Final Project Evaluation

The general project evaluation focuses on the following performance indicators

Evaluation scale
1 = *unsatisfactory* - major weaknesses
2 = *fair* - some important weaknesses
3 = *good* - strengths outweigh weaknesses
4 = *very good* - major strengths

Background information	
My name	
My organisation	
My position in the project team	
Date of filling out this evaluation questionnaire	

1. The quality of the initial project plan	1	2	3	4	
1.1 The plan answers a need in European Adult Education	poor	fair	good	very good	Don't know
The project addresses a relevant issue and clear need on a European level					
The target groups and end users are clearly identified					
The project results adequately address the needs of the target groups					
1.2 Quality of the consortium	poor	fair	good	very good	Don't know
The consortium is multilateral composed of organisations with different expert competences that can contribute to an innovative and high quality outcome					
The consortium possesses the skills and competences required to carry out all aspects of the work programme					
The project plan and work programme is known and accepted by all partners					
There is an appropriate distribution of tasks across the partners taking into account their complementary competences					
1.3 Quality of objectives and results	poor	fair	good	very good	Don't know
The project plan contains clear aims and concrete objectives					
The objectives are realistic and appropriate					
The planned results correspond to the presented objectives					
The monitoring process contains plan for revisions of results according to critical responses (ongoing need analysis) from main target groups					
1.4 Quality of the work programme	poor	fair	good	very good	Don't know
The work programme contains a clear distribution of responsibility of tasks in the consortium with different lead partners for each work packages					
The division of tasks and responsibilities corresponds to the complementary competences of the partner organisations					
The tasks are distributed in such a way that the results can be achieved on time and to budget.					
Appropriate outputs and milestones to allow project progress to be monitored					
1.5 The innovative character	poor	fair	good	very good	Don't know
The project will provide innovative solutions to clearly identified needs for clearly identified target groups					
It will achieve this by developing a brand new solution not yet available					
Clear description of how the project offers something new to the main target groups and end users					
Clear use of the different expertise in the consortium to provide the innovative solutions					

1.6 European added value	poor	fair	good	very good	Don't know
The benefits of and need for European cooperation (as opposed to national, regional or local approaches) are clearly demonstrated					
Clear demonstration of visible benefits accruing from the collaboration of organisations across national and sectoral borders					
Linguistic and intercultural issues have been appropriately addressed					
1.7 Quality of the valorisation plan	poor	fair	good	very good	Don't know
The planned valorisation activities will ensure optimal use of the results beyond the partnership circle during the lifetime of the project					
The valorisation plan ensures consultation and involvement of end users during the progress of the project					
The exploitation plan includes measures to ensure that the benefits will endure beyond the life of the project and assures sustainability of project results					
1.8 The planned impact	poor	fair	good	very good	Don't know
The foreseeable impact on the target groups and their future praxis is clearly defined					
The foreseeable impact of the project on the target groups and sectors concerned is significant					
Measures are in place to ensure that the impact can be achieved					
1.9 The cost-benefit ratio	poor	fair	good	very good	Don't know
The grant application demonstrates value for money in terms of the activities planned and the budget foreseen					
There is a consistency between work programme and budget; all aspects of the budget are clearly related to justified activities in the work programme					
The application demonstrates overall value for money by an efficient and effective use of resources to implement the project results					

Possible comments to the quality of the initial project plan

Mention 1-3 points of weaknesses:

Mention 1-3 points of strengths:

Mention 1-3 points that can improve the project plan and work programme!

2. Quality of the project implementation	1	2	3	4	
2.1 Structure of the project	poor	fair	good	very good	Don't know
Did the project plan prove to have a clear rationale and clarity of objectives					
Clear division of tasks between the partners					
Did the work programme prove to have a appropriate and realistic timescale					
What degree of relevance did the activities had for fulfilling the objectives?					
2.2 Innovation and variety of approach	poor	fair	good	very good	Don't know
Evidence of a varied range of approaches by all partners within the project					
Evidence of a use of innovative methodologies during the project					
Evidence of an effective use of new technologies during the project					
The partners' opportunity to input own expertise and learn from each other					
2.3 Implementation of the workplan	poor	fair	good	very good	Don't know
Were all activities the right ones in the light of the envisaged goals?					
The degree of adherence to the workplan by all partners					
Were all the results (deliverables) provided as planned?					
Deviations from workplan are based on well-considered reasons and mutual agreement					
2.4 Quality of project materials/ products	poor	fair	good	very good	Don't know
All the products promised in the project plan exist					
The products are useful in a European LLL - context					
The products are sustainable					
Are you happy with the quality of the products of the partnership?					
2.5 Quality of the dissemination process	poor	fair	good	very good	Don't know
A clear dissemination plan describing why, what, to whom, how and when.					
All partners share responsibility for and are equally involved in the dissemination activities					
The plan provide information on the quality, relevance and effectiveness of the project results and initiatives to key actors					
The dissemination activities had been updated and carried out continuously during the project					

2.6 Quality of the exploitation process	poor	fair	good	very good	Don't know
Clear plan of reaching and convincing the envisaged end users to adopt and apply the results of the project (multiplication)					
Clear plan of transferring the project results to appropriate decision-makers, and other multipliers in national or European systems (mainstreaming)					
The expected impact on end users and multipliers at local and national level					
The expected impact on end users and multipliers at European level					
2.7 Provision of project resources	poor	fair	good	very good	Don't know
How are the sufficiency, range and suitability of project resources					
How are the sharing of resources/expertise amongst the partners					
The extent to which ICT-technology and other resources are used effectively and innovatively					
A clear link between project workplan and cost-effective use of resources					

Possible comments to the project implementation

Mention 1-3 points of weaknesses:

Mention 1-3 points of strengths:

Mention 1-3 points that can improve the project management and quality assurance!

3. Quality of project management and co-ordination	1	2	3	4	
3.1 Decision making procedure	poor	fair	good	very good	Don't know
Are all relevant topics tabled during the meetings?					
Is all relevant information available in due time?					
Is each partner consulted when important decisions have to be made?					
Are the co-ordinators in the different partner institutions authorised to take decisions?					
3.2 Division of tasks	poor	fair	good	very good	Don't know
The team has a shared and clear understanding of the purpose and expected results					
Each partner is aware of his or her responsibilities and specific tasks?					
The team has to do tasks which need two or more people to work together					
Each team member is respected and acknowledged and may use his/her expertise and special skills					
3.3 Efficiency of timetable	poor	fair	good	very good	Don't know
The team has enough common time to meet (virtual & face to face) to support, discuss, manage, lead solve problems etc.					
There is a clear time table with activities for each partner					
The partners respects the deadlines					
The deviations from the workplan are based on well-considered reasons and mutual agreement					
3.4 Efficiency of communication	poor	fair	good	very good	Don't know
A time schedule for communication between partners and for exchange of material is available.					
The means and frequency of communication are discussed					
The technical communication levels of all partners are taken into account.					
The team has and uses the best possible tools to communicate and has agreed on how to use them					
3.5 Quality of project planning and management	poor	fair	good	very good	Don't know
Clear plans for implementation of work plans and division of work					
Clear planning and administration of budgets					
Clarity of guidelines for the organisation of different aspects of the project					
High responsibility in the team for keeping the deadlines of activities					

3.6 Quality of co-ordination and leadership	poor	fair	good	very good	Don't know
Professional competence for management displayed by project co-ordinator					
Leadership qualities to promote team work and commitment displayed by project co-ordinator					
Acknowledgement of the experience and expertise of all partners by project co-ordinator					
Promotion of teamwork, sharing of experience and expertise					
Possible comments to the project management					

Mention 1-3 points of weaknesses:

Mention 1-3 points of strengths:

Mention 1-3 points that can improve the project management:

4. Quality of the transnational partnership	1	2	3	4	
4.1 The commitment to the project by each partner	poor	fair	good	very good	Don't know
Each partner is prepared to commit time and resources as required in line with the jointly agreed work plan					
Each partner has shown willingness to resolve problems					
The team and its individual members have enough responsibility and power to make their own decisions and use their creativity					
Partners are willing to share their expertise and learn from each other					
4.2 Agreement amongst partners	poor	fair	good	very good	Don't know
Degree of mutual understanding about project rationale, overall aims and short-term / long-term objectives					
The refinement of the work plan during the project show clear evidence of equal sharing of roles and responsibilities amongst partners					
Partners learn with regard to joint group process					
The development amongst partners of a sense of ownership of the project					
4.3 Effective and on-going communication amongst partners	poor	fair	good	very good	Don't know
The range and effectiveness of communications amongst partners.					
The communication with account being taken of any language difficulties					
Partners communicate well in a multi-national context such as meetings					
Partners communicate well in the time between the meetings					
4.4 Trust and attitudes amongst partners	poor	fair	good	very good	Don't know
Team members know that each member will deliver and do what is expected of them					
The team is able to create an open and appreciative space for diverse opinions					
The development of mutual trust throughout the life of the project					
The development of positive attitudes towards transnational activities					
4.5 Management qualities demonstrated by project members	poor	fair	good	very good	Don't know
A clear evidence in the workplan of sharing of roles and responsibilities amongst partners					
Degree of commitment and equitable involvement of all partners					
The degree of adherence to the workplan by all partners					
The quality of relationship with partners and development of teamwork					

4.6 Support within each partner organisation	poor	fair	good	very good	Don't know
Has there been an effective and ongoing support from line management within each partner organisation					
The level of support for individual participants from their own organisation					
Is there sufficient inside information on the situation in the partner institutions in order to appreciate the contributions of the partner?					
Are the project's activities integrated into the development plan of the participating organisations					
4.7 Support from other organisations and external agencies	poor	fair	good	very good	Don't know
Has there been an effective peer support from other organisations outside the consortium					
Has there been an effective support from other organisations involved in similar transnational projects					
Awareness of possibilities for support from external agencies at local/national/ European level					
Awareness of available support from external agencies at local/national/ European level					

Possible comments to the quality of the transnational partnership

Mention 1-3 important weaknesses:

Mention 1-3 important strengths:

Mention 1-3 points that can improve the quality of the transnational partnership!

5. Quality of my own performance and outcome	1	2	3	4	
5.1 Initial knowledge of the project plan and the Grundtvig programme	poor	fair	good	very good	Don't know
My degree of knowledge at the start of the project of its rationale, main objectives, planned deliverables and expected impact					
My degree of knowledge at the start of the project of my organisations role and responsibilities in the work programme					
My degree of knowledge at the start of the project of the conditions and demands of a Grundtvig multilateral project.					
My degree of knowledge at the start of the project of the Guidelines for Administrative and Financial Management and Reporting in this type of project					
5.2 Initial clarification of partner agreements and project procedures	poor	fair	good	very good	Don't know
In the start phase I developed a clear knowledge of the rules of procedure, decision-making and internal communication in the project consortium					
In the start phase I took part in the clarification and adoption of the Partner Agreement with respect to the performance of my and others project work.					
In the start phase I got acquainted with the financial and administrative procedures and communicated this to the line management in my organisation.					
In the start phase I got acquainted with my responsibilities and obligations on monitoring and reporting of my project activities.					
5.3 Keeping the timetable	poor	fair	good	very good	Don't know
Did you respect the deadlines for delivering (sub) products?					
Did you communicate (within the partnership) as planned?					
Did you communicate (within your institution) as planned?					
Have all your activities taken place according to your work plan and timing?					
5.4 Contribution to products and activities	poor	fair	good	very good	Don't know
Did you fulfil the work load according to the work programme?					
Have all your activities taken place according to your time schedule?					
Did you deliver all products you were supposed to deliver?					
Are you happy with the quality of your activities or products?					
5.5 Management qualities demonstrated by project members	poor	fair	good	very good	Don't know
Did you actively seek to fulfil your role and responsibility amongst partners					
Did you proactively try to propose solutions and solve unexpected obstacles and problems in the progress of the project					
Have you regularly informed your organisation of the progress of the project and asked for support from your line management					
Have you attempted to get support from external agencies at local/national/ European level					

5.6 Personal learning as project member	poor	fair	good	very good	Don't know
I have learned about essential topics in my work field through being a partner in this project					
The transnational co-operation offered important input I would never have obtained if I had not been a partner in this project					
The impact of the project on your own professional development?					
The group has evolved during year one. Opinions and visions regarding the project subject have changed					
5.7 Organisational learning as project partner organisation	poor	fair	good	very good	Don't know
I have developed networks to other organisations on a cross-national level					
Are the project's activities integrated into the development plan of the participating organisations					
My organisation gives now higher priority to develop transnational cooperation					
Degree of European added value in your organisation					

Possible comments to the own performance and outcome

Mention 1-3 points of weaknesses:

Mention 1-3 points of strengths:

Mention 1-3 points that can improve your project performance!

6. Quality of the monitoring and evaluation procedures	1	2	3	4	
6.1 The evaluation approach	poor	fair	good	very good	Don't know
Do all project members have a similar understanding of evaluation as an ongoing process that can help to ensure quality outcomes for the project?					
Has an evaluation plan been produced, shared and agreed?					
Is the responsibility for evaluation fully understood across the partnership?					
Does the evaluation plan take into account the type of information that will be needed by the funding body for interim and final reports?					
6.2 Quality of the evaluation plan	poor	fair	good	very good	Don't know
Does the timescale of evaluation fit in with project meetings and reporting schedules?					
Does the timescale of evaluation fit in with project phases and their work packages?					
We have made an evaluation plan indicating that we are going to do evaluations continuously?					
Do we have a budget for evaluative work and is it realistic?					
Does the range of project objectives form the basis for this plan?					
Has a suitable evaluation mode been adopted for each objective?					
Main target groups participate to some extent in the various evaluation procedures and we evaluate different factors that are important for the success of the project.					
6.3 Selection of evaluation tools	poor	fair	good	very good	Don't know
The project team have discussed and implemented existing and adaptable evaluation tools for each objective.					
The project team is up to date with recently developed evaluation methodologies and has been imaginative in the choice of evaluation tools.					
The project team have chosen appropriate evaluation instruments, which can be used to collect evidence from project workers and the progression of the work programme.					
The project team have chosen appropriate evaluation instruments, which can be used to collect evidence from target groups and end users.					
Have new technologies been taken into account as a means of gathering evaluative information?					
6.4 Effectiveness of the process of evaluation	poor	fair	good	very good	Don't know
The quality of the on-going evaluation of the project					
Has the project team developed own evaluation forms or tools to meet the specific evaluation needs of the project objectives?					
Has the use of questionnaires and interviews in the survey of the first phase clarified the needs of the target groups?					
Has the use of questionnaires and interviews in the survey of the first phase clarified the tasks of the succeeding work programme?					

	poor	fair	good	very good	Don't know
Has the use of group reviews and questionnaires in the partner meetings clarified the tasks of the succeeding work programme?					
Has the phase with testing of the pilot tools provided new knowledge and guidance for the development of the final tools?					
Have the group and plenum evaluations at the pilot courses clarified the needs of the target groups and a sustainable valorisation of the project					
Have the questionnaires for the participants at the pilot courses clarified the needs of the target groups and a refinement of the online tools?					
Have the series of interviews after the pilot course with representative participants clarified the tasks of the succeeding work programme?					
Have the national conference activities included evaluation of the responses from the participants and other target groups?					
Have the valorisation activities included evaluation of the responses from the target groups in relation to a sustainable exploitation of the project results?					
The quality of the plan for the evaluation of the impact of the project					
6.5 Effectiveness of the process of monitoring	poor	fair	good	very good	Don't know
The quality of the on-going monitoring by the project members of the progress of their own project tasks?					
Have the project members in general documented and commented on their tasks of each work package, when the planned results were delivered?					
The quality of the on-going monitoring of the project progress by the project coordinator?					
Has the project coordinator contacted the responsible partner/person at least a week before the starting date of the planned task to get a confirmation that the partner was ready to fulfil the task?					
Has the project coordinator been in contact with the responsible partner at the time of deadline to check, if the results were delivered at time and with the agreed quality?					
Have the phase evaluations at the partner meetings allowed reviews and adjustments of the different parts of the succeeding project work.					
The quality of the monitoring procedure for the impact of the project?					
6.6 Effectiveness of the quality assurance	poor	fair	good	very good	Don't know
Has the Steering Committee (i.e. the administrator and the coordinator) secured the needed quality assurance of the project?					
Has the project consortium in general been aware of deviations from the operational objectives and succeeded to implement contingency plans when needed.					
Have deviations from the workplan and time schedule been based on well-considered reasons and mutual agreement?					
Did the project team discus the missing tasks of the German partner and the possible consequences in time.					
Did the project team try to implement contingency plans in time, when the German partner withdraws?					
Did the project team learn from the critique of EACEA of the progress report and thereafter improve the task of monitoring and evaluation?					

Possible comments to the monitoring and evaluation procedures
Mention 1-3 points of weaknesses:
Mention 1-3 points of strengths:
Mention 1-3 points that can improve the monitoring and evaluation procedures: