



REPORT ABOUT EVALUATION DOCUMENTS

By Mercedes Moreno (coordinator of the Project)

During these two years partners in the Project were using different kind of documents to evaluate different aspects in the partnership:

1. **MEETING EVALUATION:** The idea is to have a common tool for each partner get a feedback about their meeting's organization. In each meeting participants had the opportunity to give the host institution some marks about organization, activities etc. Obviously, each partner manages this information in order to improve their arrangements for future international projects.
2. **INTERNAL EVALUATION:** This document tries to help partners to have a common tool to evaluate the way they are getting goals, results, dissemination and so on. The idea is to have a common document for each partner having a clear knowledge about how they were working in the project in an internal sense. It is also a good way to face the intermediate and the final report for each National Agency. This document was created only as a template to help partners to develop their own final document to evaluate the implementation of the project in each institution.
3. **PROJECT EVALUATION:** We used this document in June 2011 and in June 2012. Every team evaluate the project and the coordinator partner - Spain- extracts the results from these documents (pointing only some suggestions/comments that can help us in the future):
JUNE 2011:
FRANCE: Very good evaluation of the project. Weakest elements: "more discipline about each partner's tasks and deadlines", "sometimes it was hard to take decisions, especially when all the partners were not present for the totality of the meeting". Strongest elements: "the aims of the project were defined from the beginning and were agreed by all partners". "It is a real nice partnership in terms of cultural and practice exchange between all the partners. The project is really a great experience for GRETA VET trainers".
TURKEY: Very good evaluation of the project. This partner considers that some tasks/topics as website, booklet and VET comparison were talked too much time in each meeting. Weakest elements: "we all are

partners with different backgrounds and is quite hard to harmonize our interests. I hope this weakness too turn into a big advantage till the end of our project”. Strongest elements:” the aims and the final results of the project were perfectly defined from the beginning”

GREECE: Very good evaluation of the project. Weakest elements: “more discipline is necessary”. Strongest elements: “learn and have new experiences and also see school environments at every country”.

ITALY: Very good evaluation of the project. This partner finds especially interesting to have the possibility to visit VET schools. Weakest elements: “not loose time in marginal discussion”, “take a decision”. Strongest elements: “the possibility to share information, experiences, solutions”.

ROMANIA: Very good evaluation of the project. This partner also considers that some tasks/topics as website, booklet and VET comparison were talked too much time in each meeting. Weakest elements: “more discipline would be necessary”. Strongest elements: “in my school there is a real emulation among VET teachers due to ICVET project, to make lessons becoming more attractive and more enjoyable for students”.

LATVIA: Very good evaluation of the project. Weakest elements: “on certain issues, making a single decision”. Strongest elements: “all participants are positive, open and communicative”.

SPAIN: Very good evaluation of the project. Weakest elements: “some partners do the task just in the deadline”. Strongest elements: “the results till now have a high quality” and “all institutions are really interested in improving the way they are teaching and in learning new experiences from other partners”.

JUNE 2012:

FRANCE: Very good evaluation of the project. Comments: “Meetings activities were inspiring enough to initiate new practices in IT and e-learning in our GRETA network”. Weakest elements: “more discipline about each partner’s tasks deadlines would have been appreciated”. Strongest elements: “the meeting programs were very rich and interesting”, “teachers have been able to exchange good practices in teaching and learning” and “products and results are useful and professional quality”.

TURKEY: Very good evaluation of the project. Weakest elements: “some partner comes each project meeting with different persons” and “tasks’ deadlines”. Strongest elements: “partner enthusiasm”.

GREECE: Very good evaluation of the project. Weakest elements: “cooperation”. Strongest elements: “results”, “partnership spirit” and “final conference”.

ITALY: This partner did not send project evaluation in June 2012.

ROMANIA: Very good evaluation of the project. Comments: “we had some passive partners”, “some tasks were lately”, and “at the end of our project, we remain in the main only nice things. A Leonardo partnership with 7 partners is an important achievement, we all had to learn from each other and we are sure that we will meet again in other new project in the future”. Weakest elements: “discipline to respect all the performance of the mandatory activities, all deadlines of tasks”. Strongest elements: “final products, exchange of best practices developed and, of course, the bonds of friendship created between some partners that will lead to further collaboration in other scheduled partnerships Comenius or Leonardo”.

SPAIN: Very good evaluation of the project. Comments: not equal distribution of work between partners. Weakest elements: “not every partner had the same amount of work/tasks/responsibilities”. Strongest elements: “spirit of participants, sociable people, nice people, talented people, variety of institutions”.

IN BOTH EVALUATIONS, THE COORDINATOR ROLE GOT A GOOD EVALUATION FROM ALL PARTNERS.

4. CASCADE EVALUATION: We used this document in June 2011 and in June 2012. Each partner evaluates another partner and is evaluated by another partner. This is the procedure: Spain is evaluated by Latvia and evaluates Romania. Romania is evaluated by Spain and evaluates France. France is evaluated by Romania and evaluates Greece. Greece is evaluated by France and evaluates Turkey. Turkey is evaluated by Greece and evaluates Italy. Italy is evaluated by Turkey and evaluates Latvia. Latvia is evaluated by Italy and evaluates Spain.

The result from these two evaluations of partners was:

SPAIN: got highest marks in both evaluations. Suggestions: in intermediate evaluation this partner was told to try to improve the use of the project’s web.

ROMANIA: got highest marks in both evaluations. Suggestions: in the intermediate evaluation the coordinator of this partner was told to try to convince Romanian team attending meetings to socialize more with the rest of participants.

FRANCE: got highest marks in both evaluations (except communication between meetings, with mark 3 in final evaluation). No suggestions to this partner.

GREECE: got highest marks in both evaluations (except communication between meetings, with mark 3 in final evaluation). No suggestions to this partner.



LATVIA: got highest marks in both evaluations. No suggestions to this partner.

TURKEY: got highest marks in both evaluations (except timely delivery of products/outputs, with mark 3 in intermediary evaluation). This partner was told in this intermediary evaluation that the template for VET systems comparison was delivered late.

ITALY: got highest marks in both evaluations. In intermediary evaluation this partner was told that the change of people in each meeting was a negative aspect. In final evaluation this partner was told that it was not good that no person attended the meeting in Spain.

Finally we think this way of evaluating partners in the partnership was not as useful as we thought: results depend on the partner that evaluates each institution, and we don't have a feedback from the rest of partners. For future projects we agree that it is better a kind of questionnaire that includes all partners. In that way each of us will have the evaluation from the rest, so we can get a better knowledge about our work in the partnership, our hosting role, our attitude in meetings etc.