



WP8: MONITORING & EVALUATION FINAL REPORT

Result No. 11

Andrea Diaz & Gabriel Rissola

September 2014

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	3
2. FINAL EVALUATION – PARTNERS FEEDBACK.....	3
a. Overall project implementation	3
b. Partners’ final thoughts	11
3. FINAL CONSIDERATIONS BY THE EVALUATORS	12
a. Project Performance	12
b. Quality of Products	13
c. Project results	17
d. M&E outlook..... Fehler! Textmarke nicht definiert.	
e. Reference documents	18

1. INTRODUCTION

WP8 was dedicated to monitoring and evaluation to secure a) an **adequate project implementation**, b) the **quality of project's outcomes** and c) the **relevance of project's results**. Therefore, monitoring and evaluation accompanied the whole project lifetime and intervened with feedback on a regular basis to the project coordinator, and when appropriate, to project partners.

This document is the second and final formal deliverable of this WP and the result of implementing a **Monitoring & Evaluation scheme** designed by D-O-T (WP8 leading partner) and presented in the Mid-Term Evaluation report released on October 2013.

The full family of Monitoring & Evaluation outcomes produced under this project encompasses:

- M&E mid-term report (month 13) - focus on Project Performance, presented at 3rd coordination meeting
- Train-the-trainer Evaluation, reported in WP5
- Pilot training Evaluation, reported in WP6
- M&E final report (month 24) - focus on Project Performance, Quality of Products and Project achievements

2. FINAL EVALUATION – PARTNERS FEEDBACK

The evaluation questionnaire developed by D-O-T was fulfilled by all project partners except D-O-T itself. For easiness of reading, the main evaluation outcomes are summarized in a schematic way below. Scoring scale ranges from 0 to 5, being 5 the best score. When comparable, final evaluation scores are compared with mid-term evaluation ones.

a. Overall project implementation

In a nutshell, partners view about project development after first year of activities can be summarized by the ranking below:

Topic	Mid-term Score	Final Score	Variation
-------	----------------	-------------	-----------

Overall Project management	4,4	4,8	+0,4
Administrative & Financial managment.	3,6	4,8	+0,8
Overall Project progress	3,8	4,6	+0,8
Match with your own expectations	4	4,4	+0,4
Management tools (GANTT, TO DO minutes, Moodle)	3,8	4,4	+0,6
Single WPs coordination	3,5	4,4	+0,7
Partnership coop. & communication	4	4,2	+0,2

Table 1: Overall project implementation

Partners' overall satisfaction with project implementation increased during second year. Project coordination was consolidated as the most valued aspect, either in terms of contents, finances or overall progress. Single WPs coordination improved as well, with an exception: "Most of the WP [were] coordinated well, with exception of WP6". As per the management tools, "The project includes sufficient management tools which are occasionally not used as they could". Partnership cooperation and communication did not progressed sufficiently: "in some moments of the project we missed some better communication among partnership". As per punctual observations a partner noted that P0 could have provided specific instructions for deliverables to report, that P2 could have taken more initiative to push partners to make use of Moodle, and that P3 should have be more compliant with deliverables' deadlines.

WP1 - Overall Management (TUDO)

Topic	Mid-term Score	Final Score	Variation
Overall satisfaction with WP development	4,6	5	+0,4
Face-to-face meetings	4,2	5	+0,8
Online meetings	4,4	4,5	+0,1
Formal reports, interaction with funding body		4,33	N/A
Your own deliverables produced (self-assessment)	4		N/A
Moodle for internal comm. and project management	3,75	3,75	0

Table 2: Wp1

Partners overall satisfaction with the WP performance increased to the maximum score. Partners said: "Systematic, reasonable and timely coordination", "Work and results in line with application, in some fields even exceeding expectations". Face-to-face meetings also

got the highest mark, they “Were extremely helpful to find a common ground and take decisions”. On the other hand, some areas indicated for improvement in the first evaluation failed to overcome initial difficulties: indeed online meetings and Moodle were useful tools but insufficiently used. Partners said: “Very few online meeting were organized and some lack of communication was appreciated in some moments of the project”, “Good platform, but not all project partners contributed. Coordinator probably could more insist on this!” What did improve was horizontal communication and cooperation between partners during second year: “During the first year of the project, the communication among partners was difficult. It seems that partners referred to coordinator instead of talking issues among partners.”

WP2 - Online Platform (FE)

Topic	Mid-term Score	Final Score	Variation
Your own deliverables produced (self-assessment)	5		N/A
Moodle for trainers	[4,5]	4,75	+0,25
Moodle for training use	4,5	[4,5]	0
Moodle for learners	[4,5]	4,25	-0,25
Overall satisfaction with WP development	4,25	4,25	0

Table 3: Wp2

“Platform great for serving 3 levels : project management, area for trainers, area for trainees.” Some initial misunderstandings between project partners, sorted out with help of the coordinator, affected the development of the platform. Additionally, “The content of the chosen modules were uploaded late to the platform. And the coordinators did not get an introduction in Moodle but had to be the supervisors of the trainers.” Or “Some minor problems experienced in early stages when some parts of the platform where in Spanish, not ENG.” Fortunately Moodle platform issues were apparently overcome for the piloting phase.

“In general Moodle has good features for trainers” but “The trainers were not very satisfied with Moodle, partly because they haven’t worked with the system before”, “The introduction in Moodle was not enough (it need probably a intensive course to know all the features) but the project couldn’t offer more. “. On the learners’ side, “Moodle was appropriate for the online course and the trainees were able to operate in the system.”

WP3 - Context Analysis (TUDO)

This WP was already finished and evaluated in the first year, so here it is reproduced what had been said in the Progress Report.

Topic	Score
Context Analysis tools	4,75
Your own deliverables produced (self-assessment)	4,5
Overall satisfaction with WP development	4,5

Table 4: Wp3

Areas for improvement:

- First round respondents were insufficient so the deadline for fieldwork had to be postponed, which had some impact on the completion of the analysis
- National partners should have access to the entire responses and to the evaluated results of the survey (e.g. in numbers)
- Online questionnaire: few technical problems and redundant questions

WP4 - CV Analysis, adaptation & development (SDC)

Topic	Mid-term Score	Final Score	Variation
Overall satisfaction with WP development	4	4,5	0,5
Adaptation after Pilot		4,5	N/A
Training Curriculum	3,4	4,5	0,9
Your own deliverables produced (self-assessment)	4		N/A

Table 5: Wp4

Partners' satisfaction with this WP notably increased during 2nd year. While in mid-term evaluation more leadership was required, this effectively improved during second year and it was duly acknowledged by project partners: "Very good WP; three curricula plus additional English core curriculum for EU-wide dissemination and use; very well led by SDC". On a separate note, "the adaptation took more time and work that it was anticipated" since it is "a time-consuming procedure". Content wise, "some modules were not relevant to Latvia". After final adjustment of the piloted training curricula "some networks already subscribed to exploit the curricula".

WP5- Train the trainers (LIKTA)

Topic	Final Score
Overall satisfaction with WP development	5
Training report	5
Training programme	4,75
Training activities	4,75

Table 6: Wp5

This WP was executed almost completely during the second year, and got the maximum score from partners. Led by LIKTA, counted with the intensive contribution of ESPLAI as train-the-trainer host and provider, and D-O-T as train-the-trainer evaluator. "Piloting partners were really cooperative, selected great candidates for the role of trainers." "The trainers gained a lot during the training, not only skills and knowledge but also an inside view of the project and connections to trainers from different countries. Good organization." "Very useful and comprehensive report; good collaboration of WP leader with consortium; always open for suggestions and improvements". The training evaluation was integrated to the training report.

WP6 - Pilot implementation & pilot (FCT)

Topic	Final Score
Training programme	4,67
Training activities	4,67
Overall satisfaction with WP development	3,75
Training report	delayed

Table 7: Wp6

This WP was executed completely during the second year. While partners are satisfied with the activities themselves, its coordination got the lower score from partners. FCT had the responsibility to coordinate the pilot activities between the 3 recipient countries, while D-O-T performed the pilot evaluation. This was planned to be integrated in the training report, but unfortunately the WP coordinator was delayed in the delivery of the pilot report, which was not ready for this final evaluation at the time of collecting final feedback from partners. Indeed all the pilot took longer than expected because of the improvement proposed by the WP coordinator to organize pilot training in two rounds, approach not consistently adopted by all the piloting partners.

Partners emphasized that “It [the WP] was a good planned but flexible (the course was different in the three countries) pilot” with “Great involvement of Latvian supertrainers and great experience exchange with piloting partners in Germany”. At the same time, partners criticized that “At the beginning of the project it should be agreed with WP1 management and WP6 piloting that more extra time will be needed to develop the pilot in order to guarantee more than one round”, “Lack of communication from WP coordinator; report delayed”. As per the report, “It is really pity that our 1st and second tier pilot trainers had to fill pre-pilot and post pilot surveys (4 in total), LIKTA has submitted all the surveys in time. But even by the end of the project no results of these surveys or even draft overview of the evaluation was provided. Therefore at the national dissemination event we were not able to demonstrate the evaluation results of pilot participants. Nor was that possible at the project final conference in Zagreb”. Indeed “It [the report] should be shared with partners [on time] by the partner responsible for WP6 !!!”

WP7- Preparing CV for National and European recognition (TUDO)

Topic	Mid-term Score	Final Score	Variation
Overall satisfaction with WP development	4,4	4,75	+0,35
Report on recognition strategies and adaptation results		4,75	N/A
Your own deliverables produced (self-assessment)	4,5		N/A

Table 8: Wp7

This strategic WP performed quite well. “Systematic work in this WP; very open to the plans and opinions of the partners, still offering a common frame / guideline; partners show a very good sense of recognition strategy in their countries, which resulted in good outcomes”. “Good methodological support for national piloting partners”. “A recognition case study was made by each country to see possible pathways of implementing the e-facilitator profile as a certificated career. On this study we can design a time schedule with next milestones and contact important stakeholders.”

WP coordinator took good note of recommendations made in the mid-term report. As (formal) recognition is dependent on project outcomes – e.g. the curriculum and localized modules - and on local conditions - since formal recognition could be no possible in a country but still turn it into a reference for the trainers - we had recommended to evaluate achievements in recognition after the end of the WP (representing the reflection and planning phase). Therefore, “additional revision of the report was done in order to

check the progress in recognition, although this was not expected on the basis of the proposal”.

WP8 - Monitoring & evaluation (D-O-T)

Topic	Mid-term Score	Final Score	Variation
Your own deliverables produced (self-assessment)	4,67		N/A
Mid-term evaluation report		4,5	N/A
Overall satisfaction with WP development	4,5	4,25	-0,25
Evaluation embedded in WP5 and WP6		4	N/A

Table 9: Wp8

In the mid-term report it had been pointed out that a challenge for 2nd year was to 1) stay in line with the proposal and its 5 sub-activities, 2) be coherent somehow with the initial approach, and 3) provide useful feedback to the “field work” activities (WP5/6). The WP managed to fulfill all these requirements except for WP6 where there was a delay in the submission of questionnaires by the Portuguese partner (together with its preparation of the pilot report where the evaluation was going to be embedded), which prevented an earlier integrated analysis.

Partners highlighted that “WP as a whole was implemented as foreseen, very helpful support for WPs 5 and 6”, “Good methodology of evaluation and data analysis and recommendations”, “Feedback helped the consortium to improve on many issues: communication, cooperation.”, “Very happy about methodological support and evaluation report for WP5!”.

In connection with WP6 they criticized that “The evaluation of the trainings was not very good integrated into the pilots what made the questionnaires a little annoying for the trainees”, and “that German and Latvian partners have provided all the surveys requested for WP6 (piloting) in time and get NO feedback at all due to third partner who didn’t provide feedback” suggesting that “Data then could be analyzed for 2 countries only” which was explicitly avoided by the evaluators since was not consistent with the proposed evaluation approach.

WP9 - Dissemination and valorisation (SDC)

Topic	Mid-term Score	Final Score	Variation
Overall satisfaction with WP development	4,25	4,75	+0,5
Your own deliverables produced (self-assessment)	4		N/A
Training curriculum dissemination		4,75	N/A
Dissemination report		4,67	N/A
Dissemination and Valorisation Report		4,33	N/A
Public website	4	4,25	+0,25

Table 10: Wp9

While in first year partners had noticed that this WP was performing slower than needed, WP coordinator took good note of the challenges pointed out in the mid-term evaluation report for 2nd year: 1) communicate activities in a systematic way (also for reporting), 2) choose the right events where dissemination should be done, 3) involve relevant TC networks and e-inclusion policy makers. As a result, WP performance increased during second year.

Partners said: “Overall dissemination achievements are higher than we expected; well-coordinated activities; meaningful dissemination spreadsheet to collect information”; “Good project portal, dissemination and valorization strategy”. As aspects that could have run better they said: “We have missed some proactive actions in some moments of the project”; “One or two more publications would have been good; activities in social media could have been more intense”.

The better-valorized aspect was the training curriculum dissemination, which “Obviously worked well both in the transfer receiving countries and on European level; the opportunity to present TeF at the TCE annual event is extremely helpful”. This is closed linked with further exploitation: “National events with important stakeholder already resulted in plans for further usage of the curriculum”; “We will use the training curriculum developed during this project in Spanish curriculum as soon as it is possible to develop new courses in Spanish academy.”

A draft, non-final dissemination report was available for when partners were required to fulfill the final evaluation questionnaire: “Draft version is well constructed, final one to be delivered later (which is in line with the workplan)”.

The public website “Meets the demands of all groups involved as much as possible” as long as “it has all important information and was used by trainees to reach the e-learning

platform” and “On the website the core curriculum will be available to download” by external stakeholders interested in making use of the project’s training curricula.

b. Partners’ final thoughts

Structured in three questions, partners were invited to share their final reflections.

Asked about the **fulfilment of expected impact in the short run** (i.e. during project lifetime), partners think that “all the delivery compromised was fulfilled” and “Major goals achieved”, reaching “almost the maximum impact possible during its lifetime” as per the following indicators:

- 15 supertrainers were qualified to be able to train e-facilitators.
- 60 e-facilitators were trained during the pilots and received “certifications” (more than intended)
- National stakeholders are interested in the curriculum
- There is not only a valorization plan but also the willingness of the partners to stick to the plan.

Partners think “that this project has reached the expected impact in number of people taught, in number of courses implemented and also because we have ensured that Super trainers have had the opportunity to discuss and understand the different realities of e-facilitators around Europe which it means that TeF have enriched the experience and knowledge of Supertrainers in an unexpected way”. “It will depend also on the exploitation plan (in production) how extensively impact will be generated afterwards.”

Asked about **project’s actual contribution to give policy relevance / formal or social recognition** to the role of e-Facilitators as eInclusion intermediaries / multipliers of citizens’ digital skills, either in their country or in Europe, partners agreed that “This has been achieved primarily in the transfer receiving countries, where there were quite elaborate plans for enhancing recognition, both formally and socially. The European level is a different challenge. Apart from the Zagreb event [i.e. Telecentre Europe Annual Conference], impact was limited on this level so far. But Zagreb plus the generic curriculum form an ideal starting point to further promote the profile in the EU28. This could also be achieved by extending the “project family” on telecentres and e-facilitator competences in the future.” Indeed Telecentre Europe announced its willingness to further promote the adoption of the training curriculum and recognition path by its members through an articulated institutional action.

As one of the transmitter partner reminded, ““This project takes part of a big effort that FE is doing in Spain [and other partners in other countries], together with other organizations, in order to give relevance of the figure and role of the e-facilitator as inclusion intermediaries and multipliers of citizens’ digital skills at level of policies” and get their formal or social recognition, which was achieved in Catalonia region and is in process of recognition in Spain, as well as –now- in recipient countries, namely Germany, Latvia and Portugal.

According to partners “the project was [able] to create awareness about the profile of e-facilitator and the differences about the level of knowledge that this profile needs when compared with the profile of “monitor” or the ICT trainer”; “The dissemination of the project had impact on the awareness of e-facilitators and what they can add for social inclusion into information society in Europe and on national level”; “TeF project helps us promote the figure of the efacilitator at European level and allow us, together with the rest of the partnership to see the importance of fighting together with other countries to reach this common goal.”

Asked about the most important **step to be taken after the project** to promote and extend the qualification and recognition of the e-facilitator profile, as well as project’s impact and policy relevance, partners formulated very useful suggestions articulated in this way:

1. Keep working on enlarging the curriculum of efacilitators, update curricula with new, up-to date modules (online collaboration, mobile applications etc.)
2. Promote use of the generic curriculum and the e-learning platform in other countries.
3. Promote the importance of qualification for e-facilitators to stakeholders
4. Let the curriculum be formally recognized by authorities, integrate curriculum into existing national institutionalized structures.
5. Acquisition of further successor projects on European or national levels
6. Development of a plan on Telecentre Europe level to have a common curriculum at European level and promote the recognition and further develop e-facilitators’ competences.

3. FINAL CONSIDERATIONS BY THE EVALUATORS

a. Project Performance

As evaluators, we reiterate our opinion that there was a **committed team of partners** in charge of carrying on a project, to a large extension explained by the fact that this project is retained instrumental to their own organizational strategy in term of building the capacities of their staff.

All **tasks and deliverables** have been fulfilled. Piloting partners had the opportunity to test the selected modules at their own pace, under a common, agreed time framework. The coordinator managed to stick to project implementation plans, guiding partners to cooperate in a productive, harmonic and synchronized way. Only a few delays occurred by the end of second year, motivated in our view by the added second round of training activities combined with the inexperience of the partner coordinating the pilot in playing such a role in this kind of transnational collaborative projects.

Evaluators also take stock of improvements made by the consortium in the areas where some weakness had been identified in the progress report:

- During second year, neither the commitment and initiative of WP coordinating partners nor the coordination and exchange between partners was an issue anymore (with the exception of some incoordination/miscommunication in Wp6 Pilot)
- Instructions and deadlines for deliverables were duly communicated and reiterated by project coordinator and, when applicable, by WP coordinators
- Project coordinator provided helpful guidance and constant support to partners on correct budget expenditure and financial reporting
- The frequency of Skype meetings increases, even if not reaching a monthly frequency, to an acceptable level to the scope of project implementation

Moreover, WP9 Dissemination performance (which had been somehow challenged in mid-term evaluation) improved to a point of excellence. And WP5 Train-the-trainer (run completely during 2nd year) had an outstanding performance.

b. Quality of Products

The **main products** selected at the beginning of the project subject to evaluation were the adapted modular curriculum [N7] and the report on 2nd tier training in countries [N9]. Their evaluation is reported under this section.

Additionally we conducted an evaluation of centralized super-trainers training [N8] which was functional to the project implementation, that is, a piece of work intended to contribute to a better preparation of the upcoming pilot phase. The interested reader can consult the Evaluation section of the Train-the-trainers report for further details.

[N7] Adapted modular curriculum

D-O-T conducted a quality check to the final training curriculum during its work-in-progress, in order to allow its appropriate use by partners for the final version. This quality check included a comparison with the final training curriculum released in original project VET4e-I.

In general, we observed that the skeletons were correctly developed and equally coherent with previous project modules description. We assisted the partners in the way of defining a higher time allocation to each unit/module, since the original 22 hours revealed to be not enough for proper learning of each module (for example Latvian partner estimated a range between 40 and 60 hours depending on the module).

We also recommended a final proof read and edition in order to overcome issues like American vs. UK English harmonisation (e.g. “competencies” or “competences?”); appropriate use of terms (e.g. is “ability” the right term when describing competences?); harmonisation of narrative style (we had noticed that while German style was more structured, Latvian tended to be rather narrative); and module template format (translation of header and footer, respecting column names as in the original).

As we could later verify, all our recommendations were implemented in Result N7

[N9] Pilot evaluation

We conducted a pre-training survey to candidate trainees and a post-training survey to them plus supertrainers and national referents or coordinators. We produced an extensive analysis of the collected feedback, which was incorporated as an Annex to the Pilot report. We recall below our main conclusions (Pilot Evaluation report, pp. 26-29):

Three national groups of trainees clearly differentiated in terms of age, educational background and labour experience, as well as interests and motivations, took part of the pilot activities. German group was the elder group, less educated and more diversified in terms of fields of study, less proficient in ICT, and mostly focused on senior end-users. Latvian represented the middle-age group, with higher educational degrees and more ICT oriented. Portuguese group was the youngest, still with high educational level and ICT orientation. A few commonalities across country were found in the predominance of women (2 every 1 man) and trainees’ studies on Education (a quarter per country).

Their motivation to participate in pilot training activities is linked to their profiles, for example German facilitators gained experience in the role by learning by doing, lacking until now of any specialised training to cover their training needs. In Latvia, they are interested to combine personal and professional development and to learn better how to get the most of ICT to satisfy typical end-users needs. In Portugal too, but with a special attention to the needs of specific target groups

On the other hand, trainee candidates’ self-assessment on their own readiness for e-Facilitation role in terms of needed competences - conducted prior to the training activities - identified some key skills that might require enhancement:

ICT skills: dealing with technical issues (solve computer problems, etc), coding (which educational relevance is increasing, since is a pathway to computational thinking), create a web page (a kind of coding), protect personal data;

e-Facilitation skills: using online platforms to train people, facilitating users to make an advanced use of internet Web 2.0. (create blogs, wikis, web pages);

Organisational skills: European/national networking, economic planning and management.

The evaluation conducted after the training among the trainees, their super-trainers and the national coordinators reveals that part of those needs and expectations were covered by the pilot experience itself: they were embedded in a context that required interacting with others at distance (i.e. networking), they were induced to use Moodle for the purpose of training, and one module (M11) was devoted specifically to cope with personal data protection. On top of this, a comparison of self-evaluation scores prior and after the training shows a clear improvement in their readiness for the requirements of the role (quantified as an overall 17%).

Trainees appreciated the benefits of e-learning as a “new” way of learning (around half of them hadn’t used it before), from the structured way in which content and resources are presented, to the freedom to learn at our their pace or the possibility for trainers (their actual role) to supervise the whole learning progress by consulting the platform. Those places where on-line units were combined with on-site introductory and final classes reported that this blended learning modality worked very well for students.

Many trainees highlighted not only the usefulness of the contents learnt for their daily job. The super-trainers and national coordinators emphasised also the relevance of the overall experience (i.e. being part of a transnational experience and the exchange with other countries, having a voice in the adaptation of contents to countries, the comparison between countries or the quality assurance process) as well as the high motivation and engagement of trainees.

Beyond all these positive notes, a thorough analysis of different pilot training facets unveils some aspects that might require improvement in the event of a re-edition of the experience or a new delivery of a concrete module.

- 1. Preparatory steps (prior to training activities): more attention should be paid to information provided to candidates so they make a good choice;*
- 2. Online platform: while many liked Moodle, others considered it old-fashioned and not dynamic enough. Somebody suggested that MOOCs offer more possibilities of interaction and exchange of knowledge while this [Moodle] is a teacher-centred model (which would be a paradox, as this learning management system is developed under the Constructivism paradigm). Contents are rapidly changing and becoming out of date (e.g. somebody pointed out that tables are more interesting for users than the equipment of the Telecentre to which a module refers to); learners should be stimulated to learn to learn on their own, using a more varied range of*

available resources nowadays like tutorials, videos, web 2.0, mobile devices. The graphic interface and usability of the platform were particularly challenged in Germany (which is usually more strict than other countries on web accessibility, and as said, works mostly with senior people). Also the tests and questionnaires, or even Moodle guidelines, were not pleasant for everybody. All this might suggest the need for a critical review of the virtual learning environment to use in further experiments or exploitation of the curriculum;

3. *In terms of training & learning methodology, this was much appreciated due to the benefits of e-learning, which combined with punctual, well-selected face-to-face meetings (i.e. blended learning) was effective. Nonetheless, areas where the methodology implementation should be improved were pointed out in punctual modules (M4 in Germany or M11 in Latvia), like content organization, quality and relevance of supplementary contents, scarcity of interactive and audiovisual examples, etc.*
4. *Participants suggested different directions to improve contents contemporaneity, design and interactivity, which leads us to propose that the overall methodology should incorporate in the future co-creation or participatory design techniques in order to allow final beneficiaries contributing to the definition and design of the learning environment and contents*
5. *A broad consensus of respondents on the short formal duration of modules (which we remind that echoes the duration defined in the original project VET4e-I) leads us to recommend reviewing it in light of the pilot experience and allocate a more feasible amount of time in the final edition of Trans e-Facilitator training curriculum;*
6. *Communication and participation was reported by participants as, comparatively, the weakest dimension. This ranges from the set of available communication tools (and the non-use of useful resources like skype, google+, etc) to the passivity of some tutors to motivate students to communicate, to the scarce peer learning experienced. Somebody in Germany regretted not to have learnt how to be a facilitator, which can resume the unmet expectations of a number of participants. This is another paradox, as the role of a facilitator, compared with a traditional teacher or ICT trainer, requires precisely a more dynamic approach based on fluent communication and intense participation. Perhaps the training curriculum should be enriched with a module devoted to Facilitation tools and methods (in a blended learning environment)*

To end this conclusion, we list below the modules around which there is higher agreement that would be worth either releasing again or adding to the existing curriculum:

1. *Trainees and super-trainers agreed that the most demanded and needed modules from the current training curriculum are M09 Planning a digital literacy workshop and M11 e-Safety & e-Security.*
2. *They also agreed that the most needed modules to add to the training curriculum are Managing projects and funds and Facilitating organized groups through collaborative learning methods & internet. In our opinion, the first one is a good space to develop*

international and national networking *as well as* economic planning and management (two of the poorest existing skills in the sample). The second one, in turn, might be the right container to introduce facilitation tools and techniques combined with a design thinking methodology for educators and the use of online platforms /tools to train people.

3. Coding/computational thinking *remains out of the selection but might be worth tackling this emerging need ad hoc, perhaps as part of a course on Facilitating Web 2.0 (third in the choice of supertrainers & national coordinators but sixth in trainees' selection).*

c. Project results

We judge the **knowledge transfer process** (from the project/countries where the innovation was produced to this transfer-of-innovation project/countries) as accurate and adequate for the purpose of:

- 1) create awareness in new countries about the relevance of e-Facilitator as an emerging new profession, and the necessary steps to be taken in order to get its formal and social recognition;
- 2) extend the exploitation of a common European training curricula to new countries and types of organisations; at this respect it is worth highlighting the balanced geographic distribution where pilot activities took place, as well as the new types of organisations experimenting and wishing to adopt it (from libraries to a government body)

In terms of **value-for-money maximization**, to the translation of original modules to Portuguese, German and Latvian partners added a new module (M11 – Internet Safety and Security) developed ad hoc, which then demonstrated to be one of the two more preferred both by trainees and supertrainers for further course releases, which increases the value-for-money of the e-Facilitator training curriculum.

In terms of formal and social recognition of the e-Facilitator profile in target countries, each piloting partner researched and understood well the steps needed to fight for it locally, and started to walk towards this ambitious target.

Regarding the third dimension assessed in terms of result, the **policy interest on e-Facilitators**, we had already noticed that in Portugal the project was fitting a concern about **leveraging public investments** already made in the e-Inclusion domain, appearing to policy makers as a useful tool to help ICT trainers animating the “Internet Spaces” publicly financed in previous years.

At European level, this activity was channeled through Telecentre Europe, an international NGO based in Brussels (“aisbl” type, according to Belgium law) which is the largest pan-European network of telecentre networks. Not only the final conference of Trans e-Facilitator was organized under the umbrella of Telecentre Europe Annual Conference, reaching in this way potential beneficiary organization from most European countries plus other key stakeholders and policy makers. The outcomes of the networking session organized as part of Trans eFacilitator conference motivated Telecentre Europe to plan to take further action at European level for the

recognition of the profile, starting by a policy position paper that is in the pipeline of the organization for delivery during the upcoming months.

In terms of dissemination, in the progress report we had pointed out that during 1st year **dissemination actions** focused on presentations in events on the field of digital media / eInclusion in the widest meaning, i.e. inclusion of people in the Information Society so that they (either disadvantaged audiences *or* regular audiences) can apply their ICT knowledge in jobs, learning process, social communication, recommending for the 2nd year project a more targeted dissemination strategy.

During second year, the consortium worked in line with the recommendation given by evaluators to develop a more specific dissemination strategy at both at European and national level. This attempt was aimed to engage new and more key stakeholders with a double purpose: to achieve the goal of contributing to the eInclusion process in general, and to get the attention of chambers, unions, charities and competent ministries towards a recognized career for e-facilitators the project. At European level it was with no doubt the final conference held in the context of Telecentre Europe annual conference the most helpful event to attract the attention of European policy makers, the ICT industry, library networks and regional governments represented there.

As per the further exploitation of project outcomes, “The dissemination and exploitation results are a strong basis to build on the projects valorisation strategy. There are two pillars of Trans e-facilitator that the consortium will emphasise in the future: the exploitation and transfer of the reworked curriculum with 11 modules, and the informal and formal recognition of the education and the profession of e-facilitators.” (Result 14: Dissemination Report and Valorisation Plan, p.14)

“The valorisation plan shows strategies of the project partners to further exploit the attested curriculum. These strategies will have influence on national VET systems and policy making processes. The inclusion of the curriculum into national VET systems started already during the project and will continue beyond. Further dissemination will be embedded in continued advocating efforts for the professionalization of e-facilitators. On a short term perspective the formal implementation of a new vocational training for e-facilitators or the integration of the curriculum in an existing training will encounter not vincible obstacles so that the consortium will raise more awareness for the profile of e-facilitators and implement the curriculum in non-formal trainings as much as we can so that on a long term perspective the demand for a formal recognised training will rise and finally be implemented.” (*ibid*, p.21)

d. Reference documents

All Monitoring & Evaluation documents are available on the project’s platform (WP8 Section): <http://www.elearning.trans-efacilitator.eu/moodle/course/view.php?id=9>