yes they were feasible. (EL)
 - Yes. The quality of the outcomes speaks for itself. Besides good reviews of the newsletters, the website (<http://www.trainingolderpeople.eu>) has more than 14000 visits per year (1300/month average) We have performed all the original tasks for the WP. See previous (PT2)
 - More adjustments were made during project implementation, to adapt tasks to the continuous input from partners (RO)
 - Yes, feasible (S)

- Initial objectives and tasks were feasible though the development-process lasted longer than planned and the phase-matching was a little bit difficult with the other partners who were nevertheless able to proceed. There were adjustments concerning the translation, which was limited to partners languages. (D)
 - Initial objectives and tasks were feasible but the time schedule was very tight. There were adjustments concerning the translation, which was limited to partners languages. (PL)
 - I have no responsibility on WP (CY)
3. *Do you feel satisfied with the progress of your work package and tasks? Please motivate.*
- Yes, I do. I did a lot more work that I had bargained for. Just that I wanted to do it well. Also, the leading/coordinating partners did underline in a couple of early e-mails how "the success of the whole project is depending on the quality of the first WP – i.e. WP2". It was not very nice of them, though! (N)
 - Yes, trainers from 19 countries have experienced the TOP+ training. (EL)
 - Yes, except for the lack of participation from other partners and in time products to be disseminated. (PT2)
 - Different coordination styles of WPs' leaders / answers and involvement of the other partners were different, according to requirements (RO)
 - Yes, we reached a level that was set out by us initially. (S)
 - We feel satisfied with the results of the workpackage as the catalogue of skills and competences was elaborated, and its usefulness was proved during the model testing. The results were possible to use in other WPs, particularly during model construction and workshops designed to test it. (D)
 - We feel satisfied with the progress, as the objectives were achieved, catalogue of skills and competences was elaborated, and its usefulness was proved during the model testing. The results were possible to use in other WPs, particularly during model construction and workshops designed to test it. (PL)
 - NO WP (CY)
4. *What type of resources (equipment, software and installations) have you used to carry out your tasks? Any special software needed?*
- Internet and library facilities through computer and concrete visits.
No special software needed as the survey was qualitative and limited to the partners only
However, as agreed – as I thought of it – after the kick-off meeting, I did build a knowledge platform with Lotus Notes Quick Place to the project as a 'knowledge platform'. This was used only to a limited extent, as the dissemination partner insisted on afterwards building/taking in use their own site with corresponding qualities. They used some Yahoo "wiki"-type-of-a-solution and Moodle. Later the Swedish partner still built one more corresponding site, using (obviously) their own tools/solutions. At the end of the day, as it seemed to me, the tools in themselves became an issue, not what we could and should use them for. Indeed, the result was more or less chaos and people ended up in using simply the well tried and tested: e-mail(N)
 - Classroom with PC and projectors. Video recordings. (EL)
 - Computers with professional software, video projector, video camera, etc. (PT2)
 - Electronic and informational resources (computer, general software, e/ mailing, social groups, Internet platform. (RO)
 - VCP, and PPT (S)
 - Equipment indispensable for the tasks: notebooks to collect and analyse data coming from surveys performed during WP3 and for data coming from secondary sources (i.e. other reports and databases).
Software used: Microsoft Office: Word, Excel, PowerPoint for elaboration and presentation of the results. (D)

- Equipment indispensable for the tasks: notebooks to collect and analyse data coming from surveys performed during WP3 and for data coming from secondary sources (i.e. other reports and databases).
 - Software used: Microsoft Office: Word, Excel, PowerPoint for elaboration and presentation of the results.
Statistical programmes as SPSS, Statistics for data analysis. (PL)
5. *Has any problem arisen in your work package and tasks? What kind? Why do you think these arose? How were they solved?*
- No others than the challenges and solutions reported in answers to questions 4 and 6 & 7 above. (N)
 - Not enough trainers participated in the first workshop, so there was a second workshop organised. (EL)
 - See 3. (PT2)
 - Different coordination styles of WPs' leaders have had different results on different partners. I have no major information to generalize this answer, as my involvement was somehow limited to partial tasks in different WPs. (RO)
 - Not really. (S)
 - There were other points of view concerning theoretical conception of the catalogue of skills and competences. The differences concerned not the skills/competences themselves but the classification of them. After the discussion a solution was decided. (D)
 - There were other points of view (ours and Swedish partner) concerning theoretical conception of the catalogue of skills and competences. The differences concerned not the skills/competences themselves but the classification of them. After the discussion a solution was found. (PL)
6. *Did the tasks fit into the timetable set initially or did you have difficulties to meet deadlines in fulfilling tasks? If you had to make changes for delivery of outputs what is the reason?*
- I managed to hold the deadline more or less. There was about a month's delay for the delivery of the final version of the report (an almost finished version was delivered a couple of weeks earlier). Considering the late start of the project – about 2 months delayed – and that it was really difficult to get the survey answers from some partners, I don't think the final result was that bad at all. (N)
 - Not relevant. (EL)
 - Yes (PT2)
 - Re-planning occurred at each partners' meetings, to fit the desired results, under the coordination of project leader (RO)
 - The timing was close but Ok. (S)
 - The timetable was rescheduled and there were some time adjustments due to the fact that the further work was dependent on the results achieved by others, particularly on the results of the surveys, performance of which was time-consuming. (D)
 - The timetable was rescheduled and there were some time adjustments due to the fact that the further work was dependent on the results achieved by others, particularly on the results of the surveys, performance of which was time-consuming. (PL)
 - The first phase of WP3 (development of questionnaires) took longer than planned. A WP-partner-meeting in Wroclaw was helpful to solve some questions.
 - Yes (CY)

7.3 Dissemination and impact

1. *How do you evaluate the working processes carried out in your working package and your tasks to reach the objectives and outcomes?*
 - The process for hard working, for sure. As I have already described above, I was by and large left alone with this WP. Luckily, I has been working with the theme already before, so the literature review was more like expanding, updating, and gearing the focus to the particular them in this project. The survey was of course a new piece of work, a process which could well have used some more help from the partners. But the work was interesting and the results provided some new knowledge. That helped to keep my motivation up and reaching the goals. The final product has also later been published in the publication series in IRIS. (N)
 - The validation work was adequately performed, the feedback was collected through reports, questionnaires. The procedure was video recorded. (EL)
 - See previous comments! (PT2)
 - I have partial information from the WP6 leader. (RO)
 - Professional (S)
 - We evaluate the working process positively but there were two essential problems concerning it:
 - a. The work planned for the holiday period in summer. In the area of education it is a standstill time and some tasks couldn't be done then, e.g. survey for the trainees.
 - b. The scheme of the project demanded the consequence, one activity after other with the strong dependency of them. Maybe it would have been more reasonable to plan some tasks as parallel ones. (D)
 - We evaluate the working process positively but there were two essential problems concerning it:
 - o The work planned for the holiday period in summer. In the area of education it is a standstill time and some tasks couldn't be done then, e.g. survey for the trainees.
 - o The scheme of the project demanded the consequence, one activity after other with the strong dependency of them. Maybe it would have been more reasonable to plan some tasks as parallel ones. (PL)
 - No wp (CY)
2. *How do you evaluate the dissemination activities? Has dissemination been done nationally if so to what extent?*
 - I do not know how has the dissemination in the project been carried out overall. But in IRIS there has been some national dissemination though our ordinary channels for these. Additionally, and perhaps most importantly, I have used my own international networks to spread information about the report and the report itself. The feedback has been good. (N)
 - The dissemination actions were adequate. Nationally, the TOP+ outcomes were disseminated among the trainers and participants in adult training courses of CVT SBIE. The newsletters were forwarded to list of Greek actors maintained by SBIE, including training organizations, authorities, employees' organizations and other stakeholders. (EL)
 - Poor, considering we have only disseminated an idea and not the actual product. (PT2)
 - Dissemination has addressed Romanian professional groups interested in adult training. (RO)
 - Well done. (S)
 - The dissemination activities were sufficient although some improvements could have been done. Dissemination on national level was carried out during seminars and conferences. (D)

- The dissemination activities were sufficient although some improvements could have been done. Dissemination on national level was carried out during seminars and conferences. (PL)
 - Was a good initiative (CY)
3. *What kind of dissemination method has been used? What procedures?*
- Websites, e-mails, networks, personal communication and contacts
See also the answers above and below (Q 14). (N)
 - Dissemination of newsletters produced by TOP+, website and workshops (EL)
 - The ones mentioned in the Dissemination and Marketing Plans (PT2)
 - Leaflets presented at adult training courses and at other professional meetings in Romania and during events in Europe (International Conference organised by ESREA Network on Adult Educators & Trainers - Thessaloniki, 6-8 November 2009, conference in Cyprus, other projects meetings in Cawsand - UK and Venice - Italy)
Messages on Romanian professional groups on yahoo and google (formare, educatia_adultilor, grundtvigers)
Direct mailing to professionals met during different events
Personal blog: <http://philean.wordpress.com> (RO)
 - VCP, national associations and meetings/events (S)
 - Dissemination was done as presentations or parts of presentations during national and international seminars, meetings and conferences. (D)
 - Dissemination was done as presentations or parts of presentations during national and international seminars, meetings and conferences. (PL)
4. *How do you evaluate the quality of the dissemination?*
- Good for what IRIS has done and myself personally.
In the TOP+ project, I do not know if the project has been promoted in other ways than in the project website and newsletter, as well as by a couple of partners in smaller international seminars and meetings. (N)
 - Good. (EL)
 - The process, excellent. The contents, due to the lack of specific information, low. (PT2)
 - It determined contacts and discussions with different people and plans for future initiatives and events (RO)
 - Sufficient and with desired results. (S)
 - The dissemination was sufficient to meet the project requirements. (D)
 - The dissemination was sufficient to meet the project requirements. (PL)
 - Good (CY)
5. *How do you evaluate the overall quality of project results?*
- Too early to say. It could work all right. But it may turn out to be both too similar than other adult education models (and perhaps therefore of limited interest) and too different (focusing on older adults, 'a marginal group' to which an average adult educator, not to mention consultants, tend to have little interest in).
There is a good deal of interest to the product among the practitioners, however. That is my impression based on discussions with professionals around Europe. (N)
 - Good, the model and recommendations will be a step towards better training courses for elders learning. (EL)
 - From WP2 good, From WP7 very good. From WP6 yet to see. (PT2)
 - They have the value to focus attention on aspects approached under various points of view, with the efforts to include them in a comprehensive model (RO)
 - Good (S)
 - We highly evaluate the overall quality of project results:
 - excellent literature overview was performed
 - comprehensive catalogue of skills and competences, well-based on the international surveys and literature

- adequate model presenting new aspects and approach, with efficiency proved during testing
 - 2 international workshops allowing the evaluation of previous results and gathering opinions from trainers (D)
 - We highly evaluate the overall quality of project results:
 - i. excellent literature overview was performed
 - ii. comprehensive catalogue of skills and competences, well-based on the international surveys and literature
 - iii. adequate model presenting new aspects and approach, with efficiency proved during testing
 - iv. 2 international workshops allowing the evaluation of previous results and gathering opinions from trainers (PL)
 - Satisfactory (CY)
6. *Could the overall results be improved? In what aspects and how?*
- Perhaps a second, simplified version should be produced, based on only the key issues and principles regarding the learning and learning promotion in the target group. (N)
 - The content of the training could become less broad and more focused on elders' needs only. (EL)
 - Yes, if the outcomes of the project were released within the projects lifespan (PT2)
 - Further development for specific uses (RO)
 - It can always be improved, but the results were good as is. (S)
 - Some other dissemination materials could have been produced and widely spread, e.g. leaflets. (D)
 - Some other dissemination materials could have been produced and widely spread, e.g. leaflets. (PL)
 - Could be improved (CY)
7. Other comments
- Did you have difficulties to fulfil deadlines set for carrying out tasks? Do you think time allowed was insufficient?*
- Yes, because of the unresponsiveness by the partners. (PT2)
- Did you have to make changes to deadlines for delivering work package documents, report or results? What is the reason?*
- Yes, we had to delay the August Newsletter to December because of the unresponsiveness by the partners. Note that we have sent our contribution to WP2 in due time and the leader of the WP decided not to include our work in the final report. (PT2)
- During the project you did a national "Decision-maker Survey". How do you rate the results from that and have the results influenced the development of content of the learning objects developed.*
- Please note that the goals of this project follow under the scope of a PHD thesis of a team member of Byweb, therefore we have produced an exhaustive survey in Portugal (more than 300 questionnaires) A resume of that effort was provided to the leaders of WP3, WP4, WP5 and WP6. (PT2)
- Could the dissemination activities be improved? What aspects? How?*
- Yes, if we had a product to disseminate and if the partners sent information about their ongoing activities (PT2)
- One of the initial objectives was to establish a Centre of Excellence in the area of e-learning for SMEs. How well has that objective been reached in your own country?*
- Byweb wrote the Top+ application, establishing a Centre of Excellence was not in the initial objectives of the project. (PT2)
- Trainers' skills are closely linked to personal development. This project has caused awareness on older adults acting as trainers for older adults but also being older

adults themselves. So experience is seen from both points of view of the trainer and of the trainee. For me it was a good point to start personal development based on insight get during project activities. (RO)

One of the initial objectives was to establish a Centre of Excellence in the area of e-learning for SMEs. How well has that objective been reached in your own country?

- Not in my country

Have you organised your final national training programme? How was it organised? Duration? Seminar/workshops? Number of participants?

- Not required

Most of questions are related to WP. I was not responsible for WP. (CY)

8. Partnership, Outcomes, Innovation and Impact of the project

8.1 Innovation – authenticity

The main objective of the project was to set up a broad standard orientation to older adults' trainers: their desirable profile and needs. The TOP + addresses these needs, by assessing the needs of older adults' trainers and teachers and provide a comparative study in EU member states, regarding their learning opportunities; Define a vocational expert profile to older adults trainers and foster a European standard and furthermore, creating an innovative multimedia compendium. The final product will be based upon the literature study, survey and direct interview to training and teachers of 28 countries, and translated in 23 languages.

The effectiveness/innovativeness of the TOP+ project lies in the novel and synergistic blend of content, tools and pedagogies. It gives a good contribution to the desirable profile and needs focus put on "older" adults' trainers. "Older" adults have been defined as people above the age of 45. The very high ambition of covering 28 countries and translating the final product into 23 languages has not been met. The project has produced a big quantity of documents/pages and reports, which is hardly possible to translate within available resources. This is why the project has decided to translate some strategically important documents mainly into English, French and German. The idea of initiating the project by a literature review is not new and innovative in itself. However, the project has been successful in finding and also in analyzing a substantial and seemingly high qualitative and important contribution to state-of-the art regarding training and other lifelong learning interventions targeted to older adults. The report from this work package (WP2) could very well be used for further dissemination and presentations in connection with adult training, the pedagogical aspect been used with focus on "older" adults training.

A further significant positive outcome of the project is the model and tool for self study assignments based on individual curriculum and learning services development in web based learning environments. This method is not per se new but shows the advantage of using IT and the web for individual profiling and produce an individual curriculum in a simple and efficient way. Paper versions could of course be one tool for learning, but using the web based "TOP+ Teacher profiling tool" is more efficient. It can easily be adapted not only to the target group for the TOP+ project, but also be transferred and used in several other settings and target groups.

The project has introduced new approaches and new tools which can be seen as quite innovative and be useful to the partners as well as to others in the future if effectively disseminated and transferred.

8.2 Transnationality

First of all from a geographical/cultural point of view it seems the partnership is excellent, involving partners from all directions of the European Union. The project took on the challenge to cope with different educational systems which most probably made the transnational work more difficult. At the same time the diversity makes the outcomes more valuable and interesting. It is not clear to what extent the different work packages have taken the opportunity to allow the different regions/cultures influence on their work. According to the structure of the project with a shadow leader and all participants having a budget in each work package this is well integrated in the project methodology. Some partners have pointed out that the relatively large amount of partners representing a varied background sometimes made the cooperative process difficult, and that some of the work packages have been developed relatively independent from the other work packages. At the same time the results from all development work packages show good quality, are innovative, well documented and useful.

8.3 Transferability – teachers and trainers of older adults

Teachers and trainers of older adults are through the TOP+ model, curriculum and profiling tool provided with knowledge that they can translate to their own everyday work environment. This has also been confirmed through the two workshops organized as a part of the test in WP5. Evaluation of the workshops is documented in WP5 and the only concerns expressed by few participants say that the material produced is broad, and that the level of the subject matter is too high. This raises some thoughts regarding a future re-consideration and adaptation of the material to be more precise and focused, especially if it will be transferred beyond the partnership.

The TOP+ model, individual curriculum model and profiling tool would easily enable adaptation to several other settings and target groups.

8.4 Learnability

The project results are easy accessible through the well designed Multimedia compendium where all reports, documents databases etc. are located. The technology and tools are user friendly, and the learners must not spend excessive time to learn interface or other features before the subject matter can be accessed. However, the multimedia compendium is not a training of training course itself and it is recommended that it is introduced by a workshop similar to those two test workshops organized by WP5.

A further development of this project could be to make it a full-fledged e-learning course for a wide distribution.

8.5 Partnership

The coordinator has been the representative of the coordinating organization, representing the project promoter, and has also taken on all financial and administrative issues in an excellent way. This project as well as others needs a “project manager” which not necessarily needs to be the same person as the coordinator. The project manager has the main responsibility to manage and monitor the project activities. To some extent he must play the “bad guy” to push the partners and manage the activities mainly to avoid delays and interaction between the different work packages. The TOP+ has suffered from delays, which has created some problems especially in the production of the final outcomes and also in the continuous dissemination of the project and its outcomes. It seems the management of the TOP+ project had benefitted from a more strict strategy including a detailed management plan.

The partnership in general appears well composed and has been active without any obvious “sleeping” partners. Still the TOP+ included a relatively large amount of partners, and it has been quite difficult for the project management/coordinator to keep together. One partner has mentioned “silent partners” with nonexistent communication, and rare communication with the coordinator. The Italian partner has not responded to the evaluation questionnaires and its input to the project is not clear. Each work package has appointed one responsible partner as well as a shadow work package leader, which is an interesting and useful methodology to enhance the leadership of the work packages. The outcomes from the work packages are sufficient and enough even though the initial objectives have not fully been met, especially as regards the number of countries and translations planned. The outcomes of the work packages would most probably have been improved if more interaction between the work packages had occurred.

The project communication platform has been subject to changes and modifications and it seems that the partners have had different opinions and own interest in establishing this platform. The communication should have been strengthened if the coordinator and the partners had been more proactive in the communication, having a strategy and plan for a more effective management and communication between the partners.

8.6 Validity

The needs identified in the proposal have through the project duration been the base for the work packages which can be seen from discussions during the partner meetings and other communication. The report from the literature review gives a good base and is focused directly on the needs of the target group. Still validity is not a question about needs but more of how the needs identified can be fulfilled by the project and communicated/marketed to the target groups showing these needs. It is important that the project now, when the final products are available, makes all efforts to reach this target group not only within the partnership but also beyond including other countries.

8.7 Promotion/dissemination and sustainability

The main dissemination activities have happened through the website (13000 visits per year) and also through 4 newsletters, articles and fairs/conferences.

The partners have reported satisfactory results from the dissemination so far. The newsletters are widely distributed and are very professional in layout and content. Most of the content in the newsletters are relevant to the target group, but at the same time small space is devoted to the TOP+ project and its outcomes. This reflects the fact that the substantial outputs from the project are late in the project cycle.

The main problem for the dissemination is that the final products/results and the Multimedia compendium is available at the very end of the project, and what has been disseminated so far mainly include ideas and some WP-results, and not the final product. The project needs a further developed strategy and a detailed plan where the final results and the Multimedia compendium will be disseminated on a wide scale involving all partners. A sustainability strategy of the official website (www.trainingolderpeople.eu) should be developed to guarantee the access of the Multimedia compendium over the web for a considerable period. The content of the website should better concentrate on the project, its work packages and the explicit results of the project.

The project has developed substantial results that should be disseminated and transferred on a wide scale after the project duration. Workshops should be organized to new participants similar to the two workshops organized as part of WP5.

8.8 Valorization

Valorization is the process of disseminating and **exploiting** project outcomes to meet user needs, with the ultimate aim of integrating and using them at local, regional, national and European level.

The valorization is closely related to the success of the dissemination, and especially targeted after the end of the project. The last project outcomes were available at the very end of the project duration, and a strategic valorization period has been impossible to include in the project. We recommend the project partners during the final dissemination to inform, use and "market/sell/exploit" the products in their own regions and to their European networks.

The aspect of sustainability and valorization has been mentioned as important tasks from the project promoter and the coordinator, but it must be implemented through specific actions and activities, and we urge the partnership to tackle this substantially. The website and the Multimedia compendium on the web need to appear in popular search engines like Google etc.

The following summarizes the TOP+ project achievements:

Innovation – authenticity	The effectiveness/innovativeness of the TOP+ project lies in the novel and synergistic blend of content, tools and pedagogies. It gives a good contribution to the desirable profile and needs with its focus to “older” adults’ trainers. “Older” adults have been defined as people aged above 45. The very high ambition of covering 28 countries and translating the final product to 23 languages has not been met.
Transnationality	Some partners have pointed out that the relatively large amount of partners representing a varied background sometimes made the cooperative process difficult. Some of the work packages have been developed relatively independent from the other work packages. But at the same time the results from all development work packages are of good quality, innovative, well documented and useful.
Transferability – teachers and trainers of older adults	The TOP+ model, individual curriculum model and profiling tool should easily enable adaptation to several other settings and target groups.
Learnability	The final product, Multimedia Compendium is not a training of training course in itself, and it is recommended that it is introduced by a workshop similar to those two test workshops organized by WP5. A further development of this project could be to make it a full-fledged e-learning course for a wide distribution.
Partnership	The partnership in general seems well composed and have been active without any “sleeping” partners. Still the TOP+ included a relative large amount of partners and it has been quite difficult to keep together for the project management/- coordinator. Each work package has appointed one responsible partner as well as a shadow work package leader, which is an interesting and useful methodology to enhance the leadership of the work packages. The outcomes from the work packages are sufficient and enough even though the initial objectives have not fully been met, especially as regards the number of countries and translations planned. The outcomes of the work packages would most probably have been improved if more interaction between the work packages had occurred. The project communication platform has been subject to changes and modifications, and it seems that the partners have had different opinions and own interest in establishing this platform. The communication should have been strengthened if the coordinator and the partners had been more proactive in the communication including a better strategy and plan for a more effective management and communication between the partners.
Validity	It is important that the project, now that the final products are available, makes all efforts to reach this target group not only within the partnership but also beyond including other countries.
Promotion/dissemination and sustainability	The project needs to further develop a strategy and detailed plan where the final results and the Multimedia compendium will be disseminated on a wide scale involving all partners. A sustainability strategy for the website must be developed to guarantee the access of the Multimedia compendium over the web for a considerable period. The project has developed substantial results to be disseminated and transferred on a wide scale after the project period. Workshops should be organized to new participants similar to the two workshops organized as part of WP5.
Valorization	The aspect of sustainability and valorization has been

	<p>mentioned as important tasks from the project promoter and the coordinator. It must be implemented through specific actions and activities, thus we urge the partnership to tackle this substantially. The website and the Multimedia compendium on the web need to appear in popular search engines like Google etc.</p>
--	--

9. Sustainability

The project partners/consortium all comprises organizations standing long experience from involvement in national and European projects. Each partner works with adult training as part of its normal business and has a good understanding of the problems related to older adults' training. The consortium contains considerable networks with adult training organizations and stakeholders to enable the promotion both of the dissemination, exploitation and at the end the sustainability of the project on national and European level. However, it is important that this is initiated by the project promoter and that the partners are actively involved in the strategy and plan for the dissemination and exploitation of the results as previously mentioned in this report.

10. Conclusions – Successes/failures

The initial general objectives have been met even though not all objectives of all the working packages have been achieved. In general most of them have successfully been implemented including substantial reports/outcomes. However the evaluation has identified a number of recommendations and concerns for further improvement and especially problems arisen in relation to dissemination as the final product was made available at a very late stage of project duration.

There is a fairly high quality of WP final reports including a good structure and organisation of the content. The project has quite extensively been disseminated in the participating countries. A valorisation process would probably improve the content and usability of the manuals.

Despite some delays the project has tackled the situation and managed to reach all objectives as stated in the initial proposal.

The project appears to involve a limited communication, especially visible between the work packages.

We recommend the project to negotiate with European bodies in adult education and possibly other pan European bodies to have them accept and recognize the results and introduce direct links to the project webpage and the Multimedia Compendium.

A strategy for sustainability and valorisation should be further developed as well as adding a form of ex-post evaluation.



Partner name, country: Wroclaw University of Economics, Poland

We were responsible (leader) for WP3 i.e. *Catalogue of Skills and Competences*. The essential results are available on the DVD product, as following:

WP3

The purpose of Workpackage 3 entitled *Catalogue of Skills and Competences* was to conduct the analysis of the needs of the older adult trainers and to identify the skills and competences indispensable for them. The first step of the research resulted in elaboration of questionnaires for three surveys targeted at three different respondents: older adults, trainers and stakeholders. Proposed questionnaires are shown in the document *Analytical tools for evaluating older persons' training needs and identifying skills and competences for older teachers of adults*. The statistical analysis of the outcome of the survey is included in the file entitled *Analysis of the Answers to the Questionnaires Designed to Identify Skills and Competences for Older Adults Teachers*. The comparative study concerning EU member states regarding learning opportunities, factors influencing further education, occupation and qualification structures is presented in the document *Proposal of skills and competences catalogue. Trainer of Older Persons Features Importance Evaluation. Analysis results based on international comparisons*. The conducted scrutiny allowed to identify attributes of the utmost importance and to create a list of desirable features for a trainer working with older adults. The document entitled *List of identified skills and competences* contains the recommended skills and competences divided into six thematic domains. The description of required characteristics of trainers active in lifelong learning concerning the attitude, defining the goals, presenting the content, applying methods, creating learning environment, social skills and technical/organizational aspects is given in the file *Overview of skills and competences relevant to trainers of older persons*.

Part 1 : Analytical tools for evaluating older persons' training needs and identifying skills and competences for older teachers of adults [PL]

Part 2 : Analysis of the Answers to the Questionnaires Designed to Identify Skills and Competences for Older Adults Teachers [PL]

Part 3 : Proposal of skills and competences catalogue [PL]

Part 4 : List of identified skills and competences [PL]

Part 5 : Overview of skills and competences relevant to trainers of older persons [PL]

WP3 Tasks	Actions	Output
WP 3.1 Data Analysis	Elaboration of the concept of the research on the basis of the results of WP2.	Working materials
WP 3.2 Conception of questionnaires	Elaboration of three different questionnaires for three surveys targeted at three different types of respondents: older adults, trainers and stakeholders.	Document <i>Analytical Tools for Evaluating Older Persons' Training Needs and Identifying Skills and Competences for Older Teachers of Adults</i> (DVD)
WP 3.3 Feeding the Databases	Collection of data concerning older adults teachers/trainers/stakeholders.	Files containing data on DVD Files containing data on the Project web site (Moodle platform)

WP3 Tasks	Actions	Output
WP 3.4 Draft Report	The statistical analysis of the outcome of the survey. The comparative study concerning EU member states regarding learning opportunities, factors influencing further education, occupation and qualification structures.	Document: <i>Analysis of the Answers to the Questionnaires Designed to Identify Skills and Competences for Older Adults Teachers</i> (DVD) Document: <i>Proposal of Skills and Competences Catalogue. Trainer of Older Persons Features Importance Evaluation. Analysis Results Based on International Comparisons</i> (DVD)
WP 3.5 Interviewing trainers and teachers	Interviews of trainers and teachers from UE Member states conducted during the Internal Workshop (WP5) in Porto.	Video-recorded interviews (DVD)

WP3 Tasks	Actions	Output
<p>WP 3. 6 Final Catalogue of Skills and Competencies</p>	<p>Identification of attributes of the utmost importance for an trainer working with older adults and creation of the recommended skills and competences list divided into six thematic domains.</p> <p>Description of required characteristics of trainers active in lifelong learning concerning the attitude, defining the goals, presenting the content, applying methods, creating learning environment, social skills and technical/organizational aspects.</p>	<p>Document: <i>List of Identified Skills and Competences</i> (DVD)</p> <p>Document: <i>Overview of Skills and Competences Relevant to Trainers of Older Persons</i> (DVD)</p>

Questionnaire for external evaluation Part 1.

Only give a rating 0-5, comments will be given in Part 2

Partner name, country:

Date:

Please rate indicators from 0-5 according to the following characteristics:

0	1	2	3	4	5
Don't know/ Not applicable	Strongly disagree	Don't agree	Indifferent	I agree	Strongly agree
	Rarely				Easily
	Never	Not much/often	Sometimes	Quite Enough	Always
	No				Yes

<i>ORGANISATION</i>						
Criteria	<i>RATING</i>					
	0	1	2	3	4	5
There is a sound ongoing communication between partners and project coordinator						
The dialogue between partners is fruitful						
Members of the partnership take active part in tasks foreseen						
Content, format and addresses of external messages pass via the project coordinator						
Deadlines are promoted by the coordinator and properly followed						
Partnership meetings are notified long enough in advance						
The minutes from the meetings are well prepared and sent out in time						

OPERATIVE PROCESS

Criteria	RATING					
	0	1	2	3	4	5
Tasks conform to the initial work						
There is sufficient time set aside for tasks' performance						
Meetings are efficient and useful						
Relevant issues are addressed at meetings						
The project website (TOP+) is continuously adjusted and updated						
The website information is relevant						
The private area is regularly used by partners						
Information and documentations needed for meetings are adequately considered by the partners						
Important feedback to support the project is provided						
Partners share their problems and seek solutions						
The pilot testing and the delivery have been identified, analysed and evaluated						
Reports/outcomes are produced according to plan						

<i>DISSEMINATION</i>						
Criteria	<i>RATING</i>					
	0	1	2	3	4	5
Strategies of communication, marketing, and dissemination are fully developed						
Adequate promotion material and outputs have widely been disseminated.						
The project web site is an effective tool for dissemination						
Well attended seminars- /activities showing good results have been organized for the purpose of dissemination						

<i>IMPACT</i>						
Criteria	<i>RATING</i>					
	0	1	2	3	4	5
Needs motivated in the project description are properly met						
The project will provide a better pedagogy and methodology in adult learning in the partner countries						
The project will contribute to successful adult learning in a wider European context						



Interview for external evaluation. Part 2

Partner name, country:

Date:

Please answer/comment the following questions as detailed as possible:

Organisation

7. What means of communication do you mainly use within the partnership?

8. How could contacts, if necessary, improve within the partnership?

9. Which work package have you been responsible for (if any). Each work package has defined outputs/results/reports! Please send your final versions of the WP-results (or refer to it where it can be found on the web or elsewhere).

10. To what extent have other partners supported in the work package that you are responsible for?

Operative process

11. How do you evaluate the usefulness of the TOP+ website?
12. Were the initial objectives and tasks set for your work package feasible so that you could continue as planned? Or were adjustments made? If so why were they introduced, and what kind of modifications occurred?
13. Do you feel satisfied with the progress of your work package and tasks? Please motivate.
14. What type of resources (equipment, software and installations) have you used to carry out your tasks? Any special software needed?
15. Has any problem arisen in your work package and tasks? What kind? Why do you think these arose? How were they solved?
16. Did the tasks fit into the timetable set initially or did you have difficulties to meet deadlines in fulfilling tasks? If you had to make changes for delivery of outputs what is the reason?

Impact, dissemination and training (Impact and dissemination are essential in all LLL projects)

17. How do you evaluate the working processes carried out in your working package and your tasks to reach the objectives and outcomes?
18. How do you evaluate the dissemination activities? Has dissemination been done on national level and in that sense to what extent?
19. What kind of dissemination method has been used? What procedures?

20. How do you evaluate the quality of the dissemination?

21. How do you evaluate the overall quality of project results?

22. Could the overall results be improved? In what aspects and how?

23. Other comments