

Summary report - work package 4

2011-08-31

WP4 – Evaluation, quality and report

Background

The fourth work package, piloted by the municipality of Tjörn (UCT), Sweden and Oscar-Tietz-Schule (Oberstufenzentrum Handel II) Berlin, Germany **include three aims:**

To evaluate test from partners and countries.

To ensure good work process and good results of the project.

To maintain continuous quality control throughout the project.

The first aim include an evaluation of the test courses taken place in the partner organisations in order to get feedback to the implementation of the transfer of IWOLTE into TIWOLTE courses in partner countries. Over 100 students in four different countries attended the courses.

The second and third aim of WP4, to ensure good work process and good results and to maintain continuous quality control throughout the project, include meeting evaluation and frequent adjustments on the work process.

This work package includes a transnational physical meeting in Berlin, Germany.

WP4 started parallel to the project on 1st of October 2009 and will end on 30th of September 2011.

Work packages – an overview

There are six work packages in the project. The responsibilities are distributed in the partnership and are described below.

WP1 - Presentation of previous experiences (IWOLTE)

The first work package, piloted by Tjörn municipality and the University of Gothenburg, Sweden includes a mapping of the current situation in the partner countries. This is done with the help of a survey, the discussions during the first transnational meeting in Gothenburg and the following e-meetings for information, counselling and collaboration. On the basis of the vocational supervisor and teacher IWOLTE courses, this work package gives the opportunity to start the developmental process which is the base for the forthcoming TIWOLTE course program.

WP2 - Development of training programs for vocational supervisors and teachers.

The second work package, piloted by Fredrick University, Cyprus, the University of Gothenburg and Campus Varberg, Sweden is aimed at the adaption of IWOLTE courses to the needs of different partners. The partners Tjörn municipality, Campus Varberg, Svensk Handel Kunskap, Oscar-Tietz-Schule, Frederick University and St John's Central College start developing in-service training program for vocational supervisors or teachers. In this work package is included the task to assure

The activities in WP4 as stated in the application:

Activity 1

Working meeting in Berlin to develop the method for evaluation. P1 responsible and P6 organise the meeting.

Activity 2

Evaluate the model training program/ courses after the test training. All partners responsible.

Activity 3

Kick off meeting in Gothenburg to clarify expectations, roles, tasks and objectives, organized by P1. All partners will take part and contribute.

Activity 4

Mid project meeting in Cork, Ireland to evaluate the workplan for the rest of the project. Partner 7 organize. All partners will participate. P1 responsible for mid term report.

Activity 5

End of project meeting in Graz, Austria with evaluation of results. Best practise examples of dissemination of results from TIWOLTE. All partners participate and contribute. P8 organize the meeting. P1 is responsible for the final report.

Comments on the work packages, time schedule and activities as stated in the application:

The project coordinators decided to change the schedule of the meetings, so the Berlin meeting is the last partner meeting, not the first. This change was due to the fact that the German partner, Oscar-Tietz-Schule is responsible for work package 4.

Results from work package 4 (in chronological order):

Activity 3

In the first meeting in Gothenburg, Sweden from 21st – 22nd of January 2010 the work packages were presented and divided to the partners. Every partner accepted his or her roles according to the work program (appendix 01). The timeline has been discussed and accepted. Before the meeting every partner filled out a questionnaire to compare the different expectations and objectives towards the transfer of the IWOLTE courses in the partner countries. The results are reported in the work package 1 summary report and helped to decide upon the evaluation strategy. One result for example was that the partners would not be able to use all the modules of the original IWOLTE course. Every partner would have to transfer the content of the modules into the needs of his or her target group. This process is reported in the summary reports from work package 2 and 3.

Activity 1

During the second meeting in Limassol, Cyprus from 23rd – 24th of May 2010 the evaluation strategy for the meetings and the courses has been presented by P6. The targets as stated in the application are

- to evaluate test from partners and countries,
- to ensure good work process and good results of the project,
- to maintain continuous quality control throughout the project.

The evaluation strategy proposed the following reporting tools (appendix 02):

Meeting evaluation:

- paper questionnaire after every meeting to evaluate the work process and maintain quality control for all work packages (appendix 03).
- meeting reports after every meeting presenting the results of the questionnaires.

Course evaluation:

- same online questionnaire for all participants in English, with translations in German and Swedish.

Activity 4

The third meeting in Cork, Ireland from 8th - 9th of November 2010 resulted in an agreement towards the evaluation tools as discussed in the Limassol meeting:

For the meeting evaluation we already decided to work with paper questionnaires but here the first meeting report as a result of the questionnaires was presented (appendix 05).

For the course evaluation we decided to have one single online questionnaire for all participants in English (appendix 08), with translations in German (appendix 09), and Swedish (appendix 10). The layout and some questions on the questionnaire were used from the original questionnaire of the IWOLTE course. Every partner was supposed to make their participants fill out the questionnaires online after attending the courses.

Activity 2

Between the meetings in Cork and Graz all partners delivered their courses with over 100 participants. The results of the evaluation were presented and discussed in the fourth meeting in Graz, Austria from 11th – 12th of April 2011 (appendix 11-17).

Activity 5

Between the meetings in Graz and Berlin all partners delivered their exploitation plans including the SWOT-analysis (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) according to their courses. The fifth meeting in Berlin, Germany from 28th – 29th October 2011 will finish work package 4 with the presentation of this summary report.

Conclusions

1. meeting evaluation:

To manage the working process was one of the tasks for the meeting evaluation. As the working process was divided in work packages, the easiest attempt to control the work process appeared to be an evaluation of the improvement of the work packages.

The partners were asked to answer 7 multiple choice and two open questions.

There were ten possible answers for the multiple-choice questions, from “not applicable” (= 0), “not at all” (= 1) to “absolutely“ (= 10). This ranking has been used for the meeting evaluation in the former IWOLTE – project (questionnaire see appendix 03).

The individual results for every question and meeting vary from an average of 7,27 (work package 4, Limassol meeting) to an average of 9,64 (work package 3, Graz meeting).

The average ratings for all work packages improved from the Limassol meeting to Graz meeting (appendix 04, meeting evaluation data), the greatest improvement can be found at the results of work package 3 (from 7,38 / Limassol to 9,64 / Graz) and work package 4 (from 7,27 / Limassol to 9,36 / Graz). There are different ways to find reasons for these results: One reason could be that the tasks and workflow towards work package 3 and 4 were not perfectly clear in the first meetings, simply because the courses and the curricula had to be developed first. After the courses were planned and later performed the acceptance for these work packages increased naturally. Another reason could be found, of course in the timeline: After the summary reports have been presented, all the done work had been documented and therefore the partners showed a higher acceptance.

A very similar interpretation of the results for the other work packages can be stated, but still two work package have been evaluated in a different way: The acceptance for work package 1 was high from the Limassol (= 2nd) meeting on, but still increased, maybe because the WP 1 summary report set a standard to the following work packages. The last work package, project management, started with an average of 8 and ended with an average of 8,5, which does not show the typical improvement like the other work packages demonstrate. An interpretation to these results can be found in some critical comments (questions 8 and 9): For example the division (“WP 3 and 4 are very big packages [...]”) and the timeline (“most of the critical work (WP2 and WP3 are done in a short time [...]”) of the work packages have been criticized in the 3rd meeting in Cork and in the 4th meeting in Graz (“some partners putting more effort in activities than others [...]”). Even if these comments show opinions from only two or three partners and the majority was very satisfied with the management work, it is remarkable that the very few critical comments refer to this work package 6 (see appendix 04, answers to questions 8 and 9 for the original comments). The increasing results to question 1 (satisfaction with preparation work for the meeting) maybe refer as well to a higher acceptance for the project management.

Summing up the results all partners seem to like the work in and with this project, all partners seem to have high standards towards results and motivation and therefore some critics should be accepted. There were no real problems in work process or even severe difficulties in one work package. As

the products of this project - the courses – show, the quality of the discussions and the presentations in the meeting had been on a very high level.

2. course evaluation

There were seven courses transferring IWOLTE into four partner countries. We received 101 questionnaires from six partners, only one partner (St. John´s Central College Cork) could not bring in the questionnaires due to the fact that they had to deal with 152 participants. The number of received questionnaires differs from the number of announced participants in the work package 3 report:

<i>Project partner</i>	<i>Number of participants in WP3 report</i>	<i>Number of received questionnaires</i>	<i>Comments</i>
P 1 Tjörn	15	13	Not every participant filled out a questionnaire
P 3 Campus Varberg	15	10	Not every participant filled out a questionnaire
P 4 AEHT Köping	20	19	Not every participant filled out a questionnaire
P 5 Svensk Handel	20	16	Not every participant filled out a questionnaire
P 6 Oscar-Tietz-Schule	16	25	Second course was delivered after WP3 summary report was delivered
P 7 St. John´s Central College	152	0	Technical problems due to high amount of participants
P 8 Frederick University	25	18	Not every participant filled out a questionnaire
Total	263	101	

The participants were asked to answer 8 multiple choice, two open and one mixed questions. There were four possible answers for the multiple-choice questions, from “very positive” (= 1) to “very negative“ (= 4).

The average of all courses to all multiple-choice questions is 1,58, no question has an average over 2,0 and so we can state a positive acceptance to all courses, even if the results differ between the partners.

The individual results for every partner vary from an average of 1,06 (Partner 5, Svensk Handel, question 6, Partner 6, Oscar-Tietz-Schule an Partner 8, Frederick University, both question 9) to an average of 2,30 (Partner 3, Campus Varberg, question 7).

There are different ways to explain the very good results of the participant evaluation. One important reason for good results has been the adaptation of the IWOLTE-courses into the special needs of the partner organisations (questions 2, 3, 5, 7, comments in question 10). Therefore the work on a transfer of the existing IWOLTE curriculum was the clue to good courses and satisfied participants (compare summary report WP 3). For example, in the participant evaluation for Partner 4, AEHT Koping, a lot of detailed comments to the good transfer of the IWOLTE results can be found (appendix 14, comments in question 10).

Another reason for good results surely was the personality, competence and motivation of the trainers (question 6, comments in questions 10 and 11). Here we could get a very good feedback, for example in the results for Partner 5, Svensk Handel (comments in questions 10, 11). Some good decisions were made before the individual courses were planned, for example the duration of the courses, the used methods and the target groups (questions 4, 8, 3).

It is not so easy to find out aspects to improve the courses, one could be the relevance and usability of the course content. Here we find some negative results from the participants, for example for Partner 6, Oscar-Tietz-Schule or Partner 3, Campus Varberg (questions 2 and 7).

Most of the comments (questions 10 and 11) show a very positive acceptance from the participants and gratefulness for the possibility to attend these courses (free of charge!). This impact of this project will live on in good remembrance. Summing up, the partners did a great job in transferring the IWOLTE courses from the originally university based target group into the needs of their various participants.

Appendix

- 01: updated work program**
- 02: evaluation strategy**
- 03: meeting questionnaire**
- 04: meeting evaluation data**
- 05: meeting evaluation Limassol**
- 06: meeting evaluation Cork**
- 07: meeting evaluation Graz**
- 08: course questionnaire English**
- 09: course questionnaire German**
- 10: course questionnaire Swedish**
- 11: course evaluation data**
- 12: course evaluation P1 Tjorn**
- 13: course evaluation P3 Campus Varberg**
- 14: course evaluation P4 AEHT Köping**
- 15: course evaluation P5 Svensk Handel**
- 16: course evaluation P6 Oscar-Tietz-Schule**
- 17: course evaluation P8 Frederick University**