


Evaluation 11. – 12.04.2013 in Czech Republic

The fourth meeting of the EU project EUVET was held from 11^h to 12th April 2012. The observer of the meeting in Romania could perceive a friendly and interested attention. This mood was reflected in the evaluation questionnaires by the participants.

1. The evaluation of the meeting

At the end of the meeting in Bucarest/Romania, 10 partners answered the feedback questionnaire. All answers evaluated the meeting between level 8,4 and 8,5 on a scale of 10 points. This is a **significant increase** compared to the second meeting with 1 point (7,4 and 7,5)! The partners mentioned especially:

- The meeting was very well organized, the topics of the agenda clear and finished at the end.
- One partner explained that he should have been better informed about the WP structures and WHO would lead HOW which package so the work becomes easier when he is at homework. At the very end he was satisfied with the experience and result of the meeting.
- The discussions of the interviews were described as useful. The preparation for a competency profile is seen by all partners as achieved.
- Two partners ask again more guidance and steering during the meeting.
- Two partners complain that not all partners are equally active in the project and are concerned that the targets will not be reached as quickly as they are hoping.



Evaluation 11. – 12.04.2013 in Czech Republic

2. Cooperation of the partnership

The evaluator observed the process of co-operation for about 8 months since his commitment.

In contrast to the observation before the first meeting the evaluator has to note positively that the management of the project has become more business and clearer. Before the deadlines the project management indicates on the to-do's and it will also face consequences if the tasks are not met.


During the meeting, cooperative and democratic discussion structures supplemented with controlled interventions by the coordinators. Two partners wanted more steering here, but from the perspective of the evaluator does it not seem necessary.

3. Recommendations

The positive impact of the current form of steering the project must be maintained. The coordinators should pay consistently attention on the implementation dates, milestones and ask regularly, new developments, and - as happened with the first newsletter - monitor and accompany it positively.

On the other hand, it is necessary that all partners are continuously and actively participating in the process. The next meeting should be prepared well in advance with an agenda so that the tasks of the partners are not finished "at the last second."

These recommendations are just a few of limitation in evaluating the previously made project process. On the whole, the process flows are positive and well organized.



Dieter Schulze
INIBIA EEIG
Welver-Dinker, 27th November 2012