

## **EU-Project TRAIN**

### **5th Partner Meeting and Final Conference**

**Venue: Andreas Hermes Akademie, Bonn, Germany**

**31st of August – 3rd of September 2008**

### **A MEETING EVALUATION**

#### **1 What were your expectations of this meeting?**

*Answers of the group*

- Final preparations for the conference - Clarify any outstanding work to be done by Ireland + other partners - Agree any deadlines left for the project
- Preparing the final conference - Identifying the tasks to finalise/achieve the project
- Exchange important information and suggestions about the products of the project, dissemination activities, and unreadable final report
- Good final conference - summing up of results - define last tasks
- To have a successful conference and to discuss all issues related to the final stage of the project

*Answer of the coordinator*

- Finalisation of TRAIN - to discuss and agree upon the final steps and tasks
- 

#### **2 To what extent have these expectations been met?**

*Answers of the group*

- Yes, most outstanding issues are resolved + I am clear on what needs to be done.
- All expectations been met
- To a great extend
- Conference was good, workshop helpful - Meeting was a bit long, we could have done the same in 1 day.
- At very high level

*Answer of the coordinator*

- Fulfilled
-

Please award the following sessions a rating on a 1 to 10 scale where 10 is the highest rating.  
Please also include a short comment if you wish.

### **3 MONDAY Welcome and Introduction: Goals of the meeting – Agenda**

*Comments of the group*

- Tighter time schedule would have been helpful

*Rating*

- Average Rating: 8,8; Rating range between 8 and 10
- 

### **4 MONDAY Short review on the project**

**Final stage – Exchange: news and activities – Consequences for finalisation**

*Rating*

- Average Rating: 8,5; Rating range between 8 and 9
- 

### **5 MONDAY Discussion on the Final Conference: Agenda**

*Rating*

- Average Rating: 8,3; Rating range between 8 and 9
- 

### **6 MONDAY Preparation of the Final Conference:**

**Round table – Poster session – Procedure, tasks and obligations**

*Comment of the group*

- It was clear what obligations and tasks we had.

*Rating*

- Average Rating: 9,2; Rating range between 8 and 10
-

## **7 MONDAY Modules: Common concept and framework – Further tasks and obligations**

*Comments of the group*

- I miss a common framework for the modules. This would have made discussion with Elie easier.

*Rating*

- Average Rating: 8,2; Rating range between 8 and 9
- 

## **8 MONDAY Modules: Financial and administrative aspects**

*Rating*

- Average Rating: 8,0; Rating range between 5 and 9
- 

## **9 MONDAY Preparation and arrangements for the Final Conference**

*Comment of the group*

- It was good to have time to work on workshop.

*Rating*

- Average Rating: 9,3; Rating range between 8 and 10
- 

## **10 TUESDAY Meeting with Peter Strijdonk**

*Comments of the group*

- Short and good

*Rating*

- Average Rating: 9,2; Rating range between 8 and 10
-

**B EVALUATION FINAL CONFERENCE****11 TUESDAY Keynote – Current European policies and trends concerning literacy and basic education**

*Comments of the group*

- Interesting
- Interesting but not focused on professionalisation

*Rating*

- Average Rating: 9,0; Rating range between 7 and 10
- 

**12 TUESDAY TRAIN presentation – results, products and recommendations**

*Comments of the group*

- Good format, but difficult to go into details

*Rating*

- Average Rating: 8,8; Rating range between 8 and 10
- 

**13 TUESDAY Open session: Poster presentation of TRAIN basic modules**

*Comments of the group*

- Very good

*Rating*

- Average Rating: 9,2; Rating range between 8 and 10
- 

**14 TUESDAY Parallel Workshops: Workshop 1:  
Career development, professionalisation and accreditation for literacy and basic skills education practitioners**

*Rating*

- Average Rating: 9,0; Rating range between 8 and 10
-

**15 TUESDAY Parallel Workshops: Workshop 2:**

**Core competencies in literacy tuition**

*Rating*

- Average Rating: 9,3; Rating range between 9 and 10
- 

**16 TUESDAY Parallel Workshops: Workshop 3:**

**Learning challenges for the literacy practitioners**

*Rating*

- Average Rating: 9,5; Rating range between 9 and 10
- 

**17 TUESDAY Summary of workshops and recommendations**

*Comment of the group*

- Interesting results

*Rating*

- Average Rating: 8,7; Rating range between 8 and 10
- 

**18 TUESDAY Comments from experts**

*Comments of the group*

- Disappointing, I didn't feel they added much to the conference theme.
- 9 Nadja very interesting, 7 Fuchs-Brüninghoff

*Rating*

- Average Rating: 8,2; Rating range between 5 and 10
- 

**19 TUESDAY Conclusions – summary and further perspectives**

*Rating*

- Average Rating: 8,2; Rating range between 7 and 10
-

**A MEETING EVALUATION CONTINUED****20 WEDNESDAY Review on the Final Conference****Reflections – Reports by the partners – Tasks and obligations***Rating*

- Average Rating: 8,8; Rating range between 8 and 10
- 

**21 WEDNESDAY Project products I: Compendium and Newsletter****National reports with comparative summaries and findings – Profile of competencies: analysis – Tasks and obligations***Comments of the group*

- Some national reports are not very extensive - could have been more detailed.

*Rating*

- Average Rating: 9,0; Rating range 9 only
- 

**22 WEDNESDAY Project products II: Handbook/manual****Guidelines - Concept of modules - Learning materials for teachers and trainers - Recommendations - Tasks and obligations***Comments of the group*

- Not all modules are complete + I have not received all modules. So I cannot comment on this.
- Same discussion as on Monday

*Rating*

- Average Rating: 8,6; Rating range between 7 and 9
- 

**23 WEDNESDAY Final Report: Procedure – Tasks and obligations***Rating*

- Average Rating: 8,8; Rating range between 8 and 9
-

**24 WEDNESDAY Dissemination and Monitoring:**

**Feedback on dissemination and monitoring reports – Newsletter: Contributions by the partnership – Web site – Tasks and obligations**

*Comment of the group*

- All clear

*Rating*

- Average Rating: 8,8; Rating range between 8 and 9
- 

**25 WEDNESDAY Reflection on the meeting:**

**Evaluation by external evaluator – Feedback within the TRAIN partnership**

*Rating*

- Average Rating: 8,6; Rating range between 8 and 9
- 

**Average Rating of MEETING (questions 3 to 25): 8,8**

---

**26 Which session(s) did you find most useful?**

*Comments of the group*

- Plenary session with representative from the commission
- Project products II - Handbook with materials
- Plenary information, poster session, workshop
- Workshops, because it was the only opportunity to go into some details
- The last day - evaluation of conference

*Answer of the coordinator*

- Monday: Preparation of Final Conference - Final Conference itself - Final Report: Tasks and obligations
- 

**27 Which session(s) did you find least useful?**

*Comment of the group*

- Feedback from the experts
- 

**28 Did you receive adequate information about the meeting before it began?**

*Comments of the group*

- Yes, very well (4 times)
- Yes, information was very useful and sufficient.

*Answer of the coordinator*

- There were some reports and results missing from the partnership.
- 

**29 Please comment on the accommodation and food**

*Comments of the group*

- Food very poor, accommodation was fine (2 times)
- Good and comfortable place, quiet, clean, correct food - Nice musical evening and social event
- ok!
- Very good accommodation, food could be better

*Answer of the coordinator*

- Nice and quiet place, food not very good but ok.
-



## C FINAL REFLECTION ON THE WHOLE PROJECT

### 30 How much did you / your institution profit from the project?

*Comments of the group*

- Unsure as yet until I have seen all modules from partners.
- Although it depends on future implementation of project results.

*Rating*

- Average Rating: 8,8; Rating range between 8 and 10
- 

### 31 What are the outstanding benefits of the TRAIN project? Please mention 3 issues

*Comments of the group*

- EU collaboration - working with other EU institutions
- Bring together various experiences/contexts
- Definition of literacy teachers competencies
- New unreadable on literacy teaching for Switzerland
- Production of modules
- Develop a common view of professionalisation
- Country reports on state of art
- Overview over professionalisation in Europe
- Translation of modules and compendium
- Disseminate knowledge and practices
- Modules and methodologies to be used as examples, translation of modules
- Network strengthened
- Development of a great co-operation atmosphere

*Answer of the coordinator*

- Final Conference - involving important stakeholders
  - Final Conference = European Event
  - Country reports are highly appreciated by European colleagues
-

### **32 What is still to do at this state of the project?**

*Comments of the group*

- Modules to be finished - dissemination tasks to be completed
- Complete and finalise the module products
- dissemination of the final products, final reporting
- final report, testing in Switzerland, translation
- translation of modules

*Answer of the coordinator*

- Editorial work, compilation for final report, final report to EU
- 

### **33 What could you contribute?**

*Comments of the group*

- I am writing summaries for the DIE newsletter.
- Module 4 - propose article for newsletter - send the last reports
- All what is needed for finalisation of the project: reporting, dissemination
- Reports on CH, AT, FL; giving advise, extra meeting in CH, testing of modules, workshop final conference, framework competencies
- To all remaining issues in order to have a very good final report

*Answer of the coordinator*

- It will be one of my main tasks to put everything together.
- 

### **34 Please add any additional comments here**

*Comments of the group*

- Disappointed with some of the partners input - quality very poor
- I recommend to try to find finances/budget to test each module in another country than the original country - I think that the module 4 is a untypic and special subject ... ICT experts have usually encomter ((?)) difficulties to implement their proposals ... that normal in knowledge society
- TRAIN was a very successful project, we learned a lot from each other and made unreadable contribution to the field unreadable literacy.
- I am very pleased with the project.
- Thanks to Monika!

*Answer of the coordinator*

- Social event in the evening was marvellous.