

PIA2 Summative Evaluation through project partners - Questionnaires

Introduction

The summative evaluation of the project by the project partners did take place through online questionnaires as it was agreed at the beginning of the project. The questionnaires were created online and sent to the partners to answer it. The main target of these questionnaires is to evaluate the project.

The questionnaires gather information about the project meetings, teacher trainings, final conference, as well as the products and dissemination carried out during the project life. The results and their explanation will be presented in the following paragraphs.

Kick-Off meeting

The evaluation questionnaires were sent to the project partners right after attending the Kick-Off meeting in Bremen.

In the questionnaires, organizational aspects, course of the meeting, introduction to “Project Management: Setting the Standards” workshop, atmosphere and contents covered were evaluated.

The travel information was rated by the 83,3% as “very good” and 16,7% as “good”, hotel accommodation got a 66,7% of “very good” and a 33,3% of “good”. The meals were rated between “good” and “very good” and the evening program got most of the votes for “very good”.

The overall agenda, structure of contents and amount of pauses were rated between “very good” (66,7%) and “good” (33,3%). The integration of guest contributions got a 60% “very good” and a 40% “good”. The extent of the content of the sections was slightly rated “rather poor” (16,7%), “good” (33,3%) and “very good” (50%).

Regarding the “Project Management: Setting the Standards” workshop, the usefulness and comprehensibility were rated between “good” and “very good” (50%). The partners rated the workshop as informative and inspiring “rather poor” (33,3%), “good” (50%) and “very good” (16,7%).

The atmosphere and work climate were rated in an 80% as “very good” and in a 20% as “good”.

A 83,3% of the assistants got their meeting content expectations covered, while a 16,7% got it “more or less”. A partner missed to have the materials more in advance and more time to focus on deadlines and work.

For further meetings, more proposals for communication and facing critical points to be solved together were suggested.

(See attachment “Feedback Kick-Off Meeting PIA2”)

PIA2 meetings and teacher trainings

After the core curriculum, didactic materials and education materials phases, after the meetings in Spain, France and Italy and after the teacher/multiplier trainings in Bremen, new questionnaires were sent to the partners in order to evaluate those events.

As well as for the first project meeting, different organizational aspects were evaluated as follows.

Travel information, dinners and evening programs were evaluated between “very good” (60%) and “good” (40%). Lunches were evaluated between “good” (80%) and “very good” (20%) while the hotel accommodations were rated as “good” (60%) and “very good” (40%).

Regarding the meetings, the agenda’s program and their content extension were evaluated as “good” by all the participating partners (100%). The structure of the contents (work program) was evaluated between “good” (60%) and “very good” (40%). The amount of pauses in the meetings was rated as “good” in a 80% and as “very good” in a 20%.

The teacher training that took place in Bremen was rated as “useful” and “informative” by the 100% of the participants. The workshop comprehensibility and expectations covered were rated with a “yes” by the 60% of the participants and with a “rather yes” by the other 40%. The workshop was rated as “inspiring” by an 80% of the participants and as “rather yes” by the 20%.

The overall atmosphere and meetings work environment were both rated as “very good” by the 80% of the participants and as “good” by a 20% of them.

Finally, the expectations of the people participating in the meetings and trainings were covered by the 100%.

(See attachment “Feedback PIA2 meetings and teacher trainings”)

PIA2 summative evaluation through project partners

Once the PIA2 final conference was over, a third form was sent to the project partners. This form is a summative evaluation through the project partners, which includes questions regarding the final conference itself, the national products in every country, the dissemination carried out throughout the project life, project management (communication and teamwork) and framework conditions.

Regarding the program and the execution of the PIA2 final conference, the partners rated them as “good” by the 57% while the 43% of them rated the program and execution as “very good”. The conference organization and the transparency of the final results were rated by the 43% of the project partners as “good” and the other 57% rated them as “very good”.

The quality of the presentations that took place during the whole conference were rated as “good” by the 71% while the 29% rated the presentations as “very good”. Here are included the inputs coming from the schools results and from external expert presentations about entrepreneurship, project management and the rest of the presentations.

The global atmosphere of the final conference was evaluated as “good” by the 29% of the partners and the rest of them (71%) rated it as “very good”.

About the national products, they were evaluated in every country regarding their content quality, their suitability to be used in the praxis and their layout. The products that were evaluated are the core curriculum, project management guideline, project management teaching poster, didactic

concept, teacher training concept and the evaluation of the learning success in projects. The result of this evaluation is an average of the ratings coming from all the countries.

Regarding the core curriculum, its content quality and suitability for praxis were rated as “good” by the 43% of the partners and the 57% of them did rate them as “very good”. The layout’s average of the core curriculum got to a 57% (good) and 43% (very good).

The project management guideline is the main product of the PIA2 project. As well as for the rest of the materials it was adapted to the specifics of each country and the rating comes as an average of all the countries. In this way, its suitability for praxis, as well as its layout were rated by a 57% as “good” and by a 43% as “very good”. The quality of the contents was the best evaluated in every country getting to an average of 71% for “very good” and a 29% for “good”.

Regarding the project management teaching poster, its quality of contents and layout were rated as “good” by the 43% of the participants and as “very good” by the 57% of them. Its suitability to be used for practical sessions was rated by the 57% as “good” and by the 43% as “very good”.

The didactic concept was one of the best rated documents in the project. Together with the project management guideline are the most important documents in the project since they are the basis of the method carried out in all the countries. Its content quality was rated as “good” by the 29% of the participants and as “very good” by the other 71% of them. Its sustainability for praxis was rated as “good” by the 43% of the partners and as “very good” by the 57%. Its layout got a 57% as “good” and a 43% as “very good”.

The teacher training concept is the concept carried out by trainers and multipliers. A 43% of the partners rated its content quality, sustainability for praxis and its layout as “good” while the other 57% rated it as “very good”.

The last document being evaluated is the evaluation of the learning success in projects. This is the evaluation applied to the students’ work. Its content quality and layout were rated as “good” by the 43% of the participants while the other 57% rated them as “very good”. The suitability for praxis was rated as “good” by the 57% of the partners and as “very good” by the other 43%.

The dissemination activities done regarding the implementation of the concept in each country were rated in a scale from 1-“not suitable” to 10-“very suitable”. In this way a 14% of the participants rated the dissemination as “7”, a 43% rated it as “8”, another 14% as “9” and finally, a 29% of the participants rated it as “10”.

The project management was another important point evaluated. The communication between project partners was rated as “good” by the 71% of them, while the 29% rated it as “very good”. Regarding the communication between national actors in the partner countries, teamwork with project coordinators (ITB) and the teamwork with the international project partners were rated as “good” by the 43% of the partners while the 57% rated it as “very good”.

As framework conditions, the budget available for the project was rated by the 14% of the partners as “rather poor” and by the 86% of them as “good”.

The constitution of the project consortium was rated as “good” by the 57% of the partners and as “very good” by the 43% of them.

(See attachment “PIA2 summative evaluation through project partners”)