

EU Project



**Professionalization of
Literacy and Basic Education
Basic Modules for Teacher Training**

2nd INTERIM EVALUATION REPORT

by
didaktis
Erika Herrenbrück

Hennef, Germany, January 2008

Evaluation period: July – December 2007

Subjects

1	Evaluation procedure	p. 2
2	Evaluation activities	p. 3
3	Evaluation results	p. 4
3.1	Observation of the coordinator	p. 4
3.2	Documents of the 3 rd partner meeting	p. 4
3.3	Evaluation of the work reports	p. 8
3.4	Evaluation of the project documents	p. 9
3.5	Questionnaire for the national module workshops	p.10
4	Conclusion and Suggestions	p.11
5	References	p.13

1 Evaluation procedure

1.1 The evaluation period

The preceding Interim Evaluation Report ended with the progress report which was presented to the European commission by the end of June 2007.

The period of this evaluation report covers the time from July to the end of the year 2007.

1.2 The evaluation procedure

The further evaluation of the TRAIN Project follows the questioning as it had been agreed upon in the 2nd partner meeting in May 2007 in Zurich.

The project has reached the productive phase where outputs are worked out. Thus evaluation focuses on two fields:

- Quality and the impact of the materials which are ready up to here
- Work process in the transnational partnership.

1.3 The materials

Materials which had to be worked out in the above defined period are

- Dissemination and monitoring reports
- Draft versions of modules
- Competence Profile
- Website

Furthermore the Approval of the Progress Report will be considered.

1.4 The transnational work process

The transnational work will be measured by the national output of materials which reach the partners in time so that they may profit from the results of the other partners. The activities of coordinator will be evaluated as well. Furthermore the minutes of the 3rd partner meeting will show the results of the efforts.

Remark of the author: In the following text LaBE is short for Literacy and Basic Education.

2 Evaluation activities

2.1 Observation of the coordinator

As I live near the DIE Institute in Bonn I may easily come to a personal dialog with the coordinator. We met several times to discuss the progress of work and the steps to get ahead with the project.

2.2 Documents of the 3rd partner meeting

I developed a feedback questionnaire for the 3rd partner meeting which included questions about the transnational partnership as well as about the meeting. Further documents of the meeting as minutes and work package of modules will be evaluated as well.

2.3 Evaluation of the work reports

The project reports as dissemination and monitoring reports will show the progress of the national work.

2.4 Evaluation of the project products

At the end of the evaluation period (December 2007) a great number of project products are accessible for the partners. These will be evaluated a well.

2.5 Questionnaire for the national module workshops

In the 3rd meeting the partners expressed their wish to evaluate the national workshops in which the modules are tested. An adequate questionnaire had to be tailored to suit the TRAIN project needs.

3 Evaluation results

3.1 Observation of the coordinator

The coordinator gave a number of inputs, reminders and mailings to encourage the partners in their work. It was clear to everyone which products had been done in time and who was on duty to give their contributions. Thus the coordinator worked deliberately to bring forward the project products and to support the partners.

3.2 Documents of the 3rd partner meeting 14th to 17th of October 2007 in Waterford, Ireland

3.2.1 Feedback by questionnaire

The feedback questionnaire had two parts. The first part dealt with the work process between the 2nd and the 3rd partner meeting. The second part asked for opinions about the meeting itself. The results follow here under. Unfortunately some of the handwritten feedbacks were unreadable so that not all opinions can be reported here.

Questions	Ra- tings	Answers or comments
WORK PROCESS between the 2 nd and 3 rd Partner-Meeting		
<i>The following questions were given a rating on a <u>1 low to 10 high</u> scale with added facultative comment.</i>		
1	6,9	Some partners express their regrets of being late with their contributions. The reasons were illness or lack of time.
2	7,0	The partners see a restricted use in their own country for the results of the other partners. The coordinator expresses the difficulty to deal with the delayed reports because she needs them for the planning and the progress of the project.
3	7,8	Two opinions rather different are in the group: some see a very good participation from majority of partners and other wish a more intense and fruitful communication.

4	Please add any additional comments or suggestions here.	-	The modules will be the focus of good transnational partnership. The communication shall be better immediately before and after the meeting. Coordinator and partners work very hard and the commitments of everybody are significant.
Average Rating of WORK PROCESS: 7,3			
EVALUATION of the 3rd MEETING			
5	What were your expectations of this meeting?	-	All partners express their expectation of going on with the common work process and fixing the next steps for the modules. The coordinator expects to get on with the modules and the findings of the questionnaires and to renew the commitments.
6	To what extent have these expectations been met?	-	Most of the expectations are met. A sceptical voice is not sure if all have the same understanding what shall be done at the modules.
EVALUATION of the SESSIONS			
7	Introduction and short review on the project: Progress report – Feedback from external expert – External evaluation report – Further steps	8,9	Well prepared input
8	National reports: Updates, translations etc. – Compendium	8,6	One person missed a discussion on conclusions.
9	Modules Part I: Discussion of drafts – Common concept and framework – Further procedure and commitments	8,0	Good overview of the modules
10	Modules Part II	8,4	
11	Modules Part III	8,3	One person asked: why does the coordinator not just define the framework for the program (content, methodology, evaluation)?
12	Profile of competences – Findings, comparative analysis	7,6	One person would have liked more specific details of the findings in each country.
13	Dissemination – Activities – Reports – Further steps	8,7	Well prepared by the coordinator
14	Monitoring reports – Further evaluation	8,8	Well prepared by the coordinator
	Average Rating of MEETING	8,4	

15	Which session(s) did you find most useful?	-	The partners mention the module discussion and the profile of competences. The coordinator thinks all of them to be useful for the further procedure.
16	Which session(s) did you find least useful?	-	Most partners answer “none”. One person states the modules part III.
17	Did you receive adequate information about the meeting before it began?	-	Yes. The coordinator: Unfortunately some partners did not send their reports in time.
18	Comments on the accommodation and food	-	Very good, thanks to the WIT team.
19	Additional comments	-	Was a successful meeting. Compliment to project coordinator for hard and efficient work.

Evaluator’s comments

Line 2

Only about 60% of the requested contributions had been given up to the 3rd meeting. This seems to be the reason why “the partners see a restricted use in their own country for the results of the other partners”.

Line 11

One participant would have preferred a more restricted approach of the coordinator concerning the framework for the modules. I think that ready made guidelines are not a good solution. A better way is to support the partners to develop and understand their work procedure by themselves – what the coordinator did.

The work package for the modules is a good result of these efforts.

Line 12

One person would have liked more specific details of the findings in each country. Each partner is free to take the initiative and start an exchange of ideas in-between the meetings. This would strengthen the transnational partnership.

3.2.2 The minutes of the meeting

The author of the minutes reports the discussions thoroughly and points out the important results for the next steps. I would appreciate if the author of the minutes is named at the beginning.

The minutes mirror an intensive work process. From the point of view of evaluation the important results are the following:

- The Approval of the progress report had been discussed and integrated into the further work plan.
- I worked out an evaluation form for the national module workshops. The coordinator circulated this form to partners for feedback in January 2008.
- The internals section of the TRAIN website has been installed. The partners got a password and have now access to all project documents uploaded in this section.
- The coordinator provided the partners with monitoring report codes from the Commission integrated in report forms. The partners used these forms for their reports.
- Dates for the final conference meeting of the project in Bonn in September 2008 have been circulated and then fixed by the coordinator.
- The coordinator put efforts on reducing the work load and the complexity – with two good results: The description of modules was limited to a maximum of 5 pages. The drafts of modules will be reviewed not by all but by one of the partners so that every partner works with two other partners either by reviewing or by being reviewed.
- A project flyer had been made and sent by the coordinator to all partners for dissemination to national stakeholders.

Still open points are the following:

- The Irish module had been presented in the meeting, but unfortunately it is not yet accessible as a project document on the website.
- The modules will be tested by the Swiss partner in June 2008.
- It was suggested that Proposals for Future Procedures/Profile of Competences could be a topic for the final conference. Slovenia and Ireland agreed to send the results to the coordinator. Unfortunately this did not happen until now although the coordinator sent a couple of reminders.

3.2.3 The work package for the modules

During the meeting the coordinator worked out a package for the further development of the modules. A clear framework gives a common format and structure to the description of the modules and the linking within the EU processes. A work plan marks tasks and final dates. So the partners are well informed and know what to do.

3.3 Evaluation of the work reports

3.3.1 Dissemination reports

In the meeting it was agreed that all partners would check dissemination reports. Most partners did as planned and provided their reports over the 2nd period from June, 16 to September, 30. They use the form sheet which has been provided in the website internals. This facilitates the overview of the dissemination activities. The reports show a very satisfying amount of activities in the national field of LaBE.

Some partners should please work on their reports:

- Cyprus does not follow to the project periods as required. It is recommended to do so in the next reports. Otherwise the reports cannot be compared with each other and an overview over the national activities will not be possible.
- Still missing is the report of Ireland although the coordinator had asked for them several times. It is highly recommended to give this report.

3.3.2 Monitoring reports

Here, too, the partners did as planned and provided their reports over the 2nd period from June, 16 to September, 30. They used the form sheet provided in the website internals. With the help of that form the reports give a good overview of the work progress and allow the comparison respectively make the national differences clear.

In the German report the coordinator asks for more commitment having in mind the reports still missing as mentioned here as well.

The Swiss and the Slovenian reports give identical answers to some of the questions. This is to be interpreted as a special result of transnational partnership.

Still missing is the report of Ireland.

3.4 Evaluation of the project documents

3.4.1 Website

The TRAIN website presents the project to the public with excerpts of the proposal (aims and rationale), 13 country reports regarding “Professional Development in the field of Literacy and Basic Education” and 2 newsletters.

In the internals section most of the project documents are accessible to the partners.

Project documents on the website internals

- Reports of dissemination, monitoring and evaluation
(13 documents)
- Partner Meetings: Invitation, Agenda and Travel information
(3 documents)
- Modules: four drafts
(6 documents)
- Competencies: questionnaires, tables with experts answers, results
(11 documents)
- Country reports: national reports and their summaries
(24 documents)
Forms for Dissemination and Monitoring Reports
(2 documents)
- Progress Report and Approval Progress Report with the feedback from the EU expert
(2 documents)

Sum total 61 documents are available in the internal part of the site. This shows a very considerable output at this state of the project. A lot of good work has been done by the project partners.

3.4.2 Modules

The drafts of modules (first versions) are ready from Cyprus, France, Germany and Slovenia. The elaborated state gives a valid chance that in the end they will provide very good tools for trainings.

Switzerland is not supposed to develop a module but to test the modules before publishing. The Irish module is missing.

The draft of Cyprus contains not only the description of the module but also a time schedule for the training and a handout for the participants. These documents could be good examples and facilitate the same work for the other modules. It is recommended to the partners to profit from these documents.

The coordinator worked out a form sheet for the module description which circulated in the work package after the 3rd meeting. The German and Slovenian drafts use this form sheet. The drafts of Cyprus and France should be overworked in order to fulfil the EU requirements as well. Revised modules – draft version 2 – are available from Cyprus and Germany.

3.4.3 Competencies

The questionnaires, tables with the expert's answers and the results are presented by Cyprus, France, Germany and Switzerland.

The tables with the figures are neatly arranged. The results documents resume and interpret the figures and give conclusions.

The next step would be the calculation of average figures and the interpretation: a transnational overview over the expert's opinions. Unfortunately this is made possible by the missing contributions from Slovenia and Ireland.

3.4.3 Country reports

Most of the national reports had been ready in the last evaluation period.

The French partner added the report on Belgium which gives profound information about the LaBE situation of LaBE in Belgium. The Swiss partner provided the report on Austria as well.

It would be much easier to get an overview on the reports and the European situation if all summaries had been done and followed the form which the coordinator provided.

3.4.5 Progress Report and Approval Progress Report

The recommendations of the EU expert have been taken into consideration and discussed during the 3rd partner meeting.

3.5 Questionnaire for the national module workshops

In the 3rd meeting the partners expressed their wish to evaluate the national workshops with the modules. I worked out a questionnaire, an evaluation sheet and a guideline. All three were circulated by the coordinator in January 2008.

4 Conclusion and suggestions

4.1 The work process

The work process is on a good way. The reports of dissemination and monitoring show a steady engagement of the partners. An impressive number of project outcomes are already on the website.

The coordinator has an ample overview over the tasks and foresees the needed steps in time.

4.2 Missing contributions

The following table shows the particular contributions of the partners, the coordinator and the evaluator.

Document	Cyprus	France	Germany	Ireland	Slovenia	Switzerland
Dissemination	✓	✓	✓	missing	✓	✓
Monitoring	✓	✓	✓	missing	✓	✓
Modules (drafts) 1 st version	✓	✓	✓	missing	✓	only testing
Modules (drafts) 2 nd version	✓	missin g	✓	missing	missing	only testing
Competencies	✓	✓	✓	missing	missing	✓
Country Reports	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Forms	✓ provided by coordinator					
Project flyer	✓ provided by coordinator					
Website	✓ provided by coordinator, documents by partners					
Newsletter	✓ provided by coordinator					
Evaluation	✓ provided by evaluator					
Questionnaire for module workshops	✓ provided by evaluator					

The partners should work on what is missing.

A serious problem is the situation with the Irish partner. As far as I know from the feedback of the 3rd meeting the lack of contributions is due to illness of the responsible person. I would recommend the coordinator to contact the administration of the Waterford Institute of Technology directly and ask them to give the responsibility of the project to another person who could do the necessary work supported and advised by the person actually in charge. If that will not come off the project is in danger not to realise its aims.

Slovenia is urgently asked to give the contributions so that the transnational overviews are no longer blocked. As reported by the coordinator the Slovenian promises to work things out but does not realise it. Here, too, it is recommended to contact the persons responsible of the department and make clear that the results of the project for all partners are in danger. If there is no progress the EU Commission should be informed.

4.3 Communication

Some arrangement and commitments taken in the 3rd meeting will strengthen the communication amongst the partners – in case that they are realised.

It is recommended that the partners who view the module's drafts maintain an open and frequent exchange of ideas. This could make the modules really transnational products.

5 References

- 5.1 Documents of the 3rd partner meeting
 - 5.1.1 3rd meeting questionnaire
 - 5.1.2 3rd meeting feedback results
 - 5.1.3 Minutes of the meeting
 - 5.1.4 Work package for modules

- 5.2 Work reports
 - 5.2.1 Disseminations reports (2nd period)
 - Cyprus
 - France
 - Germany
 - Switzerland
 - Slovenia
 - 5.2.2 Monitoring reports (2nd period)
 - Cyprus
 - France
 - Germany
 - Slovenia
 - Switzerland

- 5.3 Project documents
 - 5.3.1 Website www.die-bonn.de/train/English or the partner languages Deutsch, Français, Slovensko, Ελληνικά after the slash
 - 5.3.2 Modules (draft version [1](#))
 - Cyprus
 - France
 - Germany
 - Slovenia
 - 5.3.3 Competencies: Questionnaires, tables and figure, results
 - Cyprus
 - France
 - Germany
 - Switzerland

- 5.4 Country reports

In addition to the country reports ready in the 1st project period:

 - TRAIN National Report Belgium
 - TRAIN National Report: Austria

- 5.5 Questionnaire for the national module workshops
 - 5.5.1 Module Questionnaire
 - 5.5.2 Module Evaluation Sheet
 - 5.5.3 Module Guide to Feedback