

# Aurora Project



FINAL  
EVALUATION  
REPORT

**Table of content**

Objective ..... 3

Methodology ..... 3

Overall organization ..... 4

Interactive lessons ..... 12

Project progress and webinars ..... 37

Other comments and suggestions ..... 49

Concluding Remarks by Evaluator ..... 51

## **Objective**

The objective of this final report is to present the overall picture of the results of the evaluation surveys carried out after each one of the six project meetings held over the duration of the project. The meetings that are included in this report including the dates of the meetings are outlined below:

1. Paris, FRANCE (18-22 November 2013)
2. Barcelona, SPAIN(24-28 March 2014)
3. Warsaw, POLAND (08-11 June 2014)
4. Skovde, SWEDEN (17-23 October 2014)
5. Leipzig, GERMANY (22-25 February 2015)
6. Ankara, TURKEY (22-25 June 2015)

## **Methodology**

The methodology adopted for the compilation of this report is outlined below:

- a. We have made a direct comparative analysis of the questions posed in all or various meetings
- b. Questions that were of a specific or ad hoc nature were also included in report
- c. For each question the results obtained are being analysed in tabular form and also graphic form.
- d. Each question result is then commented upon by the evaluator and a number of selected comments made in various meetings are displayed.
- e. A page per question format has been adopted for ease of reference and understanding by readers of the report.
- f. The report concludes with a review of other comments and concluding remarks by evaluator.


## **Overall organization**

In this part of the report the questions were asked about the level of satisfaction by participants on matters relating to the meetings and specifically relating to:

- a. Communication re meetings by organising partner
- b. Evaluation of programme of meeting
- c. Organisation and information about travel
- d. Organisation and satisfaction with meals
- e. Satisfaction with the cultural activities organised

1. Question : **How do you evaluate the preparation of the meeting? (in selected countries)**

### Evaluation of the communication



<b>Country:</b>	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Sufficient</i>	<i>Not sufficient</i>
FRANCE	33% (4)	67% (8)	-	-
SPAIN	22% (2)	33% (3)	33% (3)	11% (1)
GERMANY	58% (7)	34% (4)	8% (1)	-
POLAND	17% (2)	75% (9)	-	8% (1)
SWEDEN	53% (8)	33% (5)	13% (2)	-
TURKEY	76% (13)	24% (4)	-	-

**Comment:** As one can see from the above graph, the most satisfied with the level of communication were participants in Turkey, Germany and Sweden. Also a good level of communication was recorded mainly in Poland and France. The meeting in Spain was rated as

worst of the lot in terms of communication although a relative majority were still overall satisfied in this respect.

**Participants’ comments:**


"We had some problems communicating about the program between the first general agreement and the final organisation" (France)

"Information was received a number of weeks before the meeting and that was good" (Poland)

“The participants thought that the communication has been very well done according to the answers. They also made good comments about the hosts! “(Turkey)

**2.Question: How do you evaluate the preparation of the meeting? (in selected countries)**

**Evaluation of the programme**



<b>Country:</b>	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Sufficient</u>	<u>Not sufficient</u>
FRANCE	42% (5)	50% (6)	8% (1)	-
SPAIN	11% (1)	67% (6)	-	22% (2)
GERMANY	33% (4)	42% (5)	25% (3)	-
POLAND	-	67% (8)	25% (3)	8%(1)
SWEDEN	40% (6)	60% (9)	-	-
TURKEY	65% (11)	29% (5)	6% (1)	-

**Comment:** In general, participants were satisfied with the programme of the meetings. The most satisfied with the programme were participants in the Turkish meeting (65% marked it as excellent), followed by the meetings in Spain, Poland and Sweden. It is to be noted that

only few participants evaluated the level of programme as "not sufficient" in regards of the meetings in Spain and Poland.


**Participants’ comments:**

“The programme was in line with the objective that the research company and this meeting helped deepen certain points” (Poland)

"The programme was prepared much in advance and all partners were able to comment on the programme and give suggestions.”

**3.Question: How do you evaluate the preparation of the meeting? (in selected countries)**

**Evaluation of the travel:**



<b>Country:</b>	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Sufficient</u>	<u>Not sufficient</u>
FRANCE	50% (6)	42% (5)	8% (1)	-
SPAIN	22% (2)	22% (2)	22% (2)	33% (3)
GERMANY	50% (6)	25% (3)	25% (3)	-
POLAND	8% (1)	58% (7)	25% (3)	8% (1)
SWEDEN	67% (10)	27% (4)	7% (1)	-
TURKEY	65% (11)	35% (6)	-	-

**Comment:** According to the above graph, the majority of participants were very satisfied with the level of travelling in the selected countries; however the Spanish meeting has the most of the unsatisfied participant (33%) also 22% of participants of Spanish meeting marked

the travelling services as only sufficient. The same reaction was in German and Polish meetings where 25% of participants marked the level of travelling only as "sufficient". Overall the meetings in Sweden, Turkey and France got the best rating in this respect.

**Participants' comments:**


"Travelling took too long." (Sweden)

"As for the trip, the participants found it well or even very well organized. They also mentioned that they did not lack of anything. "(Turkey)

"The travel was planned correctly and to go to college we had all the information upstream." (PL)

4. Question: **How do you evaluate some aspects/activities of the meeting?**  
**(MEALS)**

**Evaluation of the meals:**



<b>Country:</b>	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Sufficient</u>	<u>Not sufficient</u>
FRANCE	55% (6)	9% (1)	36% (2)	-
SPAIN	-	56% (5)	33% (3)	11% (1)
GERMANY	42% (5)	25% (3)	17% (2)	17% (2)
POLAND	33% (4)	25% (3)	33% (4)	8% (1)
SWEDEN	40% (6)	40% (6)	13% (2)	7% (1)
TURKEY	82% (14)	18% (3)	-	-

**Comment:** The most successful country- according to the gastronomic performance was undoubtedly Turkey where 82% respondents marked the cuisine as "excellent". The majority



of respondents also opted for the excellence option in the survey. Other countries did well too, but there was some unsatisfied participants - namely in German, Polish, Swedish and Spanish meetings although few in numbers. Generally the meal was marked as "good" or "sufficient".

**Participants' comments:**

"Meals were appreciated a lot. One of the participants gave his opinion that he ate the best dishes in Ankara! Moreover, Ramadan was embarrassing only for the hosts and did not affect them." (Turkey)


"It was great to have simple lunches and a very good dinner at Parkstugan." (Sweden)

"Polish traditional food and beer were excellent. Nice restaurant" (Poland)

5. Question: **How do you evaluate some aspects/activities of the meeting?**

**(Accommodation)**

**Evaluation of the accommodation (meeting room)**



Country:	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Sufficient</i>	<i>Not sufficient</i>
FRANCE	9% (1)	27% (3)	55% (6)	-
SPAIN	11% (1)	11% (1)	44% (4)	33% (3)
GERMANY	42% (5)	25% (3)	17% (2)	17% (2)
POLAND	8% (1)	58% (7)	33% (4)	-
SWEDEN	27% (4)	73% (11)	-	-
TURKEY	82% (14)	18% (3)	-	-

**Comment:** In the matter of accommodation the Turkish meeting was again the most successful. Meetings in Germany, Poland and Sweden were good too - according to the

results shown in the above graph. On the other hand Spain and France were evaluated quite badly, with Spain having 33% of not sufficient and 44% only sufficient results of accommodation level.

**Participants' comments:**


"The participants enjoyed a lot the hotel even if it did not provide them enough keys for all of them; besides they mentioned that the service and the meeting room were excellent." (Turk)

"Technical problems of projector in meeting room disturbed start of the meeting: stressing and enervating" (Spain)

"Expensive" (Sweden)

6. Question: **How do you evaluate some aspects/activities of the meeting?**  
**(Cultural activities)**

**Evaluation of the cultural activities**



<b>Country:</b>	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Sufficient</u>	<u>Not sufficient</u>
FRANCE	27% (3)	-	73% (8)	18% (2)
SPAIN	-	50% (4)	25% (2)	25% (2)
GERMANY	33% (4)	42% (5)	17% (2)	8% (1)
POLAND	-	42% (5)	50% (6)	8% (1)
SWEDEN	13% (2)	40% (6)	27% (4)	20% (3)
TURKEY	82% (14)	18% (3)	-	-

**Comment:** From the graph, it is clear that participants evaluated cultural activities in Turkish meeting as the best - 82% of respondents marked it as "excellent". Germany, Poland and

Sweden were evaluated as good too, in case of Germany 33% marked their cultural activities as excellent. 73% of the respondents marked the French cultural activities as "sufficient" only, while there were some unsatisfied respondents in Spanish (25%) and Swedish (20%) meetings.

**Participants' comments:**

"The majority of the participants enjoyed the cultural activities especially the military music band."  
(Turkey)


"This trip helped discover a new country and experience a new culture. After the meeting, we could do different activities." (Poland)

## **Interactive lessons**

The questions asked in this part of the report are focused on the presentations of different partners which took part in various meetings in different countries. The list of the countries in which these interactive lessons took place included:

- 1.) France
- 2.) Spain
- 3.) Poland
- 4.) Sweden
- 5.) Germany
- 6.) Turkey

7.Question: **In France, all partners presented their organizations. AgoraVox gave a longer presentation of their objectives and activities. Did you find this presentation?**



<b>Presentation:</b>	<u>Very interesting</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Instructive</u>	<u>Not so relevant</u>
PARTNER PRESENTATIONS	36% (4)	64% (7)	-	-
AGORAVOX	56% (5)	44% (4)	-	-


**Comment:** As we can see from the graph of French meeting, the partner presentations by all partners in the first meeting of the project were evaluated mostly as "good" and secondly as "very interesting". The AgoraVox presentation was a little bit more successful as majority of participants marked it as a "very interesting" and after that "good". There were no complains at all.

**Participants' comments:**

"Perfect".

"Interesting as acquaintance with the partners"

8.Question: **At French meeting, the partnership decided to use Adobe Connect and Pinterest presented by Manuella and Daniel. Do you find this choice:**




	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Appropriate</i>	<i>Not appropriate</i>
ADOBE CONNECT	46% (5)	27% (3)	27% (3)	-
PINTEREST	82% (9)	9% (1)	9% (1)	-

**Comment:** The majority of respondents rated the use of Adobe Connect as very good (46%) whereas in the case of Pinterest 82% rated it as "very good".

**Participants comments:**

- "I personally prefer Hangouts as it is free"
- "Very nicely done. The tools are very helpfull"
- "Very important tools for the rest of the project work"

9.Question: **At Spanish meeting, Daniel Weiss presented his interactive lesson: Use of specific social media Pinterest and Vimeo as repository/website. How do you evaluate this lesson?**




	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Appropriate</i>	<i>Not appropriate</i>
PINTEREST	11% (1)	67% (6)	11% (1)	11% (1)
VIMEO	11% (1)	67% (6)	11% (1)	11% (1)

**Comment:** As we can see from the graph the results are the same. In both cases the majority of respondents ranked this lesson as "good" (67%) and practically rated both Pinterest and Vimeo at the same level.

**Participants comments:**

"Very poor information or instruction : only visit at the Pinterest aurora site with no updated information"

10.Question: **Manuella Borghs presented during a webinar session (in Spain) an interactive lesson "Competencies in training/teaching adults in a Lifelong Learning perspective". How do you evaluate this presentation?**



Country	<i>Very good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Appropriate</i>	<i>Not appropriate</i>
SPAIN	22% (2)	67% (6)	11% (1)	-

**Comment:** Most of the respondents rated this presentation as good (67%), with only one participant rating it as only appropriate.

**Participants comments:**

"Hard to evaluate the webinar and difficult to follow because of the messy environment and technical problems"


"The only problem was that it was difficult to follow with the noise around"

"Unfortunately there were sometimes problems with the connection and we did not always hear everything Manuella said"

"Some technical problems (audio) during the webinar session but globally interesting case study"



11.Question: **Willy Aerts presented the COMPETENT online tool of SERV - Flanders for matching individual competences in occupational settings. How do you evaluate this presentation? (Presented at Spanish meeting)**



Country	<u>Very good</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Appropriate</u>	<u>Not appropriate</u>
SPAIN	33% (3)	56% (5)	11% (1)	-


**Comment:** Most of the participants evaluated this presentation as "good" ( 56%) or "very good" (33%).

**Participants comments:**

"For me to get to know the COMPETENT online tool was really interesting and a good example for the work of our organization"

"Example of good practice in competences management"

12.Question: **In Spain, Daniel Weiss presented an interactive lesson base on experience from Leonardo TOI: "What evaluators evaluate" adapted at the new Erazmus+ program. How do you evaluate this presentation?**



Country	<u>Very good</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Appropriate</u>	<u>Not appropriate</u>
SPAIN	33% (3)	44% (4)	-	22% (2)

**Comment:** According to the above graph, most of the participants rated this presentation positively. Only 22% of them has marked it as "not appropriate".

**Participants comments:**


"Very clear!"

"I expected the presentation to be more focused on "what evaluators evaluate" from the application for a project until the final report and not only on how to apply in the Erasmus+ programme"

"Poo information on the issue "evaluation". Mainly general information (user guide) downloaded from EU website. Rather confused presentation of the subject."

13. Question: **AgoraVox Team prepared presentation focused on “Dissemination & promotion via social networks & online magazines”. How do you evaluate this presentation?**

**Evaluation of AgoraVox presentation**



Country:	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Appropriate</i>	<i>Not appropriate</i>
POLAND	83% (10)	17% (2)	-	-

**Comment:** The presentation by AgoraVox (French partner) was evaluated as "Excellent" by vast majority, or 83%, thus implying that it was a very successful presentation.


**Participants’ comments:**

"This presentation allowed of discovered new online magazines. I think this presentation is very important because now we need to be present in the web and to have a lot of knowledge in this new technology because everyone use this technology to promote a product or others things"

“The presentation was really good and interactive.”

14. Question: **FOSTER Foundation, Malta gave a presentation of their objectives and activities. How did you find this presentation?**

**Evaluation of Foster presentation in Poland**



Country:	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Sufficient</u>	<u>Not sufficient</u>
POLAND	25% (3)	50% (6)	17% (2)	8% (1)

**Comment:** The overall results are good - 50% of respondents marked presentation as "good" and 25% as "excellent". However 17% has evaluated the presentation as only "sufficient" and 8% even as not sufficient.


**Participants' comments:**

"This presentation allowed of discovered the country and culture of Malta. And we could see the different project company"

"Very clear presentation."

15. Question: **Stefano Moroncelli from Core Sp Zo.o, did a presentation divided in two parts based on: “European Funds for Sme”. How do you evaluate this presentation?**

**Evaluation of Core Sp Zo.o presentation in Poland**



<b>Country:</b>	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Appropriate</u>	<u>Not appropriate</u>
POLAND	17% (2)	33% (4)	42% (5)	8% (1)

**Comment:** The presentation by the partner from Poland Core Sp Zo.o was considered as rather average - most people marked it as "appropriate" or "good". Some participants evaluated it as "excellent" or "not appropriate".

**Participants’ comments:**


"The use of an online quiz on funding opportunities was a very good choice and it created a lot of interest and competition. However, the presentation itself was too long at some points and a little boring, otherwise. "

"It was a little bit confusing that there were many presentations and sometimes it was jumping from one to another, which was sometimes hard to follow."

"It was a used presentation with lots of Italian in it. It's not such a big deal, however, to translate some of that stuff before. I had the feeling he didn't prepare at all for his presentation but he just took some slides from other presentations. The topic was interesting, though."

16. Question: **How do you evaluate the presentation by Swedish Partner on the forthcoming meeting in Skovde Sweden?**

**Evaluation of presentation of Swedish partner**



Country:	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Appropriate</i>	<i>Not appropriate</i>
POLAND	58% (7)	33% (4)	8% (1)	-


**Comment:** 91% of the participants were satisfied with the presentation of Swedish partner. More than of them rated it as "excellent" the rest as "good" or "appropriate" (8%).

**Participants' comments:**

"Very helpful presentation by the Swedes. "

"They showed the different points and purposes of the meeting"

17.Question: In Sweden, Sabina Blomgren, Europe Direct prepared a presentation based on : “Women and immigrants in European projects”. How do you evaluate this presentation?




Country	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Appropriate</u>	<u>Not appropriate</u>
SWEDEN	53% (8)	40% (6)	-	-

**Comment:** According to graph, the Europe Direct presentation in Sweden was rated very well. With 53% of respondents marking it as “excellent” and 40% as “good” it was a really successful presentation with no complains at all.

**Participants comments:**

None

18.Question: **Lena Danielsson, Globulen presented during a Swedish meeting session about “Project Parkstugan, Globulen and BIIA”. How do you evaluate this presentation?**



Country	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Appropriate</u>	<u>Not appropriate</u>
SWEDEN	33% (5)	67% (10)	-	-

**Comment:** The results of Globulen presentation are similiar to the previous one, but with 67% of respondents rating it as “good” and 33% as “excellent”. There were no complains neither.

**Participants comments:**

"I'm a part of that project and I find the presentation very educational and well done."



19.Question: **Carola Dierich, Wisamar Germany** presented an interactive lesson based on: “Future prospects for job seekers”. How do you evaluate this presentation? (Swedish meeting)




Country	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Appropriate</u>	<u>Not appropriate</u>
SWEDEN	73% (11)	27% (4)	-	-

**Comment:** The results are again very positive with 73% of participants marking it as “excellent” and rest as “good”. Yet again no complains about this presentation.

**Participants comments:**

"Very good."

20.Question: **Partners Sven-Olof Lundin, consultant & Millan, Globulen presented their project: “EQAVET, systematic quality assurance” at Swedish meeting. They gave a long presentation. How do you evaluate this presentation?**




Country	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Appropriate</u>	<u>Not appropriate</u>
SWEDEN	40% (6)	40% (6)	13% (2)	7%(1)

**Comment:** 80% of participants evaluated EQAVET presentation positively (40% as excellent and 40% as good), 13% only as appropriate and 1 participant has marked it as not appropriate.

**Participants comments:**

"Long. Understood it only because of the discussion in group after. "

21.Question: **Partners Sven-Olof Lundin, consultant & Millan, Globulen presented their project: “EQAVET, systematic quality assurance” at Swedish meeting. How do you evaluate this project?**




Country	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Appropriate</i>	<i>Not appropriate</i>
SWEDEN	27% (4)	60% (9)	-	13%(2)

**Comment:** Again majority of the participants were satisfied with the project (87% from which 60% marked the project as good and 27% as excellent). But on the other hand there were few participants who did not like it at all and rated it as not appropriate (13%).

**Participants comments:**

"Had some interesting inputs."

22.Question: **Partners Sven-Olof Lundin, consultant & Millan, Globulen presented their workshop named “What does this mean for Aurora”. How do you evaluate this workshop?**



<b>Country</b>	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Appropriate</u>	<u>Not appropriate</u>
SWEDEN	20% (3)	47% (7)	27% (4)	7%(1)


**Comment:** The EQAVET workshop results were similar to the EQAVET project and presentation. It can be considered successful - with 47% rated it as “good”, 27% as “excellent” and 20% as “appropriate”. At least 7% of participants marked it as “not appropriate”.

**Participants comments:**

None

23. Question: **Michael Debono and Duncan Dimech obo Foster Foundation, Malta, presented an interactive lesson based on: “Youth Unemployment in Europe – The Youth Guarantee”**. How do you evaluate this presentation?

**Evaluation of Foster presentation in Germany**



Country:	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Appropriate</i>	<i>Not appropriate</i>
GERMANY	58% (7)	42% (5)	-	-


**Comment:** The presentation on Youth Gurantee by FOSTER Foundation (Malta) went well. All participants rated this presentation on Youth Unemployment Issues as excellent or good.

**Participants’ comments:**

None

24. Question: **Core sp zoo, Poland, presented an interactive lesson based on: “Cosme and Operational programme”. How do you evaluate this presentation?**

**Evaluation of Core Sp Zo.o presentation in Germany**



<b>Country:</b>	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Appropriate</u>	<u>Not appropriate</u>
GERMANY	33% (4)	42% (5)	17% (2)	8% (1)


**Comment:** Most of the participants rated the presentation by the Polish Partner on Cosme and Operational Programme as "good" or "excellent". On the other hand there were 25% of respondents who rated it only as "appropriate" or "not appropriate". But in general it was a successful presentation given the fact that the presentation on Cosme and operational programme of Poland was deemed appropriate by 75% of participants.

**Participants’ comments:**

None

28. Question: **Martin Clewe, Wisamar Germany, presented an interactive lesson based on: “Mobility – Erasmus + KAI”. How do you evaluate this presentation?**

**Evaluation of Wisamar presentation "Mobility -Erasmus+KAI"**



<b>Country:</b>	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Appropriate</u>	<u>Not appropriate</u>
GERMANY	58% (7)	42% (5)	-	-

**Comment:** All participants rated the Wisamar presentation on Mobility issues as excellent or good.

**Participants' comments:**

None

29.Question: **A Study Visit was organised by Wisamar at a Vocational Training Centre (ZAW) in Leipzig. How do you rate this visit?**

**Evaluation of Wisamar study visit**



Country:	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Sufficient</u>	<u>Not sufficient</u>
GERMANY	67% (8)	33% (4)	-	-


**Comment:** The field visit to ZAW was found to be an excellent visit by 67% of the participants. The others rated it as good.

**Participants comments:**

None



25.Question: **At Turkish meeting, Dr. Semih Ozden prepared a presentation based on: “Entrepreneurship in the academical field”. How do you evaluate this presentation?**




Country	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Sufficient</u>	<u>Not sufficient</u>
TURKEY	35% (6)	41% (7)	18% (3)	6% (1)

**Comment:** The presentation was rated as successful with 76% satisfied respondents, 18% rating it as sufficient and only 6% rating it as not sufficient.

**Participants comments:**

"The participants appreciated this presentation; they thought it was a very interesting topic, relevant to project aims even if there was too much text on the slides."

26.Question: **In Turkey, Bahar Erkan prepared a presentation based on : « EU network employment on youth, EU Platform against social exclusion ». How do you evaluate this presentation?**




<b>Country</b>	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Sufficient</i>	<i>Not sufficient</i>
TURKEY	35% (6)	47% (8)	18% (3)	-

**Comment:** As we can see from the graph above, it is clear that the most of the participants were satisfied with Bahar Ergan's presentation - with 47% of participants rating it as good and 35% as excellent.

**Participants comments:**

"The participants appreciated this presentation; even it was a little long, they thought it was an interesting presentation matching with the aims of the project."

27.Question: **Willy Aerts prepared a presentation and a summary of Aurora Project to the people of Technology Faculty and Ostim Voc. High School of Gazi University, based on: « What we have done so far in the project? ». How do you evaluate this presentation? (Turkish meeting)**




<b>Country</b>	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Sufficient</u>	<u>Not sufficient</u>
TURKEY	47% (8)	35% (6)	18% (3)	-

**Comment:** Another succesful presentation at the Turkish meeting. 47% rated it as “excellent” and 35% as “good”, with only 18% rated it as only "sufficient". There were no complaints at all.

**Participants comments:**

"The participants appreciated this presentation even if there was too much text on the slides. They thought it was a very interesting topic."

28.Question: **How do you evaluate the collaborative session held on the preparation of the Final Report for the project? (Turkish meeting)**



<b>Country</b>	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Sufficient</u>	<u>Not sufficient</u>
TURKEY	41% (7)	47% (8)	12% (2)	-

**Comment:** A very similiar result as the previous evaluation. 88% of participants were satisfied with the collaborative session with 41% marked it as “excellent” and 47% as “good”.

**Participants comments:**


None

## **Project progress and webinars**

This part of the report is focused on questions about project progress and webinars. The questions posed on these subjects related to:

- a. Identification of problems
- b. Identification of solutions to such problems
- c. Tools to be used for the purpose of implementing the project
- d. Discussions on the organisation of webinars

29.Question: **During this meeting in Poland, discussions were held on the current partnership situation, problems being faced and possible solutions for the future of the project. How do you evaluate this session:**



Country:	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Appropriate</u>	<u>Not appropriate</u>
POLAND	25% (3)	33% (4)	33% (4)	8% (1)


**Comment:** This session dealing with the identification of problems which the project was facing was evaluated as good. 58% of the participants rated it positively (with 33% rating it as good and 25% as excellent), 33% as appropriate and only 1 participant (8%) as not appropriate.

**Participants comments:**

"Meeting was very chaotic."

"We need every time talk about the problem and solution that we could put in place to improve the partnership."

30.Question: **During Polish meeting discussions were held on the current partnership situation, problems being faced and possible solutions for the future of the project. How do you evaluate this session:**



Country	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Appropriate</u>	<u>Not appropriate</u>
POLAND	17% (2)	25% (3)	50% (6)	8% (1)


**Comment:** Half of the respondents marked the session on the identification of problems faced by the project as only appropriate. Only 25% as good and 17% as excellent, while one respondent has rated it as not appropriate. Overall respondents showed a low level of satisfaction with the outcome of this particular session.

**Participants comments:**

"Some of the partners came up with proposed solutions to the chaotic meeting. "

"We need to talk about solutions because someone can disagree with this solution or to have another view point."

31.Question: **Additionally the situation with regards to the planning and holding of webinars were discussed in Polish meeting. How do you evaluate the progress made in respect of:**



Country	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Appropriate</u>	<u>Not appropriate</u>
POLAND	33% (4)	33% (4)	25% (3)	8% (1)

**Comment:** As we can see from the above graph, the majority of respondents rated the progress as either excellent or good , while the 25% has marked the progress as appropriate. However there was one respondent who has rated the progress as not appropriate.


**Participants comments:**

"The choice of Adobe connect seems to have been a good choice."

"Equipment is in line with the resources available to disposition."



32.Question: **The progress of the AURORA project was one of the aims of the Swedish meeting. How do you evaluate the discussions on this issue?**




<b>Country</b>	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Sufficient</u>	<u>Not sufficient</u>
SWEDEN	40% (6)	33% (5)	20% (3)	7% (1)

**Comment:** The discussion was evaluated as quite successful - with 40% rating it as “excellent” and 33% as “good”. Only one respondent rated it as “not sufficient”.

**Participants comments:**

None

33.Question: **The revision of the AURORA project was the main goal of the French meeting. How do you evaluate the discussion on this issue?**



	<i>Very effective</i>	<i>Effective</i>	<i>Clarifying</i>	<i>Useful</i>	<i>Not clear</i>
Change of date and venue meetings	55% (6)	27% (3)	18% (2)	-	-
Objectives and outcomes project	27% (3)	46% (5)	27% (3)	-	-
Distribution of the tasks	27% (3)	27% (3)	46% (5)	-	-
Planning and timing project work	27% (3)	46% (5)	27% (3)	-	-

**Comment:** The majority of the participants rated the discussion of change of date and venue meetings as very effective (more than a half of them) or effective. The discussion of objectives and outcomes of the project were rated mainly as "effective" (by 46% of respondents). The discussion about the planning and timing project work obtained the same results as the previous ones, with 46% of participants rating it at "effective". On the other

hand the discussion on the distribution of the tasks was rated as average - with 46% marking it as only "clarifying".


**Participants comments:**

"Good partnership. I hope the Turkish partners will catch up"

"A lot of questions were solved"

34.Question: **The progress of the AURORA project was one of the aims of this meeting. How do you evaluate the discussions on this issue, in terms of distribution of tasks?**

**Evaluation of distribution of tasks**



<b>Country:</b>	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Sufficient</i>	<i>Not sufficient</i>
FRANCE	27% (3)	27% (3)	46% (5)	-
SPAIN	-	-	-	-
GERMANY	17% (2)	25% (3)	42% (5)	17% (2)
POLAND	17% (2)	25% (3)	33% (4)	25% (3)
SWEDEN	47% (7)	53% (8)	-	-
TURKEY	35% (6)	65% (11)	-	-

**Comments:** The discussions on this issue did not take a place in Spanish meeting. In Sweden and Turkey respondents evaluated this discussion as "excellent" or "good", on the other hand, in some the other countries it was mainly marked as "sufficient". At the Polish and German meetings, some of the respondents marked the discussion as "not sufficient". This shows that the project partners overall did not manage to be able to have very fruitful discussions about this important topic in various meetings.


**Participants' comments:**

"All partners that were present for this meeting showed a willingness to share the tasks to ensure the ultimate success of the project that seemed on the verge of collapse." (Poland)

"Distribution of tasks was also deemed sufficient and this links to the fact that there was a somewhat lukewarm participation by a sizeable portion of participants." (Germany)

35. Question: **The progress of the AURORA project was one of the aims of the meetings. How do you evaluate the discussions on this issue, in terms of planning and timing of project work?**

**Evaluation of discussion on planning and timing project work**



<b>Country:</b>	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Sufficient</i>	<i>Not sufficient</i>
FRANCE	27% (3)	46% (5)	27% (3)	-
SPAIN	-	-	-	-
GERMANY	17% (2)	42% (5)	42% (5)	-
POLAND	17% (2)	42% (5)	33% (4)	8% (1)
SWEDEN	27% (4)	73% (11)	-	-
TURKEY	41% (7)	47% (8)	12% (2)	-

**Comments:** The overall evaluation of the discussion about this topic was very good. The meeting in Sweden was the most effective in this regard. Only in the German, Polish and French meetings were there some participants, who marked it as "sufficient",

**Participants' comments:**


"The planning and timing was respected during the meeting." (Poland)

"The whole project got very clear. And by the end we all knew what we were supposed to do (France)

"On the other hand the planning and timing of work was satisfactorily received by participants. " (Germany

36.Question: **Additionally the situation with regards to the planning and holding of webinars were discussed. How do you evaluate the progress made in respect of planning next webinars?**

### Evaluation of Planning next Webinars



<b>Country:</b>	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Sufficient</u>	<u>Not sufficient</u>
FRANCE	-	-	-	-
SPAIN	-	-	-	-
GERMANY	17% (2)	25% (3)	50% (5)	8% (1)
POLAND	17% (2)	50% (6)	33% (4)	-
SWEDEN	33% (5)	53% (8)	7% (1)	-
TURKEY	-	-	-	-

**Comment:** Discussion about planning next webinars took place only in Germany, Poland and Turkey. Whereas the Poland and Sweden meetings did quite well according to the graph, the discussion about the next webinar in Germany was marked only as a "sufficient" by 50% of respondents outlining the lack of agreement on the subject that occurred during that meeting.


**Participants' comments:**

"We had different dates of upcoming meetings and activities and the issues to be studied"  
(Poland)

"We were able to find dates and topics for two more webinars." (Sweden)

37.Question: **During this meeting discussions were held on the current partnership situation, problems being faced and possible solutions for the future of the project. How do you evaluate this session:**

**Evaluation of General progress**



<b>Country:</b>	<i><u>Excellent</u></i>	<i><u>Good</u></i>	<i><u>Sufficient</u></i>	<i><u>Not sufficient</u></i>
FRANCE	-	-	-	-
SPAIN	-	-	-	-
GERMANY	8% (1)	42% (5)	50% (6)	-
POLAND	8% (1)	50% (6)	33% (4)	-
SWEDEN	27% (4)	67% (10)	7% (1)	-
TURKEY	-	-	-	-


**Comment:** This question was posed only after three meetings held in Germany, Poland and Sweden, with the participants in the Sweden meeting rating the project most highly in this regard. This question was not posed after the first two meetings and was excluded for obvious reasons in the last one in Turkey. Most of the participants have evaluated this discussion as "good" or "sufficient". Therefore the results are average.

**Participants' comments:**

"Partners decided to share the tasks better and therefore at the end of the day this discussion proved helpful to all." (Poland)

38.Question: **Was the meeting effective for team building purposes?**

**Evaluation of meetings affectivity**



<b>Country:</b>	<i><u>Yes, a lot</u></i>	<i><u>Yes, somewhat</u></i>	<i><u>Not Much</u></i>	<i><u>Not at all</u></i>
FRANCE	-	-	-	-
SPAIN	-	-	-	-
GERMANY	50% (6)	33% (4)	17% (2)	-
POLAND	17% (2)	50% (6)	8% (1)	25% (3)
SWEDEN	67% (10)	33% (5)	-	-
TURKEY	-	-	-	-


**Comment:** The results for this question were positive. It was only at the Polish meeting that a few participants answered that the meeting was not effective at all (25%).

**Participants' comments:**

"Without 3 partners that were creating problems we worked well. " (Sweden)

"Meetings allow the exchange of ideas, views, discover a new culture and expand the skills of each." (Poland)

39.Question: **Was the meeting also effective for team building for the partnership?**



<b>Country:</b>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
FRANCE	100% (11)	-
SPAIN	100% (9)	-

**Comment:** The same question was posed in respect of the French and Spanish meetings, but the answers could be only "yes" or "no". From both countries all the participants answered as yes - that the meetings were also good for building partnerships.

**Participants' comments:**

" Yes. We got chance to meet a lot of very interesting people and organisations" (France)

"Good team spirit also when we missed the boat!" (France)

"Next time we can go with the Turkish to watch the match" (Spain)

" The large TR delegation didn't participated much at the meeting activities, most of them leaved. Not exactly stimulating teambuilding..."



## **OTHER COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS**

### **Other comments and suggestions from Swedish meeting:**

#### **Comments**

Workshops I groups are important as well as 'mingel' workshops are interesting.

- keep working hard all

#### **Suggestions**

More of both.

more communication less travel time

team bring it

Overall the meeting was productive in terms of networking, planning, team building and information presented. The location selected for the meeting was somewhat not easily accessible however, hosts were very helpful to accommodate participants in terms of travelling and transport arrangements.

### **Other comments and suggestions from Polish meeting:**

Don't end the program earlier than indicated. Use the time maybe for team-building. It would be nice for all participants if every partner really includes himself in the project and not only some.

More information about the geography of Warsaw would have been better. The cultural element was lacking overall.

### **Other comments and suggestions from German meeting:**

The cultural aspect was neglected. Otherwise organization was great.

ZAW was a revelation.

that we do not act as a team and facilitate for each other, many tasks were given to Wisamar without any other suggestions.

During the Leipzig trip we would like to thank to Wisamar for their guidance.

Some partners they were not very active , others didn't do nothing all the project time-line .what a shame.

My first time with this project. I didn't understand who is the coordinator of this project and why in every project Turkish partners are not very cooperative.

### **Other suggestions:**

We need more information to evaluate the state of preparedness of partner for next meeting, as we did not get good feedback during the meeting.

Program meeting Ankara.

Make a good meeting for future contacts.

### **German meeting Conclusion**

From an evaluation viewpoint it is clear the meeting held in Leipzig went very well from the planning, organisation and presentation aspects though one must highlight that participants made pointers towards improvements in the cultural sphere and also in the involvement of participants in the meeting and this in fact was only mitigated by the hands on approach taken by the German organisers.

### **Other comments and suggestions from Spanish meeting:**

I would prefer it, if the meeting room would not be as expensive as during the meetings in France and Spain and if coffee breaks would be organized.

Let's hope Core would be a better host in Warsaw...

### **Other comments and suggestions from French meeting:**

More workshops about possibilities for cooperation and using the new programme

Continue in the same way

Good start of the project work

More discussions in smaller groups

There should be no charge for the meeting room

The communication should sometimes be a little clearer. If anyone does not understand what the discussion is about nor has problems to follow the conversation in English, they should mention that not to be confused on the last day of the meeting

Stimulate each partner to prepare all activities

More free activities

## Concluding Remarks by Evaluator

In conclusion one can draw the following inferences from our evaluation of the meetings held in six different countries as part of the Aurora project:

- With regards to the preparation for meetings respondents rated communication on same very highly followed by travel and lastly the programme, however the respondents were by and large positive on matters relating to preparation of meetings by respective partners.
- With regards to questions relating to activities or actions occurring as part of the meetings, respondents rated meals highly followed by the cultural aspects of the programme, however it is clear that accommodation was much less positively received. On the other hand study and other visits were largely highly satisfactory for those attending.
- When questioned about the effectiveness of discussions on the general progress of the project and planning and timing respondents rated such as largely “good” but not excellent, however, with regards to planning of webinars this was clearly a point of contention and many opted to rate it only as “sufficient”. Meeting effectiveness clearly varied from one to another, but the Sweden meeting did very well in this score.
- Presentations on various subjects were rated differently however were largely more satisfactorily rated than partner presentations on themselves, which tended to be somewhat boring.
- Questions relating to the progress of the project meetings on the topic “Identification of problems” got 58% as “good” or better, however when it came to the partners finding solutions only a minority of 42% thought that this was successful.
- With respect to tools to be used these presentations were positively received though in many cases did not lead to consensus amongst partners as to which tools were better than others.
- The session on the preparation of the final report was really well received with 88% very satisfied.
- In general one can say that some meetings such as those in Turkey and Sweden went very well, others like the one in Germany and also Poland were a little bit turbulent due to the uncertainties surrounding the project at the time. However, it is clear that after surpassing the initial problems things improved during such meetings.

