



QUALITY REPORT: WORK PACKAGES AND MEETINGS

ECVET-Trainer. Proposals for the gradual application of ECVET model in the four key productive sectors of the EU.

File:2012-1-ES1-LEO05-48017

<http://ecvet-trainer.euproject.org/>



The ECVET-Trainer project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This 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.

INDEX

QUALITY REPORTS: WORK PACKAGES	3
WP1. WORK PACKAGE 1: WORKING ORGANIZATION.	3
WP2. WORK PACKAGE 2: ANALYSIS OF THE ECVET SITUATION AND ITS IMPLEMENTATION ON THE PRODUCTIVE	3
WP3. EXCHANGE OF EXPERIENCES AND BEST PRACTICES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ECVET	4
WP4. DEFINING E-LEARNING MATERIAL.	4
WP5. TESTING AN E-LEARNING PILOT COURSE	5
WP6. QUALITY PLAN. VALIDATION AND EVALUATION OF RESULTS.	6
WP7. DISSEMINATION AND VALORISATION OF THE RESULTS	6
TRANSNATIONAL MEETINGS: quality report.....	7
WP1. KICK OFF MEETING.....	7
WP3. BORDEAUX MEETING	7
WP4. LECCE MEETING	7
WP7. HELSINKI MEETING	7
CONCLUSIONS	8
ANNEXES.....	9
WP1. WORK PACKAGE 1: WORKING ORGANIZATION.	9
WP2. WORK PACKAGE 2: ANALYSIS OF THE ECVET SITUATION AND ITS IMPLEMENTATION ON THE PRODUCTIVE	12
WP3. EXCHANGE OF EXPERIENCES AND BEST PRACTICES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ECVET	16
WP4. DEFINING E-LEARNING MATERIAL.	22
WP5. TESTING AN E-LEARNING PILOT COURSE	28
WP6. QUALITY PLAN. VALIDATION AND EVALUATION OF RESULTS.	35
WP7. DISSEMINATION AND VALORISATION OF THE RESULTS	40
MADRID MEETING: KICK-OFF MEETING.....	44
BORDEAUX MEETING	45
LECCE MEETING	47
HELSINKI MEETING	48

QUALITY REPORTS: WORK PACKAGES

WP1. WORK PACKAGE 1: WORKING ORGANIZATION.

In general partners have considered that the project was progressing well. Regarding the planned programme, some adjustments have been implemented, but everything was fine, according to the initial working plan.

Partners considered there was no relevant problem among partnership regarding delays, missing information or lack of communications.

Partners considered that communication among them was satisfactory all the time: e-mail was the most frequent tool for exchanging information. Partners shared documents and information through the website.

Regarding the kick-off meeting, partners highlighted that information was available always on time. They think that Madrid meeting was a useful event in order to clarify responsibilities, points of view, deadlines, etc.

The role of partners in the project was identified in the original application. The agenda of the meeting was delivered with time enough to prepare some presentations and ideas for the debate.

The first stage of the project was evaluated by partners in the Madrid meeting. A questionnaire was available on the web site for collecting opinions about the progress of the project. The evaluation was used to improve the coordination activities and also the product quality and the project impact.

WP2. WORK PACKAGE 2: ANALYSIS OF THE ECVET SITUATION AND ITS IMPLEMENTATION ON THE PRODUCTIVE SECTORS

Wp2 has been developed according to the guidelines expressed in the original application. Some minor delays occurred with the elaboration of national reports, nevertheless, tasks have been accomplished.

There was not any relevant problem among partners. Partners considered that the work load and tasks was well organized and a permanent and satisfactory communication was produced among partners and coordinator along all the planned activities.

It is remarkable that one partner pointed out that communication could be more intensive in WP2, exchanging information about the situation of other partners with their national reports.

The most common format for dissemination has been seminars and experts groups (100%) and the website (83%).

Regarding the evaluation of National reports (wp2), there were different situations: 67% have made an evaluation, and 33% have not made it yet.

About the evaluation, partners consider internal evaluation within the consortium. And external evaluation through experts group in wp3. This process will lead partners to ensure the quality of the project and the project impact.

WP3. EXCHANGE OF EXPERIENCES AND BEST PRACTICES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ECVET

Partners have considered that the project is progressing very well (60%) and well (40%). They also considered that the activities have been developed on time (80%).

The 2nd meeting in Bordeaux was very helpful according to the aims of the project. There were not any changes regarding the original application.

There was not any problem among partners. One comment shows that "Partners have met deadlines in the development of their job".

The most frequent methods of communication were: the e-mail, skype calls and also the project platform to exchange documents. It was commented that public and private website sections are working good, according to the aims of the project.

Regarding the Bordeaux meeting, one partner said that the contents and schedule of the agenda were really useful for preparing the meeting. The contents of the agenda were drawn up according to the objectives of the WP.

The products have been obtained through the following methods: Documentary analysis, personal interviews, focus groups and quantitative techniques.

All documents are validated by partners, using a questionnaire of evaluation, debate among partners in the Bordeaux meeting, and through national seminars with experts, organised to validate the contents.

WP4. DEFINING E-LEARNING MATERIAL

Standing at the questionnaire, the developing of project activities have been evaluated by partners satisfactorily (67%). All the tasks related to this module have been developed on time and all the modules have been defined within the established deadline.

The project, and the related work package 4, is following the planned programme of activities as it was discussed in the transnational meetings and there has been no change in the successive work packages.

In this work package there has been no problem with the partners. The work between the partners and the project coordinator is evaluated as very good (67%) and the communications among partners have been frequent, weekly or even daily, when needed. There has been fluent communication through e-mail, one virtual meeting through skype and the exchange of documents through the project platform. There was a period of validation of the e-learning contents.

The project management page has been working very well (83%) and it has been really useful for sharing information.

The meeting in Lecce has been very useful to clarify objectives and fix the deadlines for each task among the partnership. The agenda was sent with sufficient time in advance.

The product for this WP was identified in the original application. A protocol of methodology was sent to all partners. A period of validation was established for reaching an agreement on the contents.

For drawing the contents, the partnership used the documentation from the National and Comparative reports and from the Guide. The contents were designed considering mainly pedagogical criteria, adaptability to the territory and new technologies potentialities.

Finally, the contents have been validated by the partnership through an internal questionnaire before editing the final version in the Moodle. The evaluation is used to improve the product quality (100% of partners have stated this), the coordination and the overall work (83%) and finally the impact of the project (83%).

All partners consider also that the product will be useful for public administrations, social partners, VET centres, companies and learners too.

WP5. TESTING AN E-LEARNING PILOT COURSE

Partners agreed that project activities have been developed very well (80%) and well (20%). Partners opinions were as follows: "The wp5 tasks have been developed on time. The e-learning course started on May 28th and finished on June 28th"; "We had to keep learning time flexible and support the self-paced learning of the participants as it was impossible to gather them all at one place on one day". In addition, all partners thought that the project was following the working programme. About the progress of the course, two partners confirmed that participants involved in the course have a positive opinion about it.

All partners agreed that there is no problem among partners in the partnership. The relation with the coordinator was considered as very good (80%) and excellent (20%). The most frequent method of communication was through e-mail (40% considered once a week, 40% once a month). One partner said: Continuous communication, whenever needed. Sometimes more often than once a week, and sometimes less.

About the dissemination of the results, partners commented that the most frequent way was the e-mail (100%) and the website (80%).

About the methodology for obtaining the products, partners highlighted that they were obtained in different activities such as: elaborating national and international reports, exchanging opinions and developing of training materials.

About the validation of materials, all partners agreed that these were checked and tested on time. One partner said: The WP was mainly about validating and testing the learning material. All partners agreed that the materials can be used by VET stakeholders in the participant countries. Some partners have organised a focus group for validating the e-learning materials. The most frequent tools for validating the e-learning material have been: Debates among partners, questionnaires and personal interviews with experts.

WP6. QUALITY PLAN. VALIDATION AND EVALUATION OF RESULTS.

Calendar. Partners agreed that the project activities were developed very well and the project was following the working programme. Most of the partners thought that there are not any changes in the project. One partner considers that there are some changes but not specifying which.

Partners. Everyone agreed that there was not any problem among partners. About the relation with the project coordinator, partners agreed on a very good communication. Most of the partners have considered that the communications were established once a month (75%) and once a week (25%). All partners thought that project and the wp6 has been developing very well.

Products. All partners considered that the products have been identified previously. One partner has commented: A quality plan was defined at the beginning of the project in order to evaluate the results and products. A protocol of methodology was defined for the organization of the experts group.

Evaluation. About the evaluation of the results, one partner commented that the protocol of methodology was validated by partners before organising these events.

WP7. DISSEMINATION AND VALORISATION OF THE RESULTS

Activities of dissemination and valorisation have been considered as very good. All the activities were developed on time and the project regarding the dissemination and valorisation activities are also rated as very good.

The relation with the project coordinator has been defined as very good. The communication has been developed at least once a month. And the project web site has been identified as a very good tool for the dissemination activities.

Partners agreed that the final meeting in Helsinki was in accordance with the calendar established in WP1. The agenda was received on time by all partners.

Partners commented that the most common way to disseminate the products and results of the project has been through the e-mail, web site and seminars. Other media were: papers, publications and articles, and cd. The information has been delivered at different levels: local, national, European and sectorial.

All partners confirmed that the dissemination strategy has been evaluated in each country through expert groups. The methods of evaluation were questionnaires, debate among partners, national seminars and interview with experts. This

evaluations are using for improving the coordination and the overall work, the quality products and the project impact.

TRANSNATIONAL MEETINGS: QUALITY REPORT

WP1 KICK OFF MEETING

The kick-off meeting was held in Madrid with the participation of all partners. The evaluation report of this event emphasizes the good cooperation among partners and a high rate of satisfaction among the attendees, who considered that the presentations were very useful in order to establish a starting point of the project. We know each other now! Very good and very clear presentations.

WP3. BORDEAUX MEETING

All partners have considered that the meeting achieved the objectives proposed in the agenda. One partner confirmed that "The meeting was really useful according to the objectives of the Project". In general the meeting was rated as "very good" and very well organized by the MPS team. The same opinion was regarding the partnership and the presentations of partners: "All presentations were clear". Hosting and domestic arrangements were considered as very good (60%) and excellent (40%).

WP4. LECCE MEETING

Partners were satisfied with the results of the meeting. All the main issues about defining the e-learning contents have been discussed in depth.

Partners considered the results of the meeting as excellent (60%) and very good (40%). Partners consider that the meeting arrangements were excellent (60%) or very good (40%). Partners consider that the venue, the meeting room and all the arrangements were appropriate.

The partnership working is rated mainly very good (40%) and excellent (40%). Debates and exchange of opinions were very important in order to reach the objectives of the meeting. All partners made an evaluation about the statement of their own tasks and presented their strategies in order to achieve the products. It was mainly focused on the translation of documents and development of an e-learning course in the moodle platform. The presentation of partners for this meeting was rated from good to excellent. Hosting and domestic arrangements were rated from very good (40%) to excellent (60%).

WP7. HELSINKI MEETING

Most of the partners considered the conference as satisfactory. Only 20% were partly satisfied. One partner commented that "the final conference didn't had so much people as expected, however it is very difficult on working days to have people who can participate in conferencies".

Partners considered the results of the meeting as very good (40%).

Partners consider that the meeting arrangements were excellent (20%) or very good (80%).

The partnership working is rated as very good (100%). Debates and exchange of opinions were very important in order to reach the objectives of the meeting.

The presentation of partners for this meeting has been rated from good (80%) to excellent (20%). The presentation of the Finnish expert was very useful for the rest of the partners. It has opened some news debates about the implementation of ECVET in participant countries.

Hosting and domestic arrangements have been rated from very good (80%) to excellent (20%).

CONCLUSIONS

About work packages quality

In general partners are highly satisfied with the development of the project which was adjusted to the work programme described in the initial application. Most of the partners thought that there are not any changes in the project.

All partners agreed that there were no problems among participants in the association. About the relation with the project coordinator, partners agreed on a very good communication: Continuous communication, whenever needed: Sometimes, more often than once a week, sometimes less.

Organisations involved in the project have considered that all the products have been identified previously in transnational meetings and in protocols of methodology.

Partners commented that the most common way to disseminate the products and results of the project has been trough the e-mail, web site and seminars. Other media were: papers, publications and articles, and cd. The information has been delivered at different levels: local, national, European and sectorial.

All partners confirmed that the dissemination strategy has been evaluated in each country through expert groups. The method of evaluation were questionnaires, debate among partners, national seminars and interview with experts. This evaluations are using for improving the coordination and the overall work, the quality products and the project impact.

Transnational meetings

The four international meetings have been considered as satisfactory by all the partners. They agreed in the usefulness of the events in order to establish common points of view and to define the workload and tasks of partners in each workpackage. The communication with the coordinator and organisation and logistic of the events was rated as very good. The presentations of partners were rated as a high quality and very clear for the development of the work.

ANNEXES

WP1. WORK PACKAGE 1: WORKING ORGANIZATION.

1. How are the project activities developing?

Comments from repliers:

31.01.2013 [Angel](#) The first meeting shows a
[YAGÜE](#): good climate among partners
 and a good organization of
 the project.

- Not good  0% (0 of 8)
 - Good  25% (2 of 8)
 - Very good  50% (4 of 8)
 - Excellent  25% (2 of 8)

2. Is the project following the planned programme?

Comments from repliers:

04.07.2013 [Ligia](#) some adjustments have been
[WHYTE](#): needed, but everything is
 going on according to the
 workplan.

- Yes  100% (8 of 8)
 - Partly  0% (0 of 8)
 - No  0% (0 of 8)

3. How is the project advancing in relation to results and products?

- Not good  0% (0 of 8)
 - Good  50% (4 of 8)
 - Very good  50% (4 of 8)
 - Excellent  0% (0 of 8)

4. Are there changes anticipated for upcoming work packages?

- Yes  0% (0 of 8)
 - Partly  0% (0 of 8)
 - No  100% (8 of 8)

5. Could any changes affect the results and the work of the partners?

- Yes  0% (0 of 8)
 - Partly  13% (1 of 8)
 - No  88% (7 of 8)

6. Have there been any problems with the partners?

- Yes. Name of the partners  0% (0 of 8)
 - No, there was not any problem  100% (8 of 8)

7. If so, what kind of problem(s)?

- Delays  0% (0 of 8)
 - Missing information  0% (0 of 8)

- Lack of communication  0% (0 of 8)
- Others, explain  0% (0 of 8)

8. How has the work been organized in relation with the coordinating partner?

Comments from repliers:

24.09.2013 [Sigrid TERWOLBECK](#): I think that we should have more regularly a transnational meeting, it is important that partners can share together.

- Not good  0% (0 of 8)
- Good  38% (3 of 8)
- Very good  13% (1 of 8)
- Excellent  38% (3 of 8)

9. What method has been used to communicate with the coordinating partner and how often?

Comments from repliers:

31.01.2013 [Angel YAGÜE](#): E-mail is the most common tool. We have shared some documents through the website.

04.07.2013 [Ligia WHYTE](#): depending on the needs

24.09.2013 [Sigrid TERWOLBECK](#): Everytime when it was necessary.

- Once a day  0% (0 of 8)
- Once a week  38% (3 of 8)
- Once a month  25% (2 of 8)
- Other  38% (3 of 8)

10. How has the project management page been working?

Comments from repliers:

31.01.2013 [Angel YAGÜE](#): It is a useful platform for sharing information and exchanging information.

- Not good  0% (0 of 8)
- Good  38% (3 of 8)
- Very good  38% (3 of 8)
- Excellent  25% (2 of 8)

11. How is the WP developing?

Comments from repliers:

31.01.2013 [Angel YAGÜE](#): there are some basic documents and protocols in progress.

- Not good  0% (0 of 8)
- Good  38% (3 of 8)
- Very good  38% (3 of 8)
- Excellent  25% (2 of 8)

12. What documentation has been used to develop the project?

13. Did the international meeting adjust to the calendar established in WP-Management?

Comments from repliers:

- Yes  100% (8 of 8)
- Partly  0% (0 of 8)
- No  0% (0 of 8)

31.01.2013 [Angel YAGÜE](#): Madrid meeting was a useful event in order to clarify responsibilities, point of views, deadlines, etc,

14. What was the function of the international meeting?

15. Did you receive the meeting agenda with sufficient time in advance?

- Yes  100% (8 of 8)
 - No  0% (0 of 8)

16. What results have been disseminated? Where? To whom? When?

17. What format has been used for dissemination (paper, CD, webpage)?

- Paper  25% (2 of 8)
 - CD  0% (0 of 8)
 - Email  88% (7 of 8)
 - Website  75% (6 of 8)
 - Seminars  25% (2 of 8)
 - Publications/articles  0% (0 of 8)
 - Other  25% (2 of 8)

Comments from repliers:

20.01.2013 [Gabriella PAPPADÀ](#): email, info on the web will be sent after the kick off meeting
 04.07.2013 [Ligia WHYTE](#): direct communication with stakeholders
 24.09.2013 [Sigrid TERWOLBECK](#): Direct meetings Phone meetings

18. In which areas has dissemination been carried out (local, national, european, sectoral)?

- Local  75% (6 of 8)
 - Regional  63% (5 of 8)
 - National  88% (7 of 8)
 - International  88% (7 of 8)

19. Were the products for this work package identified previously?

- Yes  88% (7 of 8)
 - Partly  0% (0 of 8)
 - No  0% (0 of 8)

Comments from repliers:

31.01.2013 [Angel YAGÜE](#): original application; agenda.

20. What methodology has been used to obtain the product?

- Documentary  63% (5 of 8)
 - Interview  13% (1 of 8)
 - Focus group  38% (3 of 8)
 - Quantitative techniques  13% (1 of 8)

21. Has it been validated or tested?

- Yes  63% (5 of 8)
 - No  25% (2 of 8)

22. Who will be able to utilize it?

- Public Administration  38% (3 of 8)

- Social Partners  50% (4 of 8)
- VET Centres  25% (2 of 8)
- Companies  50% (4 of 8)
- Learners  13% (1 of 8)

23. What criteria have been considered?

- Pedagogical  63% (5 of 8)
- Adaptability to the territory  38% (3 of 8)
- New technology  38% (3 of 8)
- Others  13% (1 of 8)

24. Are any internal or external evaluations expected for the results?

- Yes  88% (7 of 8)
- No  0% (0 of 8)

Comments from repliers:

31.01.2013 [Angel](#) Questionnaires on the web
[YAGÜE](#): site.

25. How was the evaluation organized?

- Questionnaires  88% (7 of 8)
- Debate among partners  38% (3 of 8)
- National seminars 0% (0 of 8)
- Interviews with experts  38% (3 of 8)
- Other 0% (0 of 8)

26. The evaluation is used to improve

- The coordination and the overall work  88% (7 of 8)
- Product quality  75% (6 of 8)
- Project impact  75% (6 of 8)

27. Other considerations

WP2. WORK PACKAGE 2: ANALYSIS OF THE ECVET SITUATION AND ITS IMPLEMENTATION ON THE PRODUCTIVE

1. How are the project activities developing?

Comments from repliers:

23.09.2013 [Angel](#) National reports have been
[YAGÜE](#): developed on time.

- Not good  0% (0 of 7)
- Good  29% (2 of 7)
- Very good  71% (5 of 7)
- Excellent 0% (0 of 7)

2. Is the project following the planned programme?

Comments from repliers:

23.09.2013 [Ligja](#) Some delays occurred,
[WHYTE](#): nevertheless, tasks have
 been accomplished.

23.09.2013 [Angel](#) This wp was developed

- Yes  71% (5 of 7)
- Partly  29% (2 of 7)
- No 0% (0 of 7)

[YAGÜE](#): according to the original application.

3. How is the project advancing in relation to results and products?

Comments from repliers:

23.09.2013 [Angel](#) National reports took into account the opinions of relevant experts in each country.
[YAGÜE](#):

- Not good  0% (0 of 7)
- Good  29% (2 of 7)
- Very good  71% (5 of 7)
- Excellent  0% (0 of 7)

4. Are there changes anticipated for upcoming work packages?

Comments from repliers:

23.09.2013 [Angel](#) There is no changes in this wp.
[YAGÜE](#):

- Yes  0% (0 of 7)
- Partly  0% (0 of 7)
- No  100% (7 of 7)

5. Could any changes affect the results and the work of the partners?

Comments from repliers:

23.09.2013 [Angel](#) [YAGÜE](#): n/a

- Yes  0% (0 of 7)
- Partly  14% (1 of 7)
- No  86% (6 of 7)

6. Have there been any problems with the partners?

- Yes. Name of the partners  0% (0 of 7)
- No, there was not any problem  100% (7 of 7)

7. If so, what kind of problem(s)?

- Delays  0% (0 of 7)
- Missing information  0% (0 of 7)
- Lack of communication  0% (0 of 7)
- Others, explain  0% (0 of 7)

8. How has the work been organized in relation with the coordinating partner?

Comments from repliers:

23.09.2013 [Angel](#) A permanent and satisfactory communication was produced among partners and coordinator
[YAGÜE](#):

- Not good  0% (0 of 7)
- Good  14% (1 of 7)
- Very good  57% (4 of 7)
- Excellent  29% (2 of 7)

9. What method has been used to communicate with the coordinating partner and how often?


Comments from repliers:

23.09.2013 [Ligia WHYTE](#): all the times that it is necessary in order to clarify any situation.

- Once a day  0% (0 of 7)
- Once a week  71% (5 of 7)
- Once a month  0% (0 of 7)
- Other  29% (2 of 7)

- 23.09.2013 [Luca](#) e-mails, project
[ANTONAZZO](#): platform
- 24.09.2013 [Sigrid](#) In WP2, communication
[TERWOLBECK](#): could be more intensive.
- 14.05.2014 [Stefanie](#) Mostly Emails, regular
[NOWAK](#): Skype conferences


10. How has the project management page been working?



Comments from repliers:

- 23.09.2013 [Angel](#) There are excellent tools for
[YAGÜE](#): exchanging information and monitoring the results.

11. How is the WP developing?




Comments from repliers:

- 23.09.2013 [Angel](#) The protocol of methodology
[YAGÜE](#): was really useful according to the aims of the project.

12. What documentation has been used to develop the project?

13. Did the international meeting adjust to the calendar established in WP-Management?




14. What was the function of the international meeting?

15. Did you receive the meeting agenda with sufficient time in advance?




16. What results have been disseminated? Where? To whom? When?

17. What format has been used for dissemination (paper, CD, webpage)?



18. In which areas has dissemination been carried out (local, national, european, sectoral)?





Comments from repliers:

23.09.2013 [Angel YAGÜE](#): The process of dissemination of results has been organized at national level. National report was sent by email to relevant Spanish stakeholders.

- International  71% (5 of 7)

19. Were the products for this work package identified previously?

- Yes  100% (7 of 7)
 - Partly  0% (0 of 7)
 - No  0% (0 of 7)

Comments from repliers:

23.09.2013 [Angel YAGÜE](#): In the original application, in the protocol of methodology wp2 and in the kick-off meeting in Madrid.

20. What methodology has been used to obtain the product?

- Documentary  86% (6 of 7)
 - Interview  86% (6 of 7)
 - Focus group  43% (3 of 7)
 - Quantitative techniques  43% (3 of 7)

21. Has it been validated or tested?

- Yes  71% (5 of 7)
 - No  29% (2 of 7)

Comments from repliers:

23.09.2013 [Ligia WHYTE](#): it is in WP 3
 23.09.2013 [Angel YAGÜE](#): Experts have validated this action by e-mail.
 24.09.2013 [Sigrid TERWOLBECK](#): Not yet
 14.05.2014 [Stefanie NOWAK](#): the e-Learning modules will be tested in June

22. Who will be able to utilize it?

- Public Administration  71% (5 of 7)
 - Social Partners  86% (6 of 7)
 - VET Centres  100% (7 of 7)
 - Companies  86% (6 of 7)
 - Learners  57% (4 of 7)

23. What criteria have been considered?

- Pedagogical  100% (7 of 7)
 - Adaptability to the territory  71% (5 of 7)
 - New technology  57% (4 of 7)
 - Others  14% (1 of 7)


24. Are any internal or external evaluations expected for the results?

- Yes  100% (7 of 7)
 - No  0% (0 of 7)


Comments from repliers:

- 23.09.2013 [Ligia](#) within the consortium
[WHYTE](#):
- 23.09.2013 [Angel](#) We will organize an experts
[YAGÜE](#): group on October 3rd, 2013.

25. How was the evaluation organized?



26. The evaluation is used to improve




27. Other considerations

WP3. EXCHANGE OF EXPERIENCES AND BEST PRACTICES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ECVET

1. How are the project activities developing?

Comments from repliers:


- 22.01.2014 [Angel YAGÜE](#): The Project is progressing okay regarding products and results.
- 22.01.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST](#): none
- 22.01.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST](#): none
- 23.01.2014 [Luca ANTONAZZO](#): All project activities are currently developing very well.



2. Is the project following the planned programme?

Comments from repliers:

- 22.01.2014 [Angel YAGÜE](#): The activities have been developed on time.




22.01.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none

22.01.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none

23.01.2014 [Luca ANTONAZZO:](#) Yes, all activities are on time at the moment.

14.05.2014 [Stefanie NOWAK:](#) some delays occurred

3. How is the project advancing in relation to results and products?




Comments from repliers:

22.01.2014 [Angel YAGÜE:](#) We have organized an expert group in order to discuss about The comparative report and also the Guide have been finished and validated by all partners. The 2nd meeting in Bordeaux was very helpful according to the aims of the project.

22.01.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none

22.01.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none

4. Are there changes anticipated for upcoming work packages?




Comments from repliers:

22.01.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none

22.01.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none

5. Could any changes affect the results and the work of the partners?



Comments from repliers:


22.01.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none

22.01.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none


6. Have there been any problems with the partners?

- Yes. Name of the partners  0% (0 of 5)
- No, there was not any problem  100% (5 of 5)

7. If so, what kind of problem(s)?

- Delays  0% (0 of 5)
- Missing information  0% (0 of 5)
- Lack of communication  0% (0 of 5)
- Others, explain  0% (0 of 5)

8. How has the work been organized in relation with the coordinating partner?

- Not good  0% (0 of 5)
- Good  0% (0 of 5)
- Very good  100% (5 of 5)
- Excellent  0% (0 of 5)

Comments from repliers:

22.01.2014 [Angel YAGÜE](#): Partners have accomplished deadlines for delivering the allocated tasks.

22.01.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST](#): none

22.01.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST](#): none

9. What method has been used to communicate with the coordinating partner and how often?

- Once a day  0% (0 of 5)
- Once a week  100% (5 of 5)
- Once a month  0% (0 of 5)
- Other  0% (0 of 5)

Comments from repliers:

22.01.2014 [Angel YAGÜE](#): the communication is satisfactory through the email and the project website.

22.01.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST](#): none

22.01.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST](#): none

23.01.2014 [Luca ANTONAZZO](#): We used e-mail, skype calls and also the project platform to exchange documents.

10. How has the project management page been working?

- Not good  0% (0 of 5)
- Good  20% (1 of 5)
- Very good  80% (4 of 5)
- Excellent  0% (0 of 5)

Comments from repliers:

22.01.2014 [Angel YAGÜE](#): Public and private

website sections are working good, according the aims of the project.

22.01.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none

22.01.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none

11. How is the WP developing?

- Not good  0% (0 of 5)
- Good  40% (2 of 5)
- Very good  60% (3 of 5)
- Excellent  0% (0 of 5)

Comments from repliers:

22.01.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none

22.01.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none

12. What documentation has been used to develop the project?

13. Did the international meeting adjust to the calendar established in WP-Management?

- Yes  100% (5 of 5)
- Partly  0% (0 of 5)
- No  0% (0 of 5)

Comments from repliers:

22.01.2014 [Angel YAGÜE:](#) The contents and schedule of the agenda were really useful according to the objective of the wp.

22.01.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none

22.01.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none

14. What was the function of the international meeting?

15. Did you receive the meeting agenda with sufficient time in advance?

- Yes  100% (5 of 5)
- No  0% (0 of 5)

Comments from repliers:

22.01.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none


22.01.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none

16. What results have been disseminated? Where? To whom? When?

17. What format has been used for dissemination (paper, CD, webpage)?

Comments from repliers:


- 22.01.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none
- 22.01.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none
- 14.05.2014 [Stefanie NOWAK:](#) the planned tests of the e-Learning material are also a form dissemination



18. In which areas has dissemination been carried out (local, national, european, sectoral)?

Comments from repliers:


- 22.01.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none
- 22.01.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none



19. Were the products for this work package identified previously?

Comments from repliers:


- 22.01.2014 [Angel YAGÜE:](#) There were defined in the original application.
- 22.01.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none
- 22.01.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none



20. What methodology has been used to obtain the product?

Comments from repliers:

- 22.01.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none
- 22.01.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none



21. Has it been validated or tested?

Comments from repliers:

- 22.01.2014 [Angel YAGÜE:](#) we have collected opinions among partners and also from external experts of the



project.

22.01.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none

22.01.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none

14.05.2014 [Stefanie NOWAK:](#) e-Learning modules will be tested in June

22. Who will be able to utilize it?

Comments from repliers:

22.01.2014 [Angel YAGÜE:](#) According to the objective of the project, the results will help VET stakeholders, teachers and trainers in the implementation of ECVET.

- Public  60% (3 of 5)
- Administration  60% (3 of 5)
- Social Partners  60% (3 of 5)
- VET Centres  100% (5 of 5)
- Companies  40% (2 of 5)
- Learners  60% (3 of 5)

22.01.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none

22.01.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none

23. What criteria have been considered?

Comments from repliers:

22.01.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none

22.01.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none

- Pedagogical  100% (5 of 5)
- Adaptability to the territory  80% (4 of 5)
- New technology  40% (2 of 5)
- Others 0% (0 of 5)

24. Are any internal or external evaluations expected for the results?

Comments from repliers:

22.01.2014 [Angel YAGÜE:](#) all the documents are validated by partners, using a questionnaire of evaluation.

22.01.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none

22.01.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none

23.01.2014 [Luca ANTONAZZO:](#) All documents have been validated by the partnership.

- Yes  100% (5 of 5)
- No 0% (0 of 5)


25. How was the evaluation organized?

Comments from repliers:

22.01.2014 [Angel YAGÜE](#):
Questionnaires, debate among partners in the Bordeaux meeting, and National seminars with experts were organised to validate the contents.

22.01.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST](#):
none

22.01.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST](#):
none



26. The evaluation is used to improve



WP4. DEFINING E-LEARNING MATERIAL.

1. How are the project activities developing?


Comments from repliers:

21.03.2014 [Angel YAGÜE](#):
All modules were defined within the established deadline

25.03.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST](#):
None

26.03.2014 [Luca ANTONAZZO](#):
All tasks related to this wp are developing on time


11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST](#):
none



2. Is the project following the planned programme?

Comments from repliers:


25.03.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-](#) None



LINDQUIST:

11.09.2014 Kennet LINDQUIST: none

3. How is the project advancing in relation to results and products?




Comments from repliers:

25.03.2014 Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST: None

11.09.2014 Kennet LINDQUIST: none

4. Are there changes anticipated for upcoming work packages?




Comments from repliers:

21.03.2014 Angel YAGÜE: There are not changes regarding the original application

25.03.2014 Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST: None

11.09.2014 Kennet LINDQUIST: none

5. Could any changes affect the results and the work of the partners?




Comments from repliers:


25.03.2014 Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST: None

11.09.2014 Kennet LINDQUIST: none


6. Have there been any problems with the partners?



7. If so, what kind of problem(s)?



8. How has the work been organized in relation with the coordinating partner?



Comments from repliers:


21.03.2014 Angel There were fluent

[YAGÜE](#): communicatio through email and one virtual meeting through skype. There was a period of validation of the e-learning contents.

25.03.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST](#): None

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST](#): none

9. What method has been used to communicate with the coordinating partner and how often?



Comments from repliers:


25.03.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST](#): None

25.03.2014 [Stefanie NOWAK](#): Angel is always very quick answering Emails.

26.03.2014 [Luca ANTONAZZO](#): E-mails, skype meetings and information shared through the project platform. When in need, the communications and the exchange of information have been intensive

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST](#): none

10. How has the project management page been working?



Comments from repliers:

21.03.2014 [Angel YAGÜE](#): it is really useful for sharing information. On the other hand, Moodle platform works properly.

25.03.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) None

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none

11. How is the WP developing?

Comments from repliers:

21.03.2014 [Angel YAGÜE:](#) There are not pending task regarding the elaboration of modules and units.

25.03.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) None

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none

- Not good  0% (0 of 6)
- Good  17% (1 of 6)
- Very good  83% (5 of 6)
- Excellent  0% (0 of 6)

12. What documentation has been used to develop the project?

13. Did the international meeting adjust to the calendar established in WP-Management?

Comments from repliers:

21.03.2014 [Angel YAGÜE:](#) Next week we will hold the 3rd international meeting in Lecce. The agenda reflect the current situation of the project.

25.03.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) None

26.03.2014 [Luca ANTONAZZO:](#) The meeting in Lecce will be mainly focused on the developing of this wp

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none

- Yes  100% (6 of 6)
- Partly  0% (0 of 6)
- No  0% (0 of 6)

14. What was the function of the international meeting?

15. Did you receive the meeting agenda with sufficient time in advance?

- Yes  100% (6 of 6)
- No  0% (0 of 6)

Comments from repliers:

25.03.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) None

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none

16. What results have been disseminated? Where? To whom? When?

17. What format has been used for dissemination (paper, CD, webpage)?

- Paper  50% (3 of 6)
- CD  0% (0 of 6)
- Email  100% (6 of 6)
- Website  100% (6 of 6)
- Seminars  17% (1 of 6)
- Publications/articles  17% (1 of 6)
- Other  0% (0 of 6)

Comments from repliers:

25.03.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) None

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none

18. In which areas has dissemination been carried out (local, national, european, sectoral)?


- Local  33% (2 of 6)
- Regional  33% (2 of 6)
- National  100% (6 of 6)
- International  50% (3 of 6)

Comments from repliers:

25.03.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) None

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none

19. Were the products for this work package identified previously?

- Yes  100% (6 of 6)
- Partly  0% (0 of 6)
- No  0% (0 of 6)

Comments from repliers:

21.03.2014 [Angel YAGÜE:](#) It was identified in the original application. A protocol of methodology was sent to all the partners. A period of validation was established for reaching an agreement on the contents.


25.03.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) None

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none

20. What methodology has been used to obtain the product?

Comments from repliers:

25.03.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) None
11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none



21. Has it been validated or tested?

Comments from repliers:


21.03.2014 [Angel YAGÜE:](#) A questionnaire of validation was implemented before editing the final version in the Moodle.
25.03.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) None
26.03.2014 [Luca ANTONAZZO:](#) It has been validated through an internal questionnaire
11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none



22. Who will be able to utilize it?

Comments from repliers:

21.03.2014 [Angel YAGÜE:](#) The e-learning materials are valid for VET teachers, trainers and practitioners in the different productive sectors.
25.03.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) None
11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none



23. What criteria have been considered?

Comments from repliers:



25.03.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST](#): None territory
 - New technology  83% (5 of 6)
 - Others  17% (1 of 6)

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST](#): including emerging policies

24. Are any internal or external evaluations expected for the results?

- Yes  100% (6 of 6)
 - No 0% (0 of 6)

Comments from repliers:

21.03.2014 [Angel YAGÜE](#): The wp 5 will be useful for validating the materials and also the process of e-learning.

25.03.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST](#): self evaluation and peer evaluation

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST](#): internal/self- and peer-evaluation

25. How was the evaluation organized?

- Questionnaires  67% (4 of 6)
 - Debate among partners  83% (5 of 6)
 - National seminars 0% (0 of 6)
 - Interviews with experts  33% (2 of 6)
 - Other 0% (0 of 6)

Comments from repliers:

21.03.2014 [Angel YAGÜE](#): Questionnaires of the satisfaction level of students, tutors. A virtual workshop will hold among partners and external experts.

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST](#): none

26. The evaluation is used to improve

- The coordination and the overall work  83% (5 of 6)
 - Product quality  100% (6 of 6)
 - Project impact  83% (5 of 6)

27. Other considerations

WP5. TESTING AN E-LEARNING PILOT COURSE

1. How are the project activities developing?

- Not good  0% (0 of 5)
 - Good  20% (1 of 5)
 - Very good  80% (4 of 5)
 - Excellent 0% (0 of 5)

Comments from repliers:

01.09.2014 [Angel YAGÜE](#): The wp5 tasls has been developed on time. The

e-learning course started on May 28th and finished on June 28th.


11.09.2014 [Adriana BÄR](#): We had to keep learning time flexible and support the self-paced learning of the participants as it was impossible to gather them all at one place on one day.

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST](#): none

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST](#): none

2. Is the project following the planned programme? - Yes  100% (5 of 5)

Comments from repliers: - Partly  0% (0 of 5)

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST](#): none - No  0% (0 of 5)

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST](#): none

3. How is the project advancing in relation to results and products? - Not good  0% (0 of 5)

Comments from repliers: - Good  0% (0 of 5)

01.09.2014 [Angel YAGÜE](#): there were 24 participants involved in the course. There had a positive opinion regarding the main indicators of the course: contents, methodology, materials, duration, didactic media. - Very good  100% (5 of 5)

02.09.2014 [Luca ANTONAZZO](#): The overall participants' opinion in relation to the pilot course is positive.

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST](#): none

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST](#): none

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST](#): none

4. Are there changes anticipated for upcoming work packages? - Yes  20% (1 of 5)

- Partly  0% (0 of 5)

Comments from repliers: - No  80% (4 of 5)

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none

5. Could any changes affect the results and the work of the partners?

- Yes  0% (0 of 5)
 - Partly  20% (1 of 5)
 - No  80% (4 of 5)

Comments from repliers:

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none

6. Have there been any problems with the partners?

- Yes. Name of the partners  0% (0 of 5)
 - No, there was not any problem  100% (5 of 5)

7. If so, what kind of problem(s)?

Comments from repliers:

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none

- Delays  0% (0 of 5)
 - Missing information  0% (0 of 5)
 - Lack of communication  0% (0 of 5)
 - Others, explain  40% (2 of 5)

8. How has the work been organized in relation with the coordinating partner?

Comments from repliers:

01.09.2014 [Angel YAGÜE:](#) A fluent communication has been kept among partners during wp5.

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none

- Not good  0% (0 of 5)
 - Good  0% (0 of 5)
 - Very good  80% (4 of 5)
 - Excellent  20% (1 of 5)

9. What method has been used to communicate with the coordinating partner and how often?

Comments from repliers:

02.09.2014 [Luca ANTONAZZO:](#) e-mails, skype calls.

11.09.2014 [Adriana BÄR:](#) Continuous communication, whenever needed. Sometime more often

- Once a day  0% (0 of 5)
 - Once a week  40% (2 of 5)
 - Once a month  40% (2 of 5)
 - Other  20% (1 of 5)

than once a week
sometimes less.

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina](#) none
[MÖRSKY-](#)
[LINDQUIST:](#)

11.09.2014 [Kennet](#) none
[LINDQUIST:](#)

10. How has the project management page been working?

- Not good  0% (0 of 5)
- Good  0% (0 of 5)
- Very good  100% (5 of 5)
- Excellent  0% (0 of 5)

Comments from repliers:

01.09.2014 [Angel YAGÜE:](#) Partners have followed the same methodology for the development of the course.

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina](#) Efficient and positive
[MÖRSKY-](#)
[LINDQUIST:](#)

11.09.2014 [Kennet](#) none
[LINDQUIST:](#)

11. How is the WP developing?

- Not good  0% (0 of 5)
- Good  0% (0 of 5)
- Very good  80% (4 of 5)
- Excellent  20% (1 of 5)

Comments from repliers:

01.09.2014 [Angel YAGÜE:](#) Everything has been developed according to the initial application.

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina](#) none
[MÖRSKY-](#)
[LINDQUIST:](#)

11.09.2014 [Kennet](#) none
[LINDQUIST:](#)

12. What documentation has been used to develop the project?

13. Did the international meeting adjust to the calendar established in WP-Management?

- Yes  80% (4 of 5)
- Partly  0% (0 of 5)
- No  20% (1 of 5)

Comments from repliers:

11.09.2014 [Adriana BÄR:](#) No international meeting was scheduled in this period.

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina](#) none
[MÖRSKY-](#)

[LINDQUIST:](#)


11.09.2014 [Kennet](#) none

[LINDQUIST:](#)

14. What was the function of the international meeting?

15. Did you receive the meeting agenda with sufficient time in advance?

- Yes  80% (4 of 5)

- No  0% (0 of 5)

Comments from repliers:

01.09.2014 [Angel YAGÜE:](#) 1 month in advance.

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-](#) none

[LINDQUIST:](#)

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none

16. What results have been disseminated? Where? To whom? When?

17. What format has been used for dissemination (paper, CD, webpage)?

- Paper  40% (2 of 5)

- CD  0% (0 of 5)

Comments from repliers:

- Email  100% (5 of 5)

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-](#) none

- Website  80% (4 of 5)

[LINDQUIST:](#)

- Seminars  40% (2 of 5)

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none

- Publications/articles  40% (2 of 5)

- Other  0% (0 of 5)

18. In which areas has dissemination been carried out (local, national, european, sectoral)?

- Local  60% (3 of 5)

- Regional  60% (3 of 5)

Comments from repliers:

- National  100% (5 of 5)

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-](#) none

- International  60% (3 of 5)

[LINDQUIST:](#)


11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none

19. Were the products for this work package identified previously?

- Yes  100% (5 of 5)

- Partly  0% (0 of 5)

Comments from repliers:

- No  0% (0 of 5)

01.09.2014 [Angel YAGÜE:](#) The methodology and materials developed in wp4 have been tested in wp5.

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina](#) none

[MÖRSKY-](#)

[LINDQUIST:](#)

11.09.2014 [Kennet](#) none

LINDQUIST:

20. What methodology has been used to obtain the product?

Comments from repliers:

01.09.2014 [Angel YAGÜE:](#) Materials and methodology are obtained in the different activities of this project: national and international reports, exchange of opinions and development of training materials.

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none

- Documentary  80% (4 of 5)
- Interview  100% (5 of 5)
- Focus group  80% (4 of 5)
- Quantitative techniques  0% (0 of 5)

21. Has it been validated or tested?

Comments from repliers:

11.09.2014 [Adriana BÄR:](#) The WP was mainly about validating and testing the learning material

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none

- Yes  100% (5 of 5)
- No  0% (0 of 5)

22. Who will be able to utilize it?

Comments from repliers:

01.09.2014 [Angel YAGÜE:](#) In this wp, we have tested the e-learning materials and the training methodology. The evaluation questionnaires shows a positive opinion of the participant in different indicators: course organisation, contents and methodology, course

- Public Administration  80% (4 of 5)
- Social Partners  100% (5 of 5)
- VET Centres  100% (5 of 5)
- Companies  100% (5 of 5)
- Learners  100% (5 of 5)

duration, didactic media and resources and general satisfaction with the course.

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST](#): none

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST](#): none

23. What criteria have been considered?

Comments from repliers:

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST](#): none

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST](#): none

- Pedagogical  100% (5 of 5)
- Adaptability to the territory  80% (4 of 5)
- New technology  100% (5 of 5)
- Others  0% (0 of 5)

24. Are any internal or external evaluations expected for the results?

Comments from repliers:

01.09.2014 [Angel YAGÜE](#): We have organised an experts group for validating the results.

02.09.2014 [Luca ANTONAZZO](#): A group of three experts will validate the results.

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST](#): online and offline

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST](#): none

- Yes  100% (5 of 5)
- No  0% (0 of 5)

25. How was the evaluation organized?

Comments from repliers:

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST](#): none

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST](#): none

- Questionnaires  80% (4 of 5)
- Debate among partners  100% (5 of 5)
- National seminars  60% (3 of 5)
- Interviews with experts  80% (4 of 5)
- Other  0% (0 of 5)

26. The evaluation is used to improve

- The coordination and the overall work  100% (5 of 5)
- Product quality  100% (5 of 5)
- Project impact  100% (5 of 5)

27. Other considerations

WP6. QUALITY PLAN. VALIDATION AND EVALUATION OF RESULTS.

1. How are the project activities developing?


Comments from repliers:

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST](#): none

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST](#): none

22.09.2014 [Angel YAGÜE](#): The answers to the quality questionnaires shows that the project has been progressing very well, according to the original application.

29.09.2014 [Luca ANTONAZZO](#): none

- Not good  0% (0 of 4)
 - Good  0% (0 of 4)
 - Very good  100% (4 of 4)
 - Excellent  0% (0 of 4)

2. Is the project following the planned programme?

Comments from repliers:

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST](#): none

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST](#): none

29.09.2014 [Luca ANTONAZZO](#): none

- Yes  100% (4 of 4)
 - Partly  0% (0 of 4)
 - No  0% (0 of 4)

3. How is the project advancing in relation to results and products?

Comments from repliers:

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST](#): none

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST](#): none

29.09.2014 [Luca ANTONAZZO](#): none

- Not good  0% (0 of 4)
 - Good  0% (0 of 4)
 - Very good  100% (4 of 4)
 - Excellent  0% (0 of 4)

4. Are there changes anticipated for upcoming work packages?


Comments from repliers:

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST](#): none

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST](#): none

- Yes  0% (0 of 4)
 - Partly  25% (1 of 4)
 - No  75% (3 of 4)

5. Could any changes affect the results and the work of the partners?

- Yes  0% (0 of 4)
- Partly  50% (2 of 4)
- No  50% (2 of 4)

Comments from repliers:

- 11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none
- 11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none

6. Have there been any problems with the partners?

- Yes. Name of the partners  0% (0 of 4)
- No, there was not any problem  100% (4 of 4)

7. If so, what kind of problem(s)?

- Delays  0% (0 of 4)
- Missing information  0% (0 of 4)
- Lack of communication  0% (0 of 4)
- Others, explain  50% (2 of 4)

Comments from repliers:

- 11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none
- 11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none

8. How has the work been organized in relation with the coordinating partner?

- Not good  0% (0 of 4)
- Good  0% (0 of 4)
- Very good  100% (4 of 4)
- Excellent  0% (0 of 4)

Comments from repliers:

- 11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none
- 11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none
- 22.09.2014 [Angel YAGÜE:](#) E-mails and transnational meetings are a suitable way of coordinating this project.


9. What method has been used to communicate with the coordinating partner and how often?

- Once a day  0% (0 of 4)
- Once a week  25% (1 of 4)
- Once a month  75% (3 of 4)
- Other  0% (0 of 4)

Comments from repliers:

- 11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none
- 11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none

10. How has the project management page been working?

- Not good  0% (0 of 4)
- Good  0% (0 of 4)
- Very good  100% (4 of 4)
- Excellent  0% (0 of 4)

Comments from repliers:

- 11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none
- 11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none

11. How is the WP developing?

Comments from repliers:

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none

- Not good  0% (0 of 4)

- Good  0% (0 of 4)

- Very good  100% (4 of 4)

- Excellent  0% (0 of 4)

12. What documentation has been used to develop the project?**13. Did the international meeting adjust to the calendar established in WP-Management?**

Comments from repliers:

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none

- Yes  75% (3 of 4)

- Partly  25% (1 of 4)

- No  0% (0 of 4)

14. What was the function of the international meeting?**15. Did you receive the meeting agenda with sufficient time in advance?**

Comments from repliers:

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none

- Yes  100% (4 of 4)

- No  0% (0 of 4)

16. What results have been disseminated? Where? To whom? When?**17. What format has been used for dissemination (paper, CD, webpage)?**

Comments from repliers:

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none

- Paper  50% (2 of 4)

- CD  0% (0 of 4)

- Email  100% (4 of 4)

- Website  100% (4 of 4)

- Seminars  100% (4 of 4)

- Publications/articles  0% (0 of 4)

- Other  0% (0 of 4)

18. In which areas has dissemination been carried out (local, national, european, sectoral)?

Comments from repliers:

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none

- Local  75% (3 of 4)

- Regional  50% (2 of 4)

- National  100% (4 of 4)

- International  50% (2 of 4)

19. Were the products for this work package identified previously?

- Yes  100% (4 of 4)

- Partly  0% (0 of 4)

Comments from repliers: - No  0% (0 of 4)

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST](#): none

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST](#): none

22.09.2014 [Angel YAGÜE](#): A quality plan were defined at the beginning of the project in order to evaluate the results and products. A protocol of methodology was defined for the organization of the experts group.

20. What methodology has been used to obtain the product?

- Documentary  100% (4 of 4)
 - Interview  100% (4 of 4)
 - Focus group  100% (4 of 4)
 - Quantitative techniques  25% (1 of 4)

Comments from repliers:

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST](#): none

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST](#): none

21. Has it been validated or tested?

- Yes  100% (4 of 4)
 - No  0% (0 of 4)

Comments from repliers:

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST](#): none

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST](#): none

22.09.2014 [Angel YAGÜE](#): The protocol of methodology was validated by partners before organising these events.

29.09.2014 [Luca ANTONAZZO](#): validated by partnership

22. Who will be able to utilize it?

- Public Administration  75% (3 of 4)
 - Social Partners  75% (3 of 4)
 - VET Centres  100% (4 of 4)
 - Companies  100% (4 of 4)
 - Learners  100% (4 of 4)

Comments from repliers:

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST](#): none

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST](#): none

22.09.2014 [Angel YAGÜE](#): Products are available for all the people interested in the ECVET mobility and Lifelong learning processes.

23. What criteria have been considered?

Comments from repliers:

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST](#): none

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST](#): none

- Pedagogical  100% (4 of 4)

- Adaptability to the territory  100% (4 of 4)

- New technology  75% (3 of 4)

- Others  0% (0 of 4)

24. Are any internal or external evaluations expected for the results?

Comments from repliers:

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST](#): none

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST](#): none

22.09.2014 [Angel YAGÜE](#): Experts group have validated the results. A report has been done about this.

29.09.2014 [Luca ANTONAZZO](#): Some experts from each country have been involved in the evaluation

- Yes  100% (4 of 4)

- No  0% (0 of 4)

25. How was the evaluation organized?

Comments from repliers:

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST](#): none

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST](#): none

- Questionnaires  75% (3 of 4)

- Debate among partners  75% (3 of 4)

- National seminars  75% (3 of 4)

- Interviews with experts  100% (4 of 4)

- Other  0% (0 of 4)

26. The evaluation is used to improve

- The coordination and the overall work  100% (4 of 4)

- Product quality  100% (4 of 4)

- Project impact  100% (4 of 4)

27. Other considerations

WP7. DISSEMINATION AND VALORISATION OF THE RESULTS

1. How are the project activities developing?

Comments from repliers:		- Not good		0% (0 of 4)	
		- Good		0% (0 of 4)	
11.09.2014	Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:	none	- Very good	 100% (4 of 4)	
			- Excellent		0% (0 of 4)
11.09.2014	Kennet LINDQUIST:	none			
29.09.2014	Luca ANTONAZZO:	none			

2. Is the project following the planned programme?

Comments from repliers:		- Yes		100% (4 of 4)
		- Partly		0% (0 of 4)
		- No		0% (0 of 4)
11.09.2014	Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:	none		
11.09.2014	Kennet LINDQUIST:	none		

3. How is the project advancing in relation to results and products?

Comments from repliers:		- Not good		0% (0 of 4)
		- Good		0% (0 of 4)
		- Very good		100% (4 of 4)
		- Excellent		0% (0 of 4)
11.09.2014	Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:	none		
11.09.2014	Kennet LINDQUIST:	none		

4. Are there changes anticipated for upcoming work packages?

Comments from repliers:		- Yes		0% (0 of 4)
		- Partly		25% (1 of 4)
		- No		75% (3 of 4)
11.09.2014	Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:	none		
11.09.2014	Kennet LINDQUIST:	none		


5. Could any changes affect the results and the work of the partners?

Comments from repliers:		- Yes		0% (0 of 4)
		- Partly		50% (2 of 4)
		- No		50% (2 of 4)
11.09.2014	Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:	none		
11.09.2014	Kennet LINDQUIST:	none		

6. Have there been any problems with the partners?

- Yes. Name of the partners		0% (0 of 4)
- No, there was not any problem		100% (4 of 4)

7. If so, what kind of problem(s)?	- Delays		0% (0 of 4)
Comments from repliers:	- Missing information		0% (0 of 4)
11.09.2014 Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:	none	- Lack of communication	 0% (0 of 4)
11.09.2014 Kennet LINDQUIST:	none	- Others, explain	 50% (2 of 4)

8. How has the work been organized in relation with the coordinating partner?	- Not good		0% (0 of 4)
Comments from repliers:	- Good		0% (0 of 4)
11.09.2014 Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:	none	- Very good	 100% (4 of 4)
11.09.2014 Kennet LINDQUIST:	none	- Excellent	 0% (0 of 4)

9. What method has been used to communicate with the coordinating partner and how often?	- Once a day		0% (0 of 4)
Comments from repliers:	- Once a week		0% (0 of 4)
11.09.2014 Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:	none	- Once a month	 100% (4 of 4)
11.09.2014 Kennet LINDQUIST:	none	- Other	 0% (0 of 4)

10. How has the project management page been working?	- Not good		0% (0 of 4)
Comments from repliers:	- Good		0% (0 of 4)
11.09.2014 Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:	none	- Very good	 100% (4 of 4)
11.09.2014 Kennet LINDQUIST:	none	- Excellent	 0% (0 of 4)
22.09.2014 Angel YAGÜE:	Information is always on time. Transnational meeting was useful to evaluate the current situation of the project.		

11. How is the WP developing?	- Not good		0% (0 of 4)
Comments from repliers:	- Good		0% (0 of 4)
11.09.2014 Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:	none	- Very good	 100% (4 of 4)
11.09.2014 Kennet LINDQUIST:	none	- Excellent	 0% (0 of 4)
22.09.2014 Angel YAGÜE:	Newsletters and document of dissemination has been disseminated as well as		

other important reports of the project.

12. What documentation has been used to develop the project?

13. Did the international meeting adjust to the calendar established in WP-Management?

- Yes  100% (4 of 4)
 - Partly  0% (0 of 4)
 - No  0% (0 of 4)

Comments from repliers:

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none
 11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none

14. What was the function of the international meeting?

15. Did you receive the meeting agenda with sufficient time in advance?

- Yes  100% (4 of 4)
 - No  0% (0 of 4)

Comments from repliers:

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none
 11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none

16. What results have been disseminated? Where? To whom? When?

17. What format has been used for dissemination (paper, CD, webpage)?

- Paper  50% (2 of 4)
 - CD  25% (1 of 4)
 - Email  100% (4 of 4)
 - Website  100% (4 of 4)
 - Seminars  100% (4 of 4)
 - Publications/articles  50% (2 of 4)
 - Other  0% (0 of 4)

Comments from repliers:

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none
 11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none

18. In which areas has dissemination been carried out (local, national, european, sectoral)?

- Local  75% (3 of 4)
 - Regional  50% (2 of 4)
 - National  100% (4 of 4)
 - International  50% (2 of 4)

Comments from repliers:

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none
 11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none

19. Were the products for this work package identified previously?

- Yes  100% (4 of 4)
 - Partly  0% (0 of 4)
 - No  0% (0 of 4)

Comments from repliers:

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none

20. What methodology has been used to obtain the product?

Comments from repliers:

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none

- Documentary  100% (4 of 4)
- Interview  100% (4 of 4)
- Focus group  100% (4 of 4)
- Quantitative techniques  0% (0 of 4)

21. Has it been validated or tested?

Comments from repliers:

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none

- Yes  100% (4 of 4)
- No  0% (0 of 4)

22. Who will be able to utilize it?

Comments from repliers:

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none

- Public  75% (3 of 4)
- Administration  100% (4 of 4)
- Social Partners  100% (4 of 4)
- VET Centres  100% (4 of 4)
- Companies  100% (4 of 4)
- Learners  100% (4 of 4)

23. What criteria have been considered?

Comments from repliers:

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none

- Pedagogical  100% (4 of 4)
- Adaptability to the territory  100% (4 of 4)
- New technology  75% (3 of 4)
- Others  25% (1 of 4)

24. Are any internal or external evaluations expected for the results?

Comments from repliers:

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none

- Yes  100% (4 of 4)
- No  0% (0 of 4)

25. How was the evaluation organized?

Comments from repliers:

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none

- Questionnaires  100% (4 of 4)
- Debate among partners  100% (4 of 4)
- National seminars  100% (4 of 4)
- Interviews with experts  100% (4 of 4)
- Other  0% (0 of 4)

26. The evaluation is used to improve

- The coordination and the overall work  100% (4 of 4)
- Product quality  100% (4 of 4)

- Project impact  100% (4 of 4)

27. Other considerations

MADRID MEETING: KICK-OFF MEETING

1. Do you think the objectives of the meeting were achieved? - Yes  100% (10 of 10)

Comments from repliers:

18.01.2013	Kennet LINDQUIST :	none	-	 0% (0 of 10)
28.01.2013	Francois ADOUE :	Totally specially with good cooperation between partners	Partly	 0% (0 of 10)
22.01.2014	Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST :	none	- No	 0% (0 of 10)


2. Overall, how would you rate the meeting?

Comments from repliers:

18.01.2013	Kennet LINDQUIST :	none	- Excellent	 20% (2 of 10)
28.01.2013	Francois ADOUE :	Strong commitment of partners who go on the same direction , with a cooperative approach	- Very good	 80% (8 of 10)
31.01.2013	Angel YAGÜE :	There were very interesting presentations concerning national situations of VET. Presentations about teachers and trainers in the countries were interesting too. Information about financial issues, quality and dissemination was very useful for partners.	- Good	 0% (0 of 10)
			- OK	 0% (0 of 10)
			- Not good	 0% (0 of 10)
22.01.2014	Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST :	none		

3. How would you rate the Organisation and Management of the Meeting

Comments from repliers:

18.01.2013	Kennet LINDQUIST :	none	- Excellent	 40% (4 of 10)
28.01.2013	Francois ADOUE :	Perfect	- Very good	 50% (5 of 10)
22.01.2014	Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST :	none	- Good	 10% (1 of 10)
			- OK	 0% (0 of 10)
			- Not good	 0% (0 of 10)

4. Partnership Working

-  20% (2 of 10)

Comments from repliers:			Excellent
18.01.2013	Kennet LINDQUIST:	none	- Very good  80% (8 of 10)
28.01.2013	Francois ADOUE:	beautiful cooperation of all partners	- Good  0% (0 of 10) - OK  0% (0 of 10) - Not good  0% (0 of 10)
31.01.2013	Angel YAGÜE:	All partners have presented their own organization and have introduced the situation of VET on their own country.	
22.01.2014	Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:	none	

5. Presentation of Partners

Comments from repliers:			Excellent
28.01.2013	Francois ADOUE:	We know each other now ! very good and clear presentations	- Very good  60% (6 of 10) - Good  10% (1 of 10) - OK  0% (0 of 10) - Not good  0% (0 of 10)
31.01.2013	Angel YAGÜE:	Presentations helped us to establish a starting point of the project.	
22.01.2014	Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:	none	

6. Hosting the Domestic Arrangements

Comments from repliers:			Excellent
18.01.2013	Kennet LINDQUIST:	none	- Very good  60% (6 of 10) - Good  10% (1 of 10) - OK  0% (0 of 10) - Not good  0%
28.01.2013	Francois ADOUE:	Perfect	
01.02.2013	Ligia WHYTE:	Thanks to IFES and FETE-UGT personnel for the kind hosting and arrangements. As a suggestion for future meetings, maybe you should suggest the partners the hotel that is close to the Ifes building, it should be more convenient than the Legazpi.	
22.01.2014	Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:	none	

1. Do you think the objectives of the meeting were achieved?

Comments from repliers:

22.01.2014 [Angel YAGÜE](#): The meeting were really useful according to the objectives of the project.

22.01.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST](#): none

22.01.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST](#): none

23.01.2014 [Luca ANTONAZZO](#): Totally achieved.

- Yes  100% (5 of 5)

- Partly  0% (0 of 5)

- No  0% (0 of 5)

2. Overall, how would you rate the meeting?

Comments from repliers:

22.01.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST](#): none

22.01.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST](#): none

- Excellent  20% (1 of 5)

- Very good  80% (4 of 5)

- Good  0% (0 of 5)

- OK  0% (0 of 5)

- Not good  0% (0 of 5)

3. How would you rate the Organisation and Management of the Meeting

Comments from repliers:

22.01.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST](#): none

22.01.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST](#): none

23.01.2014 [Ligia WHYTE](#): Very well organized by MPS team.

- Excellent  20% (1 of 5)

- Very good  80% (4 of 5)

- Good  0% (0 of 5)

- OK  0% (0 of 5)

- Not good  0% (0 of 5)

4. Partnership Working

Comments from repliers:

22.01.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST](#): none

22.01.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST](#): none

- Excellent  0% (0 of 5)

- Very good  100% (5 of 5)

- Good  0% (0 of 5)

- OK  0% (0 of 5)

- Not good  0% (0 of 5)

5. Presentation of Partners


Comments from repliers:

22.01.2014 [Angel YAGÜE](#): Presentations and discussion on the agenda were really helpful for developing the results of the project.

22.01.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST](#): none

22.01.2014 [Anna-Kaarina](#): none

- Excellent  0% (0 of 5)

- Very good  100% (5 of 5)

- Good  0% (0 of 5)

- OK  0% (0 of 5)

- Not good  0% (0 of 5)

[MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#)

23.01.2014 [Luca ANTONAZZO:](#) All presentations were clear.

6. Hosting the Domestic Arrangements

Comments from repliers:

22.01.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none
22.01.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none
23.01.2014 [Ligia WHYTE:](#) thanks for the kindness of the French-partners!

- Excellent  40% (2 of 5)
- Very good  60% (3 of 5)
- Good  0% (0 of 5)
- OK  0% (0 of 5)
- Not good  0% (0 of 5)

7. What one area of the meeting do you think was successful?

8. What one area of the meeting do you think could have been improved, and what can be done about this in future meetings?

9. Are there any other comments or feedback you wish to make?

LECCE MEETING

1. Do you think the objectives of the meeting were achieved?

Comments from repliers:

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none
11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none

- Yes  100% (5 of 5)
- Partly  0% (0 of 5)
- No  0% (0 of 5)

2. Overall, how would you rate the meeting?

Comments from repliers:

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none
11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none

- Excellent  60% (3 of 5)
- Very good  40% (2 of 5)
- Good  0% (0 of 5)
- OK  0% (0 of 5)
- Not good  0% (0 of 5)

3. How would you rate the Organisation and Management of the Meeting

Comments from repliers:

11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST:](#) none
11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none

- Excellent  60% (3 of 5)
- Very good  40% (2 of 5)
- Good  0% (0 of 5)
- OK  0% (0 of 5)
- Not good  0% (0 of 5)

4. Partnership Working

- Excellent  40% (2 of 5)

Comments from repliers:		- Very good		40% (2 of 5)
11.09.2014	Kennet LINDQUIST: none	- Good		20% (1 of 5)
11.09.2014	Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST: none	- OK		0% (0 of 5)
		- Not good		0% (0 of 5)

5. Presentation of Partners

Comments from repliers:		- Excellent		40% (2 of 5)
11.09.2014	Kennet LINDQUIST: none	- Very good		40% (2 of 5)
11.09.2014	Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST: none	- Good		20% (1 of 5)
		- OK		0% (0 of 5)
		- Not good		0% (0 of 5)

6. Hosting the Domestic Arrangements

Comments from repliers:		- Excellent		60% (3 of 5)
11.09.2014	Kennet LINDQUIST: none	- Very good		40% (2 of 5)
11.09.2014	Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST: none	- Good		0% (0 of 5)
		- OK		0% (0 of 5)
		- Not good		0% (0 of 5)

HELSINKI MEETING

1. Do you think the objectives of the meeting were achieved?		- Yes		80% (4 of 5)
Comments from repliers:		- Partly		20% (1 of 5)
11.09.2014	Kennet LINDQUIST: none	- No		0% (0 of 5)

11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST:](#) none

29.09.2014 [Luca ANTONAZZO:](#) none

03.10.2014 [Sigrid TERWOLBECK:](#) The final conference didn't had so much people as wished, however it is very difficult on working days to have people who can participate in conferencies.


2. Overall, how would you rate the meeting?		- Excellent		0% (0 of 5)
Comments from repliers:		- Very good		100% (5 of 5)
11.09.2014	Kennet LINDQUIST: none	- Good		0% (0 of 5)
11.09.2014	Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST: none	- OK		0% (0 of 5)
29.09.2014	Luca ANTONAZZO: none	- Not		0% (0 of 5)

good

3. How would you rate the Organisation and Management of the Meeting

Comments from repliers:


- 11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST](#): none
- 11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST](#): none



4. Partnership Working

Comments from repliers:


- 11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST](#): none
- 11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST](#): none



5. Presentation of Partners

Comments from repliers:


- 11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST](#): none
- 11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST](#): none



6. Hosting the Domestic Arrangements

Comments from repliers:

- 11.09.2014 [Kennet LINDQUIST](#): none
- 11.09.2014 [Anna-Kaarina MÖRSKY-LINDQUIST](#): none



7. What one area of the meeting do you think was successful?

8. What one area of the meeting do you think could have been improved, and what can be done about this in future meetings?

9. Are there any other comments or feedback you wish to make?