

Terminal Check



molam

510380-LLP-I-2010-PT-LEONARDO-LITP



Education and Culture DG
Lifelong Learning Programme

EACEA
Education, Audiovisual & Culture
Executive Agency



Moving at labour market

Interim Evaluation Report



Partners

Sociedade Portuguesa de Inovação (Project Coordination)

Ana Ribeiro

email: anaribeiro@spi.pt

Dora Fazekas

email: dorafazekas@spi.pt

URL: www.spi.pt

Deutsches Jugendinstitut

Tabea Schlimbach

email: schlimbach@dji.de

URL: www.dji.de

ASIMAG

Leire Monterrubio

email: l.monterrubio@asimag.net

URL: <http://www.asimag.es/>

TK Formazione

Michela Calabrese

email: m.calabrese@tkformazione.it

URL: www.tkformazione.it

Careers Europe

Katie Peyton-Lister

email: katie.peyton-lister@careerseurope.co.uk

URL: www.careerseurope.co.uk

Tempo

Gabriela Vlčková

email: vlckova@tempo.cz

URL: www.tempo.cz/



Document history

version	date	author	comments
V1	19.09.2011	Harry Theotokatos	
V2	17.10.2011	Harry Theotokatos	



Index

Index.....	4
1. Introduction.....	6
2. Project Background	6
3. Evaluation Methodology	7
4. Work Package 1 – Project Management (SPI - PT)	7
5. Work Package 2 – Research (DJI - DE).....	10
6. Work Package 3 – Content Elaboration (TKF - IT)	13
7. Work Package 4 – Creation of Interactive Tool (SPI - PT).....	14
8. Work Package 5 – Test and Validation (ASIMAG - ES)	15
9. Work Package 6 – Dissemination (TEMPO – CZ).....	15
10. Work Package 7 – Website and Blog (SPI - PT)	16
11. Work Package 8 – Exploitation (TEMPO - CZ).....	17
12. Work Pack 9 – Monitoring and Evaluation (CE-UK)	17
13. Conclusion	18

1. Introduction

The purpose of this first and only Interim Evaluation Report by the External and Internal Evaluators for the period 1st October 2010 to 30th September 2011 is to provide an assessment and comments on the project progress, achievements and problems encountered, trends and issues and any action needed to be taken by the Partnership to address these.

2. Project Background

The project Moving at Labour Market (MoL@M) aims to equip EU career guidance professionals in VET schools and youth centres, labour offices etc, with expanded knowledge on other EU labour markets, so that they can help and encourage European emigration for employment purposes. This will be done by providing this target group with an Interactive Tool, which is to be complementary to existing instruments such as EURES, Euroguidance, etc, on practical information on local rules and practices related to job markets and local job culture of the involved EU countries. Through this tool the target group will be able to enhance European occupational mobility and contribute to the increase of employability of especially lower skilled job seekers across Europe.

The intended results of the MoL@M project are:

- **A methodological approach - Research** – this will include three activities that would allow the Partnership to identify the main needs of potential emigrants in the areas of cultural, social and economic adaptation to host countries, as well as the needs of those who work to encourage and advise on their job seeking in other EU countries. The activities are desk research, administration of a questionnaire (at least 10 to be collected) and 2 interviews by each partner with low skilled immigrants working in their country.
- **Research Report** – the report will summarise the conclusions of the research in each country, including the results of the instruments applied to collect information and national report per partner country.
- **Content building workshops** – will be organised in three partner countries to present the first structure of the contents and a summary of the themes to be addressed, and to collect feedback and inputs (8 to 12 persons per country).

- **Creation of a Prototype Interactive Tool** – (which will include an e-learning course) in 6 languages, designed to promote the occupational mobility of job-seekers to other EU labour markets as well as their social, economic and cultural integration. The Tool will be available through a direct link from the project website. The Tool will be tested and validated in three partner counties entirely by distance or involve one seminar.
- **Dissemination and exploitation activities of the results** – activities will be undertaken not only to educate and inform, but also to disseminate the project results and promote the adaptation of the developed results.
- **DVD** – in six project languages with a total of 600 copies.

3. Evaluation Methodology

The detailed evaluation of the project is contained in the Project's Monitoring and Evaluation Plan. The information drawn here is based on the first two Partnership Meetings Evaluation Reports, the minutes from the first three Partnership meetings, correspondence between the Coordinator and the partners, correspondence among the partners, the deliverables and from my attendance at the 1st Partnership meeting in Porto.

4. Work Package 1 – Project Management (SPI - PT)

DURATION OF WP 1 - 01/10/2010 TO 30/09/2012 (24 MONTHS)			
Activity	Delivery according to Workplan	Sub-activities	Actual realisation
First Mol@m Skype conference	None		09/12/2010
Sub-activities as agreed on the Skype Conference			
Send a revised workplan		09/12/2010	09/12/2010
Resend the ppt on project presentation		09/12/2010	09/12/2010
Send information about hotel reservation for the Porto meeting		17/12/2010	17/12/2010
D1 – 1st Partnership meeting	01/11/2010, Portugal		20-21/01/2011, Porto, Portugal
D2 – 2nd Partnership meeting	04/04/2011, Germany		27-28/04/2011, Halle, Germany
D3 – 3rd Partnership meeting	05/09/2011, Italy		20-21/09/2011 Florence, Italy
D7 - Interim Report	30/10/2011		

There was a delay in scheduling the kick-off Partnership meeting because it was not possible for the Partners to match their availability, and this has led to some re-scheduling of dates for certain deliverables. As it was not possible to meet within 2010 the Partners agreed on a Skype conference which took place on 9 December 2010 with all but one of the partners who did not participate due to technical problems. The kick off meeting took place in Porto on 20-21 January 2011, the 2nd Partnership meeting on 27-28 April 2011 in Halle, Germany, and the 3rd Partnership meeting took place on 20-21 September 2011 in Florence, Italy. The second and third Partnership meetings have taken place within the month indicated in the project application, with a delay of 2-3 weeks later than planned, and this small delay does not affect the running of the project.

4.1. Summary and comments from the first two Evaluation Surveys on the Partnership performance and meetings held

A questionnaire for the first Partnership meeting was sent out to the meeting participants three weeks later, to be completed online and comprising of two sections, seven questions about the overall performance of coordination and leadership in the Partnership by the Project Co-ordinator SPI, and nine questions about evaluating the Partnership Meeting. The results of the evaluation of performance of coordination and leadership of the project were overwhelmingly positive (80%-90%). The only issue that was somewhat worrisome was that nearly half the participants felt that the deadlines were too tight due to the two month delay of the kick-off meeting, and this is reflected in the re-scheduling of some of the sub-activities of WP2. Regarding the evaluation of the organisation of the kick-off meeting it was rated by all the participants as good to excellent.

The second Partnership meeting took place in Halle, Germany, on 27 and 28 of April 2011. The questionnaire for evaluation of the meeting was sent out to the participants on 4th of July 2011. The results for both the overall performance of coordination and leadership in the Partnership by the Project Co-ordinator, and the evaluation of the Partnership Meeting were similar to those of the first one. All partners agreed that the tasks and the workplan and timetable are clear. All partners answered positively about the decision making progress and communication between partners. Partners also felt that their contribution was valued.

Nevertheless, from both the above questionnaires, as well as from correspondence amongst the Partners, there are persistent concerns regarding the workload and deadlines. Responding to these concerns the internal evaluator/monitor recommended the following actions need to be taken: All partners to take more responsibility for each work package (so all the responsibility is not falling only on the WP leader), deadlines need to include a margin to allow for changes or just certain aspects taking longer than expected, and the concern about an excessive work load (exceeding what was planned and budgeted for in the application) - particularly of deliverable D9 (Methodological approach – Research) of WP2 - needs to be addressed urgently. The above was communicated again on the 4th of July 2011 by the internal monitor to the Project Coordinator.

On the 12th of July the Project Coordinator replied that in her perspective, the above were due to the amount of effort that was demanded for WP2, in which the Partnership collected much information, but this information will be useful for the next stages of the project, so it will end up by compensating in terms of quality and probably less work. For example, a big amount of work was estimated for the development of contents in WP3, but thanks to the results of WP2 already have all the required information to proceed with the content component. So the Project Coordinator agreed to do send an e-mail to the partners explaining her reasons for the workload, and be more realistic when setting the deadlines. This email was sent on the same day by suggesting improvement in three areas: simplification of tasks, realistic deadlines and pointing out the Partnerships difficulties and making suggestions to achieve the best possible solution.

4.2. Project Management of the Coordinator

Based on the above surveys and the correspondence among the Partnership, the overall project management by the Coordinator has been good so far. The Coordinator has been able to follow up with outstanding issues and deadlines, has kept the project on track regarding deadlines, has shown timely response to Partner enquiries, and has also shown initiative and flexibility in dealing with some project implementation issues, as for instance in the case of WP2.

I would agree with the Coordinator's comments of 12th of July that most of the delays have been with WP2. However, in this report it is obvious that there are delays in all WPs, but not of critical nature at this point.

4.3. Performance of the Partnership

The main positive characteristics of the Partnership so far have been complementarity, cooperation, and hard and good quality work. The only major delay relates to the completion of deliverables in WP2 (2 months), the reasons for which have already been discussed. However, the completion of this WP, by taking into account all the information and conclusion that has been gathered, ought to make the completion of WPs 3, 4 and 5 more timely.

Recommendations:

Recommendation WP1-1: The ‘monkey survey’ to be made available to the partners during the Partnership meetings as it is standard. The partners to agree on a standard timeline for the completion of the survey and of the survey report. All of the above will help the internal evaluator not to ask often for responses from the partners.

Recommendation WP1-2: In view of the pressure on all partners to complete WP2, and also to meet deadlines for other WPs, the partners should try to set more achievable deadlines and stick to them as much as possible so to avoid additional pressure, delays and re-scheduling.

5. Work Package 2 – Research (DJI - DE)

DURATION OF WP 2 – 01/10/2010 TO 30/04/2011 (7 MONTHS)			
Activity	Delivery according to Workplan	Sub-activities	Actual realisation
First Mol@m Skype conference			09/12/2010
Sub-activities as agreed on Skype Conference			
Send first draft for research methodology		17/12/2010	17/12/2010
Send “homework” to partners to analyse their national contexts		17/12/2010	17/12/2010
Present the above homework		20/01/2011	Kick off meeting 20/01/2011
Develop final draft of Methodological approach		20/01/2011	15/02/2011
D9 – Methodological approach - Research	14/01/2011		
Sub-activities as agreed on 1st Partnership meeting			
Send EN version of the questionnaires with counsellors, interview grids with immigrants and immigrant organisations.		28/01/2011	26/01/2011 Final version of questionnaire for career guidance

			professionals sent on 15/02/2011
Send Methodological Approach		28/01/2011	09/02/2011
Test questionnaires with 1-2 counsellors (pre-test). [all partners]		11/02/2011	13/02/2011
Skype conference to discuss pre-testing results and if anything needs to be changed in the questionnaires. [all partners]		14/02/2011	14/02/2011
Finish desk research and send to pairs. [all partners]		01/03/2011	01/03/2011
Finish data collection (questionnaires and interviews). [all partners]		15/03/2011	01/03/2011
Analyse and organise data collected through questionnaires and interviews. [all partners]		10/04/2011	Final draft of the views of migrants, 20/04/2011
D10 – Research Report	30/04/2011		30/06/2011
Sub-activities as agreed on 1st Partnership meeting			
Report writing.		20/04/2011	16/06/2011
Report final proofreading and designing.		30/04/2011	30/06/2011
Sub-activities as agreed on 2nd Partnership meeting*			
Chapters 1 to 3 to be handed to TKF		31/05/2011	31/05/2011
Develop Chapter 4 of the Research Report		07/06/2011	10/06/2011
Final proofread of the Research Report		10/06/2011	30/06/2011
National Reports		30/06/2011	30/09/2011 Spain

* The deadlines agreed at the Partnership meeting were readjusted after further discussion by an email sent by the Project Manager on 20/05/2011 because there were some difficulties in compiling the information with the quality desired by the due dates.

A preliminary discussion took place on the interview guidelines for low skilled immigrants, the methodology of the interviews and the analysis of the national results during the first Mol@m Skype conference on 9 December 2010. As agreed on this conference the WP responsible partner (DJI) sent to the partners on time the draft tools for data collection, [Draft Structure of the Research Report, Desk Research Guidelines, Guidelines for Expert interviews and Guidelines for Interviews with labour migrants] and the “homework”, the investigation of potential interview partners for the expert interviews. The above draft interview grid was redesigned by SPI, prior to the kick off meeting, to a questionnaire to be administered to career guidance counsellors, and an additional tool for the immigrant organisations in each partner country, so to ensure the inclusion of the original suggestion mentioned in the project proposal and adopt the same methodology in each country.

During the kick off meeting DJI presented the questionnaire and a general discussion took place about terminology, concepts, target groups, methods and tools of conducting the research and interviews. Regarding the drafting of the Research Report, it was agreed that the national reports had to be translated to all partner languages. In addition, in order to facilitate the revision of the

Research Report the partners decided to form pairs for the revision of the outcomes of the national desk research. The pairs were: TK-JI, ASIMAG-SPI and CE-TEMPO.

The only conceptual issue that required some discussion was whether there should be a clear separation between 'migrant hosting' and 'migrant sending' countries when asking the relevant target groups. It was finally agreed not to give emphasis on these terms and instead use the terms to 'home country' and 'destination country'. The questionnaire was pilot tested and on a Skype discussion on 14/02/2011, and all partners agreed that the questionnaire for career guidance professionals is useable with some minor adjustments.

During the conduct of the interviews all partners met the stated targets – 10 experts and 2 migrants from each country. The most challenging part for all partners was the analysis and the consolidation of the collected data and DJI provided and responded to nearly all the guidance and comments from the other partners for the completion of this task.

During the 2nd Partnership meeting in Halle, all partners discussed the survey findings and commented on which findings/ aspects need to be considered/prioritised for inclusion in the Interactive Tool. There was also a detailed discussion that fined tuned the required input on the various sections of the Research report.

By 30 June 2011 the national reports that had been finalised were from Portugal, Italy and the Czech Republic. The reports from the UK and Germany were delivered by the 20th of July, but the translation of the Spanish National Report was only completed in 30 Sept 2011 due to staff changes of the partner. However, this had no implications in the development of the other activities of the project, since all the information was contained in the global research report in English, which was finalised, revised and published by the 30th June.

6. Work Package 3 – Content Elaboration (TKF - IT)

DURATION OF WP 3 – 01/10/2010 TO 05/12/2011 (15MONTHS)			
Activity	Delivery according to Workplan	Sub-activities	Actual realisation
D11 – Methodological approach - contents	07/03/2011		
Sub-activities as agreed on 2nd Partnership meeting			
Proposal for the structure of the tool.		20/05/2011	31/05/2011
Proposal for the information section of the tool		31/05/2011	31/05/2011
Revised methodological approach		31/05/2011	14/07/2011
D12 – Content building workshops	06/06/2011		13/07/2011 UK
Sub-activities as agreed on 2nd Partnership meeting			
Conduct the content building workshops		June and July 2011	13/07/2011 UK
Sub-activities as suggested by TKF on 20/07/2011			
DJI and CE send the minutes of the Content building workshops to TK Formazione.		22/07/2011	28/07/2011
Elaboration of all contents		31/12/2011	
D13 - Contents	05/12/2011	31/12/2011	

During the kick-off meeting it was discussed that the content building workshops will be held in Italy, the UK and Germany with representatives of the target groups, in order to discuss the proposed structure for the contents of the Interactive Tool, and collect inputs about the proposed contents and characteristics of the Tool. It was clarified that these were not going to be validation workshops and their objective was not going to be presentation of the detailed contents, but instead to discuss the structure and main themes that partners plan to insert in the Interactive Tool. After collecting these inputs from the workshop participants, contents will be developed in detail and translated by all partners.

A draft of the methodological approach of the content elaboration and on the organisation of the content building workshops was sent by TKF to all partners for comments on 31 May 2011. The draft document contained all the necessary quality/performance indicators identified in the M&E Plan. The German content building workshop had 9 participants, the Italian 11 and the UK 6 and overall went well.

The main findings from the content building workshops were: There are many services available (different quality and availability in countries), hardly any specific information for low qualified persons, limited knowledge before and after migration, limited knowledge of services in home country, labour migration is something positive and knowledge of language of host country is a key for employment and settlement.

7. Work Package 4 – Creation of Interactive Tool (SPI - PT)

DURATION OF WP 4 - 05/06/2011 TO 05/03/2012 (9 MONTHS)			
Activity	Delivery according to Workplan	Sub-activities	Actual realisation
D14 – Methodological approach – Interactive tool	04/07/2011		10/06/2011 (version 1) 30/09/2011 (version 2)
Sub-activities as agreed on 2nd Partnership meeting			
Proposal for the structure of the tool.		20/05/2011	20/05/2011
Sub-activities as suggested by TKF on 20/07/2011			
All partners send the filled grid/scheme with the collection of relevant websites for section D of the Interactive Tool.		31/08/2011	

The first draft of the proposal of the structure of the Interactive Tool was distributed to the partners on 20 May 2011 and it covered all main sections. This document was, at the same time, the first version of D14 – Methodological Approach “Interactive Tool”, based fundamentally on the conclusions of WP2 and on the discussion of the meeting in Halle. The partners were asked to provide feedback by 10 June 2011, which was done by TK and CE, as the other partners had no special comments. The Partnership agreed to maintain this version and discuss it in the content building workshops and only after that, elaborate a new version of the structure of the Tool.

During the 2nd Partnership meeting in Halle (in April), the partners decided to discuss the elaboration of the Interactive Tool at an early stage because they thought it made better sense to discuss this along with the development of the contents (WP3). So at the content building workshops the version of the Interactive Tool that was presented was based on the results and conclusions of the Research (WP2).

Following the above workshops, the elaboration of the Interactive Tool was updated to incorporate the comments of the workshop participants and was discussed during the 3rd Partnership meeting in Florence – this gave origin to an updated version (version 2) of D14 – Methodological Approach “Interactive Tool”. Based on the results of the content building workshops the Tool should not be a parallel structure of existing tools, but to focus on the low qualified, on guidelines prior to migration, be used for prior preparation of migration, use the story telling section to help make realistic plans, while national contexts vary greatly and cannot be applied for all.

Recommendation WP4-1: Based on the suggestion of the External Evaluator sent to the partners on the 16th September 2011, the Interactive Tool could be developed Section by Section in order to made the process more manageable and achievable, maintain high quality and avoid lengthy delays and complicated follow up with partners.

Recommendation WP4-2: Based on the suggestion of the External Evaluator sent to the partners on the 19th September 2011, to include in either Section D or E of the Interactive Tool some practical information about the first and necessary things/steps that migrants need to do when settling in any of the partners' countries.

8. Work Package 5 – Test and Validation (ASIMAG - ES)

DURATION OF WP 5 - 09/01/2012 TO 06/08/2012 (8 MONTHS)			
Activity	Delivery according to Workplan	Sub-activities	Actual realisation
D16 – Methodological Approach – Testing	09/01/2012		

9. Work Package 6 – Dissemination (TEMPO – CZ)

DURATION OF WP 6 – 01/10/2011 TO 30/09/2012 (24 MONTHS)			
Activity	Delivery according to Workplan	Sub-activities	Actual realisation
D21 - Dissemination plan	04/04/2011		
First Mol@m Skype conference			09/12/2010
Sub-activities as agreed on Skype Conference			
Send template to partners to fill in about their proposed dissemination activities		17/12/2010	17/12/2010
Partners return the template to TEMPO		07/12/2011	08/02/2011
Present final draft of D21 – Dissemination plan		20/01/2011	08/02/2011
Sub-activities as agreed on 1st Partnership meeting			
Send the missing documents for national dissemination plans to TEMPO.		28/01/2011	07/02/2011
Send the final draft of the Dissemination Plan.		31/01/2011	15/03/2011
Send the national list of key actors to TEMPO.		31/03/2011	07/02/2011
D22 – Project brochure	04/04/2011		
Sub-activities as agreed on 2nd Partnership meeting			
Feedback on the brochure.		06/05/2011	18/05/2011
Translations of the brochure.		15/05/2011	07/06/2011

A comprehensive but concise template for the national dissemination plans was sent by NVF to all partners on 17 December 2010 to be completed by 7 January 2011. The task was completed a month later. There were short delays in completing various sub-activities, i.e. updated versions of the national plans, list of key actors, but this didn't stop partners to conduct their dissemination activities. The report on the dissemination activities regarding the first reporting period was delivered by 15/4.

The dissemination plan was completed on 15 March 2011, 6 weeks later than planned. The quality of the plan is good covering all major areas of dissemination, such as its rationale, identification of target group, rules for dissemination, the national dissemination plans and activities.

A short description of the project in a 'mini-leaflet' was produced by SPI in January 2001 and was provided to the other partners for use and translation. The project brochure was produced with only a small delay of 2 weeks and it had favourable comments from all the partners.

10. Work Package 7 – Website and Blog (SPI - PT)

DURATION OF WP 7 – 01/10/2010 TO 30/09/2012 (24 MONTHS)			
Activity	Delivery according to Workplan	Sub-activities	Actual realisation
D25 – Project website	04/04/2011		
Sub-activities as agreed on 2nd Partnership meeting			
Translations and comments on the website.		10/05/2011	16/05/2011.
Launch the website.		15/05/2011	16/05/2011
D25 – Project blog	04/07/2011		

The project website was designed and uploaded on March 2011, as well as the blog, the Twitter and the Facebook and partners were invited to comment on all of the above by 4 March 2011. There were some suggestions for improvement of the website, such as the use of a drop box for handling bigger files. The website was made available in all languages on 16 May 2011, almost on schedule.

Regarding the Mola@m blog, SPI suggested that the partners send their material by the last Friday of each month and then update it. The material should include topics relevant to the project theme.

11. Work Package 8 – Exploitation (TEMPO - CZ)

DURATION OF WP 8 - 05/09/2011 TO 03/09/2012 (13 MONTHS)			
Activity	Delivery according to Workplan	Sub-activities	Actual realisation
D27 – Exploitation strategy	05/09/2011		

TEMPO requested on 23 August 2011 from the partners a one page description - to be provided by 30th of August so there can be a presentation at the 3rd Partnership meeting - of the activities they intent to carry out in order to exploit the project outputs and results. At the 3rd Partnership meeting it was mentioned that the contributions from the UK and Spanish partners were still missing, but the aspects connected to the exploitation strategy were discussed in order to allow the elaboration of the Exploitation Strategy (D27).

12. Work Pack 9 – Monitoring and Evaluation (CE-UK)

DURATION OF WP 9 - 01/10/2010 TO 30/09/2012 (24 MONTHS)			
Activity	Delivery according to Workplan	Sub-activities	Actual realisation
First Mol@m Skype conference			
Sub-activities as agreed on Skype Conference			
Present final draft of D30 – Monitoring and evaluation plan		20/01/2011	
D30 – Monitoring and Evaluation Plan	10/01/2011		
Sub-activities as agreed on 1 st Partnership meeting			
Send monitoring and evaluation plan to SPI.		28/01/2011	25/02/2011
Send monitoring and evaluation plan to all partners.		28/01/2011	11/03/2011
D31 – Interim evaluation report	05/09/2011		

The External Evaluator submitted his original proposal to the Project Co-ordinator on the 15th of November 2010 and the final one on 13th of December 2010. The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan as required by the proposal was developed jointly by the external and internal evaluators (CEA). A first draft of the M&E Plan was distributed to the partners for comments on the 23rd of December 2010. Additional comments were sent by the external evaluator on 5th of January 2011. The final draft of the M&E Plan was sent for comments to the partners on the 16th of February 2011. In general, the comments were positive with some minor changes. The final version of the M&E Plan was sent to all the partners on the 11th of March 2011, a six week delay.

13. Conclusion

Overall, the project has progressed well, albeit under some considerable strain and pressure at times in relation to WP2. It is obvious to all partners the need for the best utilisation of the WP2 material and results, and apply significant focus on the detail of planning and execution of WPs 3, 4 and 5. This is important to be done between now (October 2011) and February 2012. A positive step has been the initiative to start discussing the development of the Interactive Tool earlier than planned, in parallel with the Research and the Content Elaboration WPs, so to get its structure right at an early stage. At the same time, while it is important to focus on the above three WPs, the other three WPs should not be neglected in terms of timely completion of their sub-activities and deliverables.