



# Results of the 3rd evaluation round

Final version | August 2012

Institute for Innovation in Learning, University of Erlangen Nuremberg

*"This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication [communication] reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein."*

LLP/Leonardo da Vinci Programme | Grant agreement number: 2010-1-PT1-LEO05-05164

## Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	3
2. General Aspects of the Project Development and the Role of the Partners.....	5
3. Communication .....	16
4. Added Value (of Intermediate Outcomes).....	24
5. Strengths of Best Form and Suggestions for Improvement.....	29

## 1. Introduction

This document is the 3<sup>rd</sup> evaluation report within the Best Form project. All the partners have contributed in terms of completing a questionnaire and the report was developed by the German partner the Institute for Innovation in Learning, University of Erlangen Nuremberg.

Evaluation is an on-going process, made of “formal” procedures as well as of “informal” interactions, and unpredictable contingencies. The evaluation process, as an integrated part of the Best Form project looks intensively at the operations (the way the project is conducted) and on the outcomes and effects, both from a partner and individual perspective.

Evaluation is expected to feedback information to the project members and lead to an increase in the quality of the project.

### 1.1 The Purpose of the Evaluation

Internal evaluation supports the Consortium to decide whether the project is meeting its wider objectives and how certain aspects should and could be improved. Evaluation in the Best Form context follows in the first place a formative approach. The main reasons for the evaluation activities are:

- Considering if there are better ways of designing the project and,
- The opportunity to learn from what has and has not succeeded.

The methodologies and tools applied aim at defining a twofold purpose: i) Best Form’s operational and ii) learning purposes:

1. Operational purposes, namely to look at how the project is being developed, the project management, the quality of partners’ participation, alignment with the project activities, potential corrective measures etc.
2. Learning purposes: identifying the critical factors of the project activities, the overall assessment of the “lesson” that can be drawn from the project.

## **1.2 Scope of the Evaluation**

The evaluation activities are focused at making sure that the project develops along the directions described in the description of work and necessary for a high quality of the project outcomes.

Internal evaluation collects information for the project coordination to determine whether the project is being implemented as planned; to identify strengths and weaknesses of the project and any problems that need to be solved, whilst collecting suggestions for improvement.

In response to operational aspects, evaluation will focus on the following activities:

- Project development, administration and handling of financial matters and;
- Communication among partners.

In response to learning aspects, evaluation will focus on the following activities:

- Assessment of the project partners' degree of satisfaction about the project outputs and results; and,
- Assessment of the added-value the project generates for individuals and organisations.

The project partners are the main audience of the evaluation activity. It should be noted that all project partners are involved in the evaluation tasks.

## **1.3 Evaluation Criteria**

The following dimensions are being addressed for evaluating the project from an internal perspective:

- Project development, coordination and roles,
- Communication style, referring to the communication flow among partners, that lead to a guarantee of good management and sharing of information,
- Added value for individuals and organisations participating in the project.

## **1.4 Evaluation Instrument**

Online-questionnaire for internal evaluation: The objective of the questionnaire is to internally monitor the status of the project and generate ideas for improving collaboration, communication and interdisciplinary research within ImREAL. It is aimed at collecting individual's perception of the project. The questionnaire encompasses closed questions and some open questions (Annex 1), and is divided into three sections:

- (1) General aspects of project development and the role of partners,
- (2) Communication,

(3) added value (of immediate outcomes).

- Under each of these sections project partners are asked to comment on the following:
  - (a) Develop an overall assessment,
  - (b) Comment on any problems encountered and how they have been overcome – was the outcome satisfactory?,
  - (c) Comment on any positive aspects,
  - (d) How things could be improved.

## 2. General Aspects of the Project Development and the Role of the Partners

In the following you find a description of the development of the project, which is based on an evaluation questionnaire filled in by all partners after the first, second and third evaluation meeting.

Table 1: development of the project regarding the role of the coordinator in project development, the feasibility/practicality of project planning, handling of administrative and financial matters, problem-solving, relevance between stated objectives and activities carried out, accord and shared visions within the WP and the satisfaction with the state of development of activities in the WPs.

Dimensions	<b>3<sup>rd</sup> meeting:</b> participants stating a “high to very high level of satisfaction” in percentage (number of answers)	Missing answers	1 <sup>st</sup> meeting evaluation	2 <sup>nd</sup> meeting evaluation	3 <sup>rd</sup> meeting evaluation
Role of the co-ordinator in project development	<b>88% (7)</b>	1	100% (7)	100% (8)	88% (7)
Feasibility/practicality of project planning	<b>88% (8)</b>	-	100% (8)	87,5% (7)	88% (8)
Handling of administrative and financial matters	<b>38% (7)</b>	1	<b>62,5% (5)</b>	100% (8)	<b>38% (7)</b>
Problem-solving	<b>88% (8)</b>	-	100% (8)	87,5% (7)	88% (8)
Relevance between stated objectives and activities carried out	<b>88% (8)</b>	-	87,5% (7)	100% (9)	88% (8)

*Boosting Entrepreneurship Tools for Migrants  
August 2012*

Accord and shared visions within the WP	<b>100% (8)</b>	-	87,5% (7)	88,87% (7)	100% (8)
Satisfaction with the state of development of activities in the WPs	<b>63% (8)</b>	-	87,5% (7)	<b>55,56% (5)</b>	<b>63% (8)</b>

The partners (number of partners, who filled in the questionnaire: 8 with two missing answers in this first part) are content or even very content with the role of the coordinator regarding the project development as well as with the feasibility/practicality of the project, the problem solving and the relevance between stated objectives and activities carried out.

For the role of the coordinator regarding the project development there has been a decline from 100% in the first and second evaluation round to 88% in the third evaluation round.

For the feasibility/practicality of the project as well as for problem solving it is almost the same result in the third evaluation round as for the second evaluation round with 88% and 87,5%. Compared to the first evaluation round it is a decline from 100%.

For the relevance between stated objectives and activities carried out the result in the third evaluation round is almost the same compared to the first round with 88% and 87,5%. There was an improvement in the second evaluation round to 100% compared to the first round and thus a decline in comparison to the third round.

Only 38% of the partners are content with the handling of administrative and financial matters. It is a decline compared to the first and second evaluation rounds with 62,5% and 100%.

All partners (100%) are content with the accord and shared visions within the WP. It is an improvement compared to 87,5% in the first and 88,87% in the second evaluation round.

More than the half of the partners (63%) is content with the state of development of activities in the WPs. It is an improvement compared to the second evaluation round with only 55,56%, but a decline in comparison to the first evaluation round with 87,5%.

**Summing up the results indicate a positive development of the project although the state of development of activities in the WPs (63%) can be improved as well as and even more the handling of administrative and financial matters with only 38%.**

Below there are individual comments on each single question:

**Comments on “Role of the co-ordinator in project development”**

Problems encountered:

- Definition tasks in Portugal somewhat complicated,

- The main problem faced during these last 6 months was: the lack of information from the promoter with regards to the current situation of the project and the development of the main project results,
- The coordinator has been less engaged in the project in the last period.

Previous comments:

- The information concerning the exchange rate was send without not enough time and this delay the elaboration of national financial reports.
- There have been difficulties in complying with a few deadlines.
- I would have liked the coordinator to have put a bit more pressure on the work of partners as we approach the delivery of the pilots.
- There were no problems encountered.
- Some deadlines could not be matched. The reasons are multiple.

Positive/satisfactory aspects:

- Excellent approach to dealing with partners,
- It is useful that the coordinator reminds us periodically about deadlines!
- Good communication with SPI and other partners,
- The work is well organized and in friendly way. Documents i.e. meetings minutes prepared on time and of good quality,
- During the meeting, we established clear work guidelines for the coming months until the end of the project.

Previous comments:

- The communication level with André and Mette is very high and they are always there to support you,
- Efficient role of the coordinator in leading project development and ensuring the accomplishment of deadline's results,
- The experience of the coordinator institution in managing similar projects,
- The style of relationship with partners is very straight forward, direct but polite,
- Very good management, efficient coordination,
- The work is well organized and in friendly way. Documents i.e. meetings minutes prepared on time and of good quality,
- Very friendly and engage coordination.

Additional comments:

- In any case, the coordinator shows excellent professional skills and ensures the project consortium cohesion.

**Although the project partners mention some smaller problems regarding some aspects of organisation within the project, they are content with the coordinator and stress the friendly and good way to communicate.**

**Previous summarized: The partners describe the co-ordinator as very efficient, well managed and experienced in managing similar projects. The communication with the coordinator is very high and supportive. The only problem that occurred was difficulties in complying with deadlines.**

**Comments on “Feasibility/practicality of project planning”**

Problems encountered:

- I think there should be clearer sense of what tasks/activities should be prioritised for,
- No problems,
- Some of the project activities are much more time consuming than anticipated, which sometimes causes delays in the project implementation,
- Still there are a lot of things to do until the end of the project. External evaluation should be done earlier not now, at the same time with the national pilots in Portugal and Italy.

Previous comments:

- Sometimes the deadlines are provided with tight times,
- The planning needs a constant update, due to delays and non compliance with previous deadlines,
- Project planning is a bit skewed towards product development and the working of the partnership. I believe more planning (and action) is required to engage with target groups for the pilots and the broader stakeholder groups,
- We did not face real problems. Once or twice we felt the allocated time was a bit too short, we asked for few more days and the coordinator accepted it. This does not impede at all upon the project’s progress or quality of the products,
- Some aspects of the project are difficult to realise and sometimes it would be better to rethink some activities, like the complete translation of the Case studies, which is not really a huge gain for the community of business adviser, since it is too extended.

Positive/satisfactory aspects:

- Plans are being implemented and the project is meeting its targets,
- Realistic deadlines,
- Easy to move on,
- Events and steps are consulted with partners and then accepted by all. If needed timeframe of activities is adjusted,
- I think in general the project is running smoothly, and all partners are having an active role in the project implementation.

Previous comments:

- The planning has been flexible enough and constantly updated,
- There has been progress and the partnership as a whole is working, which is good to see.
- Good consensus among the partners,
- Events and steps are consulted with partners and then accepted by all,
- Good planning and good reaction to changes in the deadlines.

**Summarizing the comments, it is clear that the partners think that in general the project is running smoothly and that all partners have an active role in the project implementation.**

**Previous summarized: Many partners suggest that there is more time needed in order to comply with the deadlines. But the planning has been flexible and there was a good consensus among the partners.**

**Comments on “Handling of administrative and financial matters”  
problems encountered:**

- Communication re: financial issues is patchy,
- Complicated explaining and getting enough cash to support project expenses due to delay in payments.

Previous comments:

- Some confusion regarding financial budgets.
- Reply to questions raised by the partners should be a little bit faster.
- There were no problems encountered.
- There were a couple of delays due to delayed feedback from SPI.

Positive/satisfactory aspects:

- Done in a professional way, always in due time, without putting extra-pressure on us,
- Good communication with SPI coordinator.

Previous comments:

- Strong answers trying to solve the problems,
- The experience of the coordinator institution in managing these issues,
- Everything transparent and clear,
- Lots of understanding and support from coordinating team,
- Financial rules are clearly presented, templates and assistance is provided in due time,
- Actually everything running very smoothly. The financial and administrative matters are being handled in a detailed and effective way.

Additional comments:

- We would like to be more updated about administrative and financial matters from the promoter.

**There are different and even contradictory opinions stated by the project partners regarding this aspect. This result can be also seen in the number of content project partners which is only 38% of all project partners who answered the questionnaire.**

**Previously summarized: Several comments mention that some confusion regarding financial budgets had emerged and that questions raised by partners to the coordinator should have a faster reply. But there are also aspects which went well like good management and support of administrative and financial issues by the coordinating team.**

**Comments on “Problem-solving”**

Problems encountered:

- Continuity problems persist,
- Difficulties in getting problems solved due to national agency complications,
- It is a challenge to develop a project and products that are equally useable and interesting in different national realities,
- A very long time between submitting the interim report and receiving the next payment. In fact the next payment is expected in June 2012. It means financial problems with cash flow in partners' institutions,

- Although the communication in these last 6 months was not so good, the promoter always has good attitude to face and solve the problems.

Previous comments:

- There is a good attitude from all partners to solve problems,
- There has been some continuity issues, for example partners replacing people assigned to the project, making it difficult for newcomers to grasp what the project is about and how best to contribute to it,
- There were no problems encountered.

Positive/satisfactory aspects:

- Issues are addressed and the work is carried out,
- Good communication with SPI coordinator,
- The coordinator is able to find tailored solutions considering partner needs,
- Financial rules are clearly presented, templates and assistance is provided in due time,
- I think that the partnership as a whole is very good to solve the problems that they encounter, and have a high level of communication between them.

Previous comments:

- Best Form consortium has created a useful collaboration that enhances the attitude to solve the problem encountered,
- Partners have a very open and sincere communication amongst them,
- Partners are very efficient when in need to handle with a specific problem,
- Everybody is keen to contribute and get on with their work for the project,
- Good mobilization of the partners for preparing the Interim Report,
- Partnership is effective in solving problem and applying changes if necessary,
- Good communication in the partnership. All problems could be addressed and solved. Good problem solving.

Previous additional comments:

- Elaborating and sending the Interim Report in due time and at the required standards had a high stake and created a kind of pressure, but the coordinating team was very well organised and acted professionally in gathering data, documents, etc. from partners and in managing excellently the

---

situation under the given conditions. It proved determination but also gentleness in working with the others.

**The partners mention continuity problems and financial aspects which cause(d) problems, but they also stress the good communication within the partnership and with the coordinator.**

**Previous summarized: There is a positive feedback regarding the aspect problem-solving. The partners are efficient, show supportive communication and share the spirit of finding solutions for problems encountered.**

### **Comments on “Relevance between stated objectives and activities carried out”**

#### Problems encountered:

- It appears that relationships with grass root migrant organisations could have been more intense,
- Unfortunately cash difficulties did not allow us to participate in Romania meeting,
- It can be difficult to fully meet the expectations of the target groups.

#### Previous comments:

- Only issue from my perspective is that the definition of business advisor seems to differ accordingly to which country is examined and this can sometimes create difficulties in the synergy of the activities and the objectives,
- In a few occasions, the results and outcomes were behind the expectations set in the proposal,
- As stated, I would like to see more activities aimed at connecting with community leaders, community advisers and other people playing a role in their communities,
- There were no problems encountered,
- In a few occasions, the results and outcomes were behind the expectations set in the proposal.

#### Positive/satisfactory aspects:

- Nevertheless, the composition of the trainee groups in Portugal and Italy is quite interesting,
- Strong correlation objectives-activities (the partnership succeeded to keep unchanged the initially foreseen objectives and to achieve them through activities and outcomes),
- There is a good coherence between the project objectives and the activities within the target groups,
- Pilot course move good and participants are motivated,
- Partnership is effective in solving problem and applying changes if necessary,

- I see a high level of coherence between the objectives and the project activities.

Previous comments:

- The objectives and the activities carried out are connected to the real needs,
- I do believe that the overall project aims correspond to the activities that the partnership is carrying out and has carried out,
- Still, the results produced so far generally satisfy the main goals of the project,
- The pilot programme is beginning to take shape; contacts with potential participants have been established,
- Perfect correlation objectives-activities. The partnership could perform all foreseen activities and thus achieved the objectives,
- Still, the results produced so far generally satisfy the main goals of the project.

Previous additional comments:

- Objectives were relevant first of all for the partners (we believe in them!), and of course for the stakeholders as well.

**There is the opinion that the relationships with grass root migrant organisations could have been more intense and furthermore that it can be difficult to fully meet the expectations of the target groups. One project partner country had cash difficulties that did not allow him/her to participate in the meeting in Romania.**

**Some partners wrote that there is a good coherence between the project objectives and the activities within the target groups and that the pilot course develops good and that the participants are motivated. Furthermore that the partnership is effective in solving problems and applying changes if necessary. In general it shows a positive development.**

**Previous summarized: Generally the comments on the aspect of the relevance between stated objectives and activities carried out were positive. In addition there were comments that the definition of business advisor differed accordingly which could create difficulties in the synergy of the activities and objectives and that there should be more contact with community leaders, community advisor and other people in immigrant community.**

## **Comments on “Accord and shared visions within the WP”**

### Problems encountered:

- There are some communication skills and problems to move on the project as we intended.

### Previous comments:

- I think it would take more time to develop a shared vision because the project has many ramifications. This is not a criticism or ‘problem’ as such but simply a fact,
- There were no problems encountered.

### Positive/satisfactory aspects:

- I believe the experience of the pilots has helped create a common vision,
- No disagreements in that regard,
- All the partners are in line with the planned work,
- There is huge effort of everybody to move on with the project,
- At the 3rd meeting details of WP5 Post implementation where discussed, afterwards tools were prepared and accepted so partners should have a clear vision what is expected from them,
- I think each WP is well planned and its activities are clear for the project and the other WPs.

### Previous comments:

- Partners exchange opinions and give in general feedbacks to the partner which is leading the WP,
- Each WP coordinator and each partner is very aware of their role and tasks within the project,
- The level of consensus is sufficient to ensure the project has a good chance of reaching its short term objectives,
- Shared vision achieved from the beginning,
- At the 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting details of preparing training modules were discussed and partners should have a clear vision what is expected from them,
- Each WP coordinator and each partner is very aware of their role and tasks within the project.

### Previous additional comments:

- Only a shared vision that highlights the strategic potential of the project and therefore gives it higher priority would make it possible to pursue longer term objectives beyond September 2012.
- Each WP leader supported in an efficient way the others in developing and achieving the tasks.

**There is a quite good feedback from the project partners regarding the accord and shared visions within**

the WP.

Previous summarized: Although it might take more time to create a shared vision amongst partners because people have different perceptions, operate in different realities and the project has many ramifications, there are also optimistic comments that there are interest in the concepts and the model and also the willingness to think laterally, which can be beneficial for the development of the approach.

### Comments on “Satisfaction with the state of development of activities in the WPs”

#### Problems encountered:

- I think the fact that small enterprise development is not a speciality for several partners acts as a limiting factor,
- Maybe some if the current delays could be avoided if for example the non piloting partners were involved in the external assessment at the same time that the Portuguese and Italian partners were developing the national pilots.

#### Previous comments:

- There were some delays in the execution of WP2 but these delays didn't affect the implementation of the next WPs,
- There have been some delays in some of the WPs, but it seems to have improved, but it is important not to delay the work in progress and future activities,
- WP2 activities were too delayed,
- A few activities of WP3 and WP6 were also behind schedule,
- I think the lack of experience of assisting real entrepreneurs is making it difficult for some partners to develop learning materials that can 'talk' both to entrepreneurs and advisers. The treatment is a bit 'text book' like, too dry,
- There were no problems encountered,
- WP2 activities were too delayed,
- A few activities of WP3 and WP6 were also behind schedule.

#### Positive/satisfactory aspects:

- I think the project has helped raise the profile of entrepreneurship amongst partners,
- Small delays in achieving certain dissemination outcomes, but without affecting the partnership's satisfaction or the project's progress,
- I think all partners are motivated and put a lot of efforts to perform their tasks properly,

- Except for some minor delays, I feel that the project is following its work plan and all the WPs are developed accordingly to this plan.

Previous comments:

- I think all partners have done great efforts to “catch up” with the delays, and are ensuring that no future delay will occur,
- Partners have a great capacity to make additional efforts in order to comply with deadlines and to timely produce outcomes of the project,
- Partners are willing to have a go and I’m sure there will be a shift of emphasis as we move closer to the pilot programmes,
- The partnership worked efficient and we have no delays or under-achievements of the activities/outcomes,
- I think all partners are motivated and put a lot of efforts to perform their tasks properly,
- Partners have a great capacity to make additional efforts in order to comply with deadlines and to timely produce outcomes of the project.

**Summing up only with the exception of some minor delays the project is following its work plan and all the WPs are developed accordingly to this plan.**

Previous summarized: Summing up, the partners are content with the state of the development of the activities in the work packages. But they also mention that there have been some delays in some WPs and the partners try their best to comply with deadlines.

### 3. Communication

**Table 2:** development of the project regarding the role of the coordinator in the communication process, communication flows among partners, level of attention on the developed work (e.g. feedback), partners’ active attitude (e.g. initiative in presenting proposals and themes for elaboration/discussion) and technical issues using the project communication tools

Dimensions	<b>3<sup>rd</sup> meeting:</b> Participants stating a “high to very high level of satisfaction” in percentage (number of	Missing answers	1 <sup>st</sup> meeting evaluation	2 <sup>nd</sup> meeting evaluation	3 <sup>rd</sup> meeting evaluation

*Boosting Entrepreneurship Tools for Migrants  
August 2012*

	answers)				
The role of the co-ordinator in the communication process	<b>63% (7)</b>	1	100% (7)	100% (8)	<b>63% (7)</b>
Communication flows among partners	<b>100% (8)</b>	-	87,5% (7)	77,78% (7)	100% (8)
Level of attention on the developed work (e.g. feedback)	<b>75% (8)</b>	-	<b>62,5% (5)</b>	<b>66,67% (5)</b>	75% (8)
Partners' active attitude (e.g. initiative in presenting proposals and themes for elaboration/discussion)	<b>88% (8)</b>	-	87,5% (7)	87,5% (7)	88% (8)
Technical issues using the project communication tools	<b>75% (7)</b>	1	100% (6)	85,71% (6)	75% (7)

63% of the partners (number of partners: 8 with two missing answers in this second part) are content and very content with the role of the coordinator in the communication process. Compared to the first and second evaluation round where 100% of satisfaction regarding this aspect was reached, there was a mentionable decline in the third round.

100% of the partners are content with the communication flow among partners in the third round. Compared to the first with 87,5% and the second round with 77,78% it is a mentionable improvement.

More than the half of the partners (75%) is content with the level of attention on the developed work, for example feedback. It is a slight improvement in comparison to the first evaluation round with 62,5% and the second one with 66,67%.

88% of the partners are content with the active attitude of the partners which is expressed through the initiative in presenting proposals and themes for elaboration and discussions. Compared to the first evaluation round with 87,5% as well as to the second round with 87,5% it is a very similar result.

75% of the partners are content with the technical issues using the project communication tools. In the first and second evaluation round 100% and 85,71% were content. It is a clear decline.

**In summary the communication is in a positive state, but there could be a greater focus on the role of the coordinator in the communication process.**

Below there are individual comments on each single question/aspect:

**Comments on “The role of the co-ordinator in the communication process”**

Criticalities:

- The promoter should update more frequently partners on the current project situation.

Previous comments:

- Overall, communication is good but at times, when the main coordinator is away, there are gaps,
- There was nothing to criticize.

Positive/satisfactory aspects:

- Good coordination, getting individual partners and the group 'to come up with the goods',
- We got always prompt replies,
- The coordinator ensure an excellent communication process,
- Coordinator responds to every email and organizes Skype conference to ensure good communication. If there is a need reminders are sent to avoid delays.

Previous comments:

- Both, André and Mette are always available if you need something or you have doubts,
- The coordinator has established a positive leadership in the communication process,
- The communication flows efficiently among partners, being smooth, open, sincere and intense,
- Most of time, communication is good, with clear information and suggestions about tasks,
- Active, efficient and "visible" continuously,
- Coordinator responds to every email and organizes Skype conference to ensure good communication. If there is a need a reminders are sent to avoid delays,
- Very good coordination. Open and problem solving oriented. Understands his role as coordinator and not as leader, which is obviously very good for collaboration and cooperation within the project.

**There are different opinions regarding the satisfaction with the communication process chosen by the coordinator, but the majority gives a good feedback and is very content.**

**Previous summarized: In comparison with the first evaluation round the project partners still think that the co-ordinator has established a positive leadership in the communication process. The partners appreciate that he enables a good, active and efficient communication.**

**Comments on "Communication flows among partners"**

Criticalities:

- Communication to some extent can always be improved, but I think partners are already very good to communicate,
- Communication could be more fluid,
- The communication should be improved. It could be interesting to consider as compulsory the sending of feedbacks by all partners.

Pervious comments:

- I would like to have a better communication level among partners,
- I would like to see a bit more substance in the communication,
- There was nothing to criticize.

Positive/satisfactory aspects:

- There is communication,
- Continuity and promptness,
- I feel that partners have an active role and provide feedback and talk when applicable.

Pervious comments:

- I think in general that there is a good communication flow between partners and that partner coordinating a WP, is very good to take responsibility for the WP and inform the coordinator about the progress,
- Good communication flows thanks to frequent contacts among partners,
- The communication flows efficiently among partners, being smooth, open, sincere and regularly,
- There is communication,
- Permanent/continued proper and pleasant communication style (friendly, balanced and supportive),
- Good communication within the partnership, although some partners are at some time detached.

**In general the project partners are content with the communication among partners although some wish an improvement regarding this aspect.**

**Previous summarized: Similar to the first survey the coordinated and moderated communication is satisfactory. The communication works well because of frequent contacts among the partners although some of the partners wish to have more communication.**

**Comments on “Level of attention on the developed work (e.g. feedback)”**

Criticalities:

- Feedback could be more elaborate,
- Few comments and feedback regarding the work carried out by the other colleagues.

Previous comments:

- In my opinion more in-depth feedback could always be given, but in general partners gave good feedback - but could maybe be improved slightly,
- Partners should be able to provide more inputs in the outcomes developed by other partners,
- More time for feedback should be provided, especially for longer documents,
- I would like to see a bit more substance in the communication,
- There was nothing to criticize,
- More feedback on the work of the different partners would be supportive.

Positive/satisfactory aspects:

- High – all partners are highly analytic,
- Partners are good to provide feedback.

Previous aspects:

- Partners in general provide good feedback,
- All the partners are positive involved in the work development,
- All partners showed a high level of involvement, they reacted at the requests of the coordinating team or of the WPs' leaders.
- 

**Some partners wish an improvement regarding the aspect of giving feedback, but at the same time other ones are very content.**

**Previous summarized: In general there is the same opinion like in the previous evaluation. All partners are positively involved in the work development and provide good feedback. The feedback could be more detailed and profound in order to benefit more from it.**

**Comments on “Partners’ active attitude” (e.g. initiative in presenting proposals and themes for elaboration/discussion)**

Previous criticalities:

- I would like to have more initiatives from the rest partners,

- I think partners are all keen but probably very busy on other projects, which might be reducing their ability to be more proactive. For people joining the project at a later stage is also more difficult to be proactive,
- There was nothing to criticize.

Positive/satisfactory aspects:

- There seems to be increased interest in discussing proposals re: dissemination and follow up,
- Active participation of all partners, with valuable contribution and real commitment,
- I feel that partners are very active in the project development and to take on a proactive attitude,
- There is a very good work environment among all partners,
- All partners are able to present different point of view enriching the discussion.

Previous comments:

- UK partner provides useful information for the development of modules,
- I think partners are very proactive in their work and their attitude towards implementing a project with very good quality. All partners also participate well in all discussions and meetings,
- Every partner act in a proactive way,
- All partners are very experienced in LLP projects, having a positive attitude,
- People are very professional and keen to contribute,
- Stimulated by the WPs' leaders, the partners brought their contribution and provided useful ideas and proposals for the "format" of the outcomes,
- Partners are all very engaged, understand the project and give direct feedback on different issues,
- The discussions during the meetings are intensive and target oriented.

**Regarding this aspect, i.e. the active attitude of the partners, the project partners are very content.**

**Pervious summarized: Some partners believe that the rest partners should do more on their own initiative and other respondents think the project members act in a proactive way. But the majority have a very positive impression about the attitude and professionalism of the partners.**

**Comments on "Technical issues using the project communication tools"**

Criticalities:

- For a short period one of the partner email addresses did not work properly on the project group, but group moderator was very careful and he solved immediately the problem,
- There was a problem with some email addresses. Maybe should be positive to send the most important emails to all, using individual email addresses, in order to be sure that all people receive the messages.

Previous comments:

- We do not use project intranet,
- The platform the partnership as a whole is not using very much I think,
- There was nothing to criticize.

Positive/satisfactory aspects:

- Using combination of communication tools,
- Communication tools are efficient (emails, Skype),
- Partners use mails, Skype and phone calls as applicable, which in my opinion works really well.

Pervious comments:

- I think the mailing list works very well and is a good tool to reach everyone in the partnership,
- The organization of mid-term virtual meetings is a positive point of the project communication,
- Fast and efficient communication due to the use of combination of specific tools (emails, Skype, web),
- Communication tools are efficient (emails, Skype).

Additional comments:

- I believe the assessment of the pilots will throw light into this issue.

Previous comments:

- The project communication tools (website) have to be translated in the national languages,
- I cannot really comment on this aspect, as I have not made full use of the different tools.

**Summing up the project partners are content with the technical communication tools and the solving of occurring problems in this special context.**

**Pervious summarized: The communication tools are described as very efficient and fast (e-mails and Skype) and the mailing list is a good tool to reach everyone in the partnership.**



#### 4. Added Value (of Intermediate Outcomes)

**Table 3:** development of the project regarding the expected added value of the planned project outcomes for the addressed beneficiaries, added value of the project compared to similar initiatives which you know of / you participate in and the expected learning outcomes from participation in the project activities.

Dimensions	<b>3<sup>rd</sup> meeting:</b> Participants stating a “high to very high level of satisfaction” in percentage (number of answers)	Missing answers	1 <sup>st</sup> meeting evaluation	2 <sup>nd</sup> meeting evaluation	3 <sup>rd</sup> meeting evaluation
Expected added value of the planned project outcomes for the addressed beneficiaries	<b>88% (8)</b>	-	87,5% (7)	88,89% (8)	88% (8)
Added value of the project compared to similar initiatives which you know of / you participate in	<b>88% (7)</b>	1	75% (6)	87,50% (7)	88% (7)
Expected learning outcomes from participation in the project activities	<b>88% (8)</b>	-	87,5% (7)	100% (9)	88% (8)

88% of the partners (number of partners: 8 with 1 missing answer within this third part) see the great expected added value of the planned project outcomes for the addressed beneficiaries. This result is comparable to the first (87,5%) and also to the second evaluation round (88,89%).

88% of the partners see an added value of the project compared to similar initiatives which are known due to own participation for example. It is an improvement compared to the first round (75%) and very similar to the outcome of the second evaluation round (87,5%).

88% of them see the expected learning outcomes from participation in the project activities. It is almost the same result compared to the first evaluation round (87,5%), but a decline in comparison to the second round (100%).

Below there are individual comments on each single question/aspect:

---

**Comments on “Expected added value of the planned project outcomes for the addressed beneficiaries”**

Critical aspects:

- It appears in the training there was a need for more references and case studies related to real small businesses’,
- The number of participants to the International Conference not that much as expected’,
- In fact in our country there is lack of direct beneficiaries (business advisory services) so we need to address the outcomes to other institutions working with migrants,
- It is important that the exact added value for the project partners is clear, so that they can communicate this to the target group.

Previous comments:

- At this point there is as such no critical aspect other than hoping that the final results really will be as good as they suggest being at this stage,
- The forthcoming activities (content development and pilot course implementation) are critical success factors for the expected added value come true,
- The level and type of added value will very much depend on delivery on the ground, using experienced, confident tutors capable of getting the most out of participants. At the moment I do not know whether this will be the case,
- There is nothing to criticize,
- In fact in our country there is lack of direct beneficiaries (business advisory services) so we need to address the outcomes to other institutions working with migrants,
- The project grounds on a very good project for supporting business advisers and their clients. It is difficult to design training suitable for all countries. It is necessary to localise it strongly to the respective countries.

Positive/satisfactory aspects:

- I believe the two groups of trainees found the programme very formative,
- The project outcomes will be useful for the target group and give sustainability to the project,
- There is a niche in our country, no similar products are available. Exchange of best practice from other countries,
- I believe that the handbook can be really useful for the target group, but also the interactive tool and that the target group will experience an added value in using our project results.

Pervious comments:

- The results achieved until now are directly addressed to the project beneficiaries and therefore there are useful for them,
- I believe that if the final result of the content and the interactive tool is as positive and high quality as it seems at this intermediate stage, the beneficiaries will gain an added value from the target group being better equipped to deal with the beneficiaries,
- The project outcomes will create new job prospect for the beneficiaries,
- If successfully implemented, Best Form may help to boost immigrant entrepreneurship and help immigrant-oriented associations to develop innovative services related to business support,
- Participants will get much more than new knowledge and skills; they will establish new contacts, meet peers in other organisations and will have an opportunity to digest themes of critical importance for them and people in their communities,
- As we could find out during the needs analysis, during the elaboration of the case studies and of the network database, when we got in touch with stakeholders and managers, the Best Form project outcomes are needed and they represent a novelty in the same time for the local context here,
- There is a niche in our country, no similar products are available. Exchange of best practice from other countries,
- Important topic. Especially the community-based approach is innovative and can even be applied in other fields.

**In general the project partners are very optimistic regarding the meaning of the expected added value of the planned project outcomes for the addressed beneficiaries.**

Pervious summarized: The partners are very optimistic and hopeful regarding the replication of the model in different country situations. There is the hope to improve the situation for migrant entrepreneurship in the country of each project partner. One partner for example writes that there is a niche in his/her country and that there are no similar products available. Another partner is concerned that it might be difficult to design a training suitable for all countries.

**Comments on “Added value of the project compared to similar initiatives which you know of / you participate in”**

Previous critical aspects:

- Best form to some extent does have similarities of other projects that I know but these are not directed to immigrants, which I believe is the main difference,
- Italian context offers similar survey and research.

Positive/satisfactory aspects:

- I think the participation of Cultural intermediaries was very useful, as it vindicates several aspects of the CBBS model,
- The theme - entrepreneurship for immigrants,
- The proposed approach, through its possibility to be adapted to different local contexts,
- The main difference is that this cannot only be used by immigrant business advisors, but all business advisors that deal with minorities in their local context. Also the interactive tool providing an easy and user friendly approach to learn more is very innovative.

Previous comments:

- There aren't similar initiatives in project countries so the project has a high added value,
- I think the project brings added value to the immigrant community,
- The innovative aspect of the approach proposed,
- Compared to other collaborative projects, I think participants will get much more,
- Due to our role in the project (mainly evaluation), the added value related to the development of new instruments, concepts and tools for evaluation.

**The project partners are convinced of the added value of the project compared to similar initiatives known by them.**

**Previous summarized: There are opinions that there is a high added value of the project compared to similar initiatives because of the consideration of individual needs of immigrants and because the main issues of the project are very new and innovative. Whereas, in some countries there are similar researches on this topic (for example in Italy) which should have kept in mind as well. But similar projects are not directed to immigrants. Another partner emphasizes that the added value relates to the development of new instruments, concepts and tools for evaluation.**

**Comments on "Expected learning outcomes from participation in the project activities"**

Critical aspects:

- It is very important to communicate the expected learning outcomes to the target group, so they understand the added value.

Previous comments:

- The pilot course will be too short to adequately develop all skills,
- The transfer of innovation does not include other components of the CBBS (such as institutional strengthening),
- There was nothing to criticize.

Positive/satisfactory aspects:

- It's been very useful to witness the practical implementation of the CBBS model in other national realities,
- New outcomes,
- New methods and solutions for dealing with the problems,
- Have a good recognition in the area of supporting migrants (contacts, cooperation with public authorities, foundations, and other institutions),
- The learners would increase their professional development skills and hopefully the project results would be a useful additional resource in their work.

Previous comments:

- The expected learning outcomes are high as it is a new field for us,
- I think the learning outcomes will be directed towards learning more about immigrant communities and how skills can be improved from a practical point of view,
- The project focuses on the key aspects to develop skills among the trainees,
- I'm confident the project is already a good learning experience for all of us, partners. I'm also confident it will be the same for participants in the pilot programmes,
- Approaching the immigrants in general:
  - knowing how to deal with their needs, worries and fears,
  - understanding other cultures,
  - increasing tolerance.
- Accurate transfer and adaptation of CBBA model to Romanian realities.

- Have a good recognition in the area of supporting migrants (contacts, cooperation with public authorities, foundations, and other institutions),
- Development of new approaches to evaluation of a European project,
- Learning how to implement a community-based “empowerment” approach.

**The expected learning outcomes from participation in the project activities in summary are evaluated very optimistic by the project partners.**

**Previous summarized: One partner criticised that the pilot course will be too short adequately develop all skills. But it was also mentioned that it also enables us to learn more about immigrant communities and approach them in general (how to deal with their needs, worries and fears; understanding other cultures; increasing tolerance) and how skills can be improved from a practical point of view. It has a good recognition in the area of supporting migrants.**

## **5. Strengths of Best Form and Suggestions for Improvement**

### **Strengths:**

- The emphasis placed of the development of good learning products such as the handbooks for trainees and trainers,
- The experience gained through the pilots in Portugal and Italy, which have tested not only the learning materials but also engaged with people supporting migrant communities, who are now more knowledgeable about enterprise,
- Access to materials and approaches amply tested in the UK,
- Quality of the partnership,
- The diversity of expertise and experience inside of the partnership, which brought valuable and qualitative outcomes,
- Multicultural vision and processes and Best Form experience in London makes this project very important to support business advisers in Portugal and Italy and to learn from that to other participating countries,
- Coordinating institution is very experienced in managing LLP projects,
- Good organization of works,
- Good motivation of partners,
- Products for transfer are really innovative for target countries,
- The project has a very good partnership and no issues have been encountered in terms of collaboration between them,

- The work environment among all partners is good and collaborative. This makes easier the development of the project activities. We have a very strong added value from the UK partner, who is working a lot and providing help and suggestions,
- The project uses an innovative approach to deal with integration issues and development of local areas and communities,
- The project results can be used not only by immigrant business advisors and trainers, but also other employment professionals dealing with minority groups,
- All the partner show a positive aptitude and are engaged with the project objectives. The coordinator ensures an efficient project management.

#### **Previous meetings:**

- Very Strong communication between partners,
- Strong team work between partners,
- The collaboration process is good although there are not a lot of feedback or contributions of the work done until now from all partners,
- There is a real support from the coordinator in all fields: technical and financial,
- The project progress is in general good,
- There is a clear transmission of the know-how of the UK to the rest partners,
- I believe that we have a very strong partnership and all partners bring an added value to the project,
- I feel all partners contribute to the project development and have a genuine interest in the project and for the project to succeed,
- The project team has created a great collaboration between partner thanks to the strong commitment of every project manager,
- The collaboration between high professionals from different job fields and competencies (academic institutions, consultancies and Ngo's) is the added value of the project,
- The quality of the partnership – the institutions are quite experienced in LLP projects and thus are aware of their roles and tasks within Best Form,
- The diversity of involved institutions – gathering private companies, universities and NGOs, Best Form partnership allows for a market-oriented approach, supported by an academic background, but with deep and direct links to the target groups and beneficiaries on the ground,
- The quality of the work plan – the proposal sets a clear path in terms of activities, results and outcomes to be produced during the project lifetime, helping the partners to understand their role.
- Professional, experienced partners committed to making the project work,
- Interest in the main theme of the project, creating possibilities for further development,
- An experienced project manager coordinating the partnership,

- Access to a well-developed programme and materials from the UK,
- A partner with many years' experience providing business support to the target groups,
- As for evaluation round one, one may notice that we succeeded to maintain the positive features, so the strong points would be, again: the homogeneity of the partnership, lack of divergent points of view in the ways and solutions used in approaching the implementation, impressive variety of expertise and experience among partners,
- We may also add: friendly cooperative atmosphere, sense of humour (despite the complexity of the work, the partnership is not "stressed"), seriousness in approaching tasks, professionalism,
- Coordinating institution is very experienced in managing LLP projects,
- Good organization of works,
- Good motivation of partners,
- Products for transfer are really innovative for target countries,
- Partnership,
- Coordination,
- Well defined workplan,
- Collaboration and cooperation across the project.

**Positive aspects mentioned are the development of good learning products such as the handbooks for trainees and trainers and the experience gained through the pilots in Portugal and Italy, which have tested not only the learning materials but also engaged with people supporting migrant communities, who are now more knowledgeable about enterprise. Furthermore the access to materials and approaches amply tested in the UK and the quality of the partnership as well as the diversity of expertise and experience inside of the partnership, which brought valuable and qualitative outcomes, have to be mentioned.**

**One of the other strengths mentioned is the coordinating institution, which is very experienced in managing LLP projects, the good organization of works, the good motivation of partners and the products for transfer are really innovative for target countries. Furthermore it was described that the project uses an innovative approach to deal with the integration issues and the development of local areas and communities and that the project results can be used not only by immigrant business advisors and trainers, but also other employment professionals dealing with minority groups. Another comment was that all partners show a positive attitude and are engaged with the project objectives and that the coordinator ensures an efficient project management.**

---

**Previous summarized:** There are many very positive comments on the strengths of the project BEST FORM. Many project partners describe a well-functioning partnership with well-structured and planned activities (good project management and organisation), a good work attitude (high motivation) and a collaborative environment. The experience of each partner working in an international context ensures an efficient collaboration.

**Weaknesses:**

- Too many partners,
- Partners that did not run a pilot programme have, in the main, an internal role, limiting the benefits they can accrue from the project,
- Best Form might not be a priority for several partners, compared to other projects they might be engaged in,
- Financial matters very complicated and distress project in our view,
- Situation in partner countries is very different in case of immigration. In some countries supporting immigrants in entrepreneurship is at very low level or not organized at all. It is not easy to find channels for exploitation of the results. There is a need to first rise awareness of this matter, “prepare the soil” before implementing the product,
- There is a risk that the partners will not manage to communicate properly to the target group concerning how they can benefit from the project results and what they can use their improved skills for,
- Also it is important to highlight the interactive tool for the target group, which is an innovative learning resource they can use when/where they like,
- The communication flow from the promoter to the partners could be improved. During these last 3 months we didn’t have information from the promoter about the development of the handbooks and national piloting although in our case we sent emails asking information in this sense,
- Not strong enough collaboration and contribution of the partnership in gathering foreign participants for the International Conference.

**Previous meetings:**

- Different situations among migrant situation in several countries,
- There were some delays in the implementation of WP2,
- The project website is not ready within the first project year and this is the main dissemination common tool for the project,
- If we do not use the project intranet, I do not see its relevance,

- The differences in goals and expectations among partner countries, due to the implementation of pilot courses only in Italy and Portugal,
- Relative lack of enterprise support experience in the partnership,
- Relative lack of practitioners' perspective, that is front line workers rather than managers and project managers,
- Situation in partner countries is very different in case of immigration. In some countries supporting immigrants in entrepreneurship is at very low level or not organized at all. It is not easy to find channels for exploitation of the results. There is a need to first rise awareness of this matter, "prepare the soil" before implementing the product,
- The implementation is not taking place in all countries (but this was clear at proposal stage),
- Harmonisation of the training approach across the different countries might be difficult. The distributed development of the training materials can lead to significant differences in the materials in terms of didactic and quality.

**One project partner thinks that there are too many partners participating in this project and another partner thinks that partners that did not run a pilot programme have, in the main, an internal role, limiting the benefits they can accrue from the project. Another opinion is that Best Form might not be a priority for several partners, compared to other projects they might be engaged in. There is also the comment that the financial matters are very complicated and distress the project. It is mentioned that the situation in partner countries is very different in case of immigration. In some countries supporting immigrants in entrepreneurship is at very low level or not organized at all. Another very important aspect written by a project partner is that there is a risk that the partners will not manage to communicate properly to the target group concerning how they can benefit from the project results and what they can use their improved skills for. Also it is important to highlight the interactive tool for the target group, which is an innovative learning resource they can use when/where they like.**

**Previous summarized: It is mentioned that the situation of immigrants is different in several countries. In some countries supporting immigrants in entrepreneurship is at very low level or not organized at all. It is important to rises awareness of this matter first. One project partner stresses that project website was not ready within the first project year although it is a very important tool to disseminate the project. Another partner writes that there were differences in goals and expectations among partner countries. Two partners think that there is a relative lack of enterprise support and practitioners' perspective. Additionally, the implementation is not taking place in all countries and the harmonisation of the training approach across the different countries might be difficult.**