



PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND COORDINATION OF ACTIVITES

1.3 Final-term Evaluation Report

FINAL-TERM EVALUATION REPORT

BLUE KEP project general objective is to enhance the framework conditions for innovation in nautical/maritime sectors (sea economy) within the cooperation area, by strengthening the integration of education systems through harmonization of the technical educational systems. This goal will be achieved through standardization of school curricula and methods/tools for assessment and recognition of skills at both educational and professional level, building on good practices gained by KEPASS project. The strategy is to create/strengthen connections among Italian and Croatian educational sectors and productive systems, starting from the technical school system addressed to nautical/maritime technologies. In that way, the project will develop new educational and knowledge mobility schemes and professional skills, which contribute to a better exploitation of the innovation existing potential in cross-border area.

The specific objectives of the project are:

- to encourage standardization of technical schools' curricula and knowledge mobility to support innovation
- to increase availability of trained professionals in targeted sector with mutually recognized skills
- to improve cross-border cooperation among targeted blue economy systems, clusters and complementary specializations

The **evaluation activity** aims at gathering qualitative information showing achievements and critical aspects emerging from the implementation of the project for the assessment of overall effectiveness and efficiency of the BLUEKEP project.

Gathered information, through evaluation tools, enables the assessing of project relevance, project effectiveness and innovation, consistency between project and achieved results, coherence within the project, benefits for beneficiaries and partnership.

Specifically, the final-term evaluation (FTE) covers the efficiency of implementation, relevance of the project, effectiveness, partners' perception of change and potential sustainability. It assesses the achievements of the project with respect to the relevance of its objectives and the attainability of its outcomes. It also assesses the project design including to what extent the assumptions outlined in the Application Form are valid and identifies unexpected factors beyond the control of the project that affected it negatively or positively. Special emphasis is placed on the degree to which the project has succeeded in carrying out the activities outlined in the AF.

At this purpose, the FTE set up by LP Informest foresees the realization and the supplying of **questionnaires** to the project partnership (PP1 Adriatic Ionian Euroregion, PP2 Region Marche, PP3 Istria Region, PP4 RRA Public Institution Development Agency of Sibenik-Knin County, PP5 RERA - Public institution for coordination and development of Split Dalmatia-County), the partner educational experts and to the stakeholders (accredited schools), aimed at evaluating the efficiency of the overall project management and of the project implementation from different points of view.

Accredited schools are from:

Friuli Venezia Giulia Region (IT):

- ISIS Malignani Udine
- ISIS Brignoli Einaudi Marconi (BEM) Staranzano-Gradisca d'Isonzo (GO)
- Istituto Nautico Tomaso di Savoia Duca di Genova – Luigi Galvani Trieste

Marche Region (IT)



- IIS Fazzini Mercantini Grottammare (AP)
- ITT G. & M. Montani Fermo
- IIS Volterra Elia Ancona

Istria Region (HR)

- Technical School Pula

Sibenik-Knin County (HR)

- Industrial Craft School Sibenik
- Traffic Technical School Sibenik
- Technical School Sibenik

Split-Dalmatia County (HR)

- Nautical High School Split).

Questionnaires results are proceeded in a Final-term Evaluation (FTE) Report about the consistency of the implementation of the project congruently with the results and objectives outlined in the Application Form.

Present Questionnaires are prepared on Middle-term Evaluation Report schema and queries, permitting to compare the given responses with those collected during the previous surveys referred to the first phase of the project mobility activities (mobility preparation and organisation).

Project monitoring is ensured by LP, WP coordinators and Steering Committee to better adapt and tailor project advancement and focus its completion. Internal quality evaluation is carried out by Steering Committee and managed by LP.



Addressed questionnaires are mainly composed by scaled questions, Yes/No questions and a final open-ended question to gather further comments and remarks on the project activity. To many questions was also given the possibility to explain the given answer by specification. The open answers have been reported in full, omitting only the name of the respondent.

On August 27, 2019, the LP sent final-term evaluation Questionnaires by email to all PPs, partners' experts and stakeholders (see templates in attachments) using the Project's mailing list. With this mail addressees were asked to fill out the questionnaire and to mail it back to the evaluator. Answers were received from all the involved respondents except for PP1 Adriatic Ionian Euroregion, reporting the opinion of the larger set of involved subjects in the activities.

September 2019

Index

1. Project partners questionnaire
2. Partners' external experts' questionnaire
3. Interviews to stakeholders
4. Final considerations

Annexes – Templates of the Questionnaires

1. PROJECT PARTNERS QUESTIONNAIRE

The first 6 questions contained in the project Final-Term Evaluation Questionnaire for partners were about the project overall management. The addressed questions were asked, using a Likert-type scale. Five options were provided: "*Strongly disagree*", "*Disagree*", "*Neutral*", "*Agree*", and "*Strongly agree*".

- 1) **The Project Leader is providing an effective overall coordination of the project.** 3 out of 4 respondents agree to this question and 1 declares neutral.
- 2) **The Financial Manager is effectively supporting us in all administrative and financial issues.** 3 out of 4 respondents agree to this question and 1 strongly agrees to this question.
- 3) **The Steering Committee is performing as an effective management tool.** 3 out of 4 respondents agree to this question and 1 strongly agrees to this question.
- 4) **The managerial structure is able to provide a high-level centralized management of the project.** 3 out of 4 agree to this question, while 1 declares neutral.
- 5) **The managerial structure is incentivising the involvement by each partner in the best possible way.** All 4 respondents agree to this question.
- 6) **Our budget for the BLUEKEP Project is adequate.** 3 out of 4 agree to this question, while 1 considers it as neutral.

The second group of questions is inherent to communication. Five options were provided: "Poor", "Fair", "Good", "Very good", and "Excellent".

- 7) **How do you rate the internal communication within the BLUEKEP partnership?** 1 out of 4 considers it very good while 3 as good.
- 8) **How do you rate the external communication by the BLUEKEP Project?** 1 out of 4 considers it very good while 3 as good.

The third group of questions concerns the level of coordination capacity for each WP. Five options were provided: "Strongly disagree", "Disagree", "Neutral", "Agree", and "Strongly agree".

- 9) **The WP1 coordinator is providing effective support and supervision of its activities.** All 4 respondents agree with the question.
- 10) **The WP2 coordinator is providing effective support and supervision of its activities.** All 4 respondents agree with the question.
- 11) **The WP3 coordinator is providing effective support and supervision of its activities.** All 4 respondents agree with the question.
- 12) **The WP4 coordinator is providing effective support and supervision of its activities.** All 4 respondents agree with the question.

Successive question regards the level of cooperation reached within the project. Five options were provided: "Poor", "Fair", "Good", "Very good", and "Excellent".

13) **Overall, how do you rate the level of cooperation within the BLUEKEP Project Partnership?** 3 out of 4 consider it very good, while 1 good.

Another question is based on the self-evaluation of the proper state of art of project activities. Three options are provided: "behind schedule", "on schedule" and "ahead of schedule".

14) **The progress of your project's activities is ...** 3 out of 4 consider them on schedule, while 1 behind schedule. In the latter case, the delay is due to "*Student mobility start later than it was planned, because of the delay of project activities*".

At the question on meeting attendance, to a Yes/No question

15) **Do you attend the project's meetings on regular basis?** All 4 responded positively.

A question concerns the evaluation of participation to the project. Five options were provided: "Poor", "Fair", "Good", "Very good", and "Excellent".

16) **Up to today, how do you rate your participation in the BLUEKEP Project?** 3 out of 4 respondents rated as very good while 1 as good.

Finally, an open question allows to respondents to give further considerations and remarks.

17) **Is there any further issue you would like to signal?** Only 1 respondent gave a contribution, suggesting for "*Better planning project activities and getting all necessary information on the time*".

2. EXPERTS' PROJECT PARTNERS QUESTIONNAIRE

The first 3 questions contained in the project final-term evaluation Questionnaire for experts acting as technical support to project partners were about the project overall management. The addressed questions were asked, using a Likert-type scale. Five options were provided: "Poor", "Fair", "Good", "Very good", and "Excellent".

- 1) **How do you rate the capacity of the Project Leader to provide an effective overall coordination of the project?** 1 out of 5 considers it as excellent, 2 as very good, 2 as good
- 2) **How do you rate the capacity of the managerial structure to provide a high-level centralized management of the Project?** 2 out of 5 consider it as very good, 3 good
- 3) **How do you rate the capacity of the managerial structure to incentive the involvement by each partner in the Project?** 3 out of 5 consider it as good, 2 very good

Following questions are related to communication evaluation.

- 4) **How do you rate the internal communication within the BLUEKEP partnership?** 1 out of 5 considers it as excellent, 2 very good, 1 good
- 5) **How do you rate the external communication by the BLUEKEP Project?** 3 out of 5 consider it as very good, 2 good

Evaluation on technical WP coordinators

6) **The WP3 coordinator is providing effective support and supervision of its activities.** 1 out of 5 considers it as excellent, 2 very good, 1 good.

As comments: The mobility program has successfully been carried out for both students and their accompanying tutors/teachers. The mobility experience has been evaluated as interesting and enriching by all participants. There have been some minor issues related with the managing of the agendas in some mobility programs and some information reporting has been delivered over the deadlines

7) **The WP4 coordinator is providing effective support and supervision of its activities.** 1 out of 5 consider it as excellent, 2 very good, 2 good

As comments:

- *Some details about evaluation of the module are not clearly defined yet*
- *The LP made many efforts to ensure the effective development of the Project activities and to achieve all the expected outcomes. The contribution of the Maritime Pole (experts in FVG, in cooperation with the LP) added a great value to the international teaching modules*

Following questions are related to the level of cooperation among partners, evaluation on the involvement, possible existing gaps in current activities, capacity to work together and overall organisation

8) **Overall, how do you rate the level of cooperation within the BLUEKEP Project Partnership?** 3 out of 5 consider it as very good, 2 good

9) **Up to today, how do you rate your involvement in the implementation of the BLUEKEP Project activities?** 3 out of 5 consider it as good, 2 very good

10) In your opinion there are any gaps (both in activities implementation and expected results)? please indicate them and the critical situation related to them. 3 out of 4 responded to the question, as follow:

- *Initial gaps could be reduced and closed along project implementation*
- *School programs are not compatible enough, so modules are also too general; it is too difficult to develop competencies if the modules are too general*
- *a) The Project outcome "development of the international modules" was carried out in a timing that didn't allow to integrate them in the ordinary school year. Thus, the testing of these materials was only partially done during the mobility phase of the project. b) The expected presentation of the international modules to some representatives of the Italian and Croatian Ministries of Education/Training did not take place. This situation has been caused by some aspects that are external and independent form the Project (such as the re-organization in the Italian Ministry during summer 2019), but the partnership could have made a stronger effort in trying to achieve the expected goal*

11) What is the assessment of the ability of the partnership to work together (the extent of the collaboration, mainly referred to common activities)? 1 out of 5 considers it as excellent, 2 very good, 2 good

12) What is the assessment of the overall organization of the activities of the Project, (mainly regarding the meetings and the events)? 2 out of 5 consider it as excellent, 1 very good, 2 good

This section of questions is related to the quality of the project activities:

13) What is the assessment of the validity of the assumptions of the Project idea after the implementation of the activities to date? 3 out of 4 consider it as very good, 2 good

14) Please, indicate any unexpected factor or new information that might jeopardize or change the Project idea. 1 single answer

- *During the summer of 2019, as well known, the Italian Government has changed unexpectedly. As a consequence of that, the partnership had to face a complete re-organization of the administrative/technical staff in the Italian Ministry of Education. As the project was supposed to end in the month of September 2019, the expected outcome - consisting in a meeting with the representatives of the Italian Ministry, to present the learning model that has been developed in the Project activities - could not take place due to the aforesaid re-organization phase*

15) Please list the strength and weakness of the Project to date. (collected answers) only 3 out of 4 responded to this question)

Strengths:

- *Friendship; Multiculturalism; Life experience*
- *Project activities were well organised; Good visibility; Impact on the new generations of students within the blue economy sector*
- *The partnership composition: the presence of experienced teachers and experts that during all the Project phases have shared their knowledge and commitment, in order to cooperate and try to solve all the minor and important issues that emerged during the project phases. Great commitment of the Lead partner, strong efforts made to smooth all phases in the project; Positive attitude of both school teachers and students towards the project activities and the mobility phase in particular. The exchange experience has been a great opportunity for the young participants to widen their knowledge of a different culture and a different school system*

Weaknesses:

- *Some undefined details*

- *Language and cultural differences; Some activities were postponed which created minor difficulties in project implementation*
- *The timing of the project: considering that the mobility and most of the actions planned in the Project were connected to the School Year, the months of July/August 2019 have been only partially utilized. This situation affected the general timing of the Project, that already was very concise (less than one year). In the eventuality of a future project, this aspect could be optimized by choosing a longer period of time or a different timing of the actions; Issues related to the need for accompanying the underage students. During the project, a great effort was needed, by all partners, to guarantee a convenient accompanying service to the students during the mobility phase. In the eventuality of a future project, it is necessary to deepen the knowledge about safety/security themes when dealing with youngsters/underage students, in order to find the best and most sustainable organisational solution. This could be done, for example, by comparing this mobility experience to other Mobility programmes known in Europe*

16) **Is there any further issue you would like to signal?** 1 single answer

- *The learning outcomes /modules developed in the Project could be effectively tested on a wider sample of students and different types of schools. Therefore, it seems valuable that a new project should take place, to allow this test and to spread the learning methods in different school environments*

3. STAKEHOLDERS QUESTIONNAIRE

The opening questions contained in the project final-term evaluation Questionnaire for stakeholders addressed to the 11 accredited schools (all of them responded to the survey) were about the project overall implementation, communication and organisation viewed from the point of view of the involved schools. The addressed questions were asked, using a Likert-type scale. Four options were provided: "Unsatisfactory", "Average", "Good" and "Very good".

At the question

1. **What is the overall assessment of the involvement of your school in the implementation of the project activities?** 5 out of 11 respondents consider it as very good, while 6 as good.
2. **What is the assessment of the quality of communication and information flow between your school and the project partner?** 3 out of 11 respondents consider it as very good, 7 as good and 1 on average.
3. **What is the assessment of the quality of communication and information flow between your school and the matched school?** 5 out of 11 respondents consider it as very good, 4 good and 2 on average
4. **What is the assessment of the extent of the implementation of the mobility program compared to the foreseen plan?** 3 out of 11 respondents consider it as very good, 7 as good while one on average, the latter giving as explanation that "*Students were not allowed to do anything in the company, they just observed, which was not very interesting for them, and they didn't learn much*".

5. **What is the assessment of the extent of the implementation of the project with respect to expected results to be achieved?** 2 out of 11 respondents consider it as very good, while 9 as good.
6. **What is the assessment of the ability of the matched schools to work together (the extent of the collaboration, mainly referred to common activities related to student exchange)?** 5 out of 11 respondents consider it as very good, 4 as good while 2 on average.
7. **What is the assessment of the overall organization of the activities of the project?** 3 out of 11 respondents consider it as very good, 8 as good.
8. **What is the overall assessment of the project management?** 1 out of 11 respondents consider it as very good, 10 as good.
9. **What is the assessment of the validity of the assumptions of the project idea after the implementation of the activities to date?** 4 out of 11 respondents consider it as very good, 6 as good and 1 on average.

It was then asked to briefly indicate strengths and weaknesses of the mobility exchange (not all respondents gave an exhaustive reply)

10. **Please list the strengths and weakness of the student mobility exchange to date** (multiple answers are unified for each responder, maintaining reiterated and similar answers and features of origin of some answers to better highlight the assessment)

Strengths

- *Communication between schools; Motivating activities carried out during the school time and in the free time; Better knowledge of the school system; Different teaching methods and approaches*
- *Improvement of English language; Professionalism of teachers and tutors*
- *Teachers and students discover schools with different educational objectives provided for similar vocational subjects; Students discover a different economic and social territory; Educational institutions further develop the connection with companies; Students improve adaptability to learn new skills and knowledge; Improvement of L2 language (English)*
- *Possibilities of future collaboration with matched school; Mutual sharing of best practices concerning teaching methodology; Students were given a fresh insight in a different education system and had the opportunity to develop adaptability and teamwork; Potential to decrease differences between the two education systems and subject curricula*
- *Languages (Croatian: elementary; English: general knowledge improvement); Full immersion in Croatian culture; Life skills development (autonomy; self-confidence; motivation; resilience)*
- *Good opportunity to get in contact with different culture and foreign students engaged in the same studies; Very good chance to develop adaptability and various skills like the capacity to work in team; Good experience to improve English language and the capability to communicate with foreign partners; Great experience to come in contact with real job activities and to deal with colleagues and partners; Good opportunity to experience and compare different ideas and teaching techniques*

- *getting know foreign educational systems; meeting new people; getting know new culture; possibility of getting job after college in company where students were in practice*
- *Improved social skills*
- *Improving and developing language and communication skills; Meeting new cultures; Gaining new experiences; Making new friends*
- *getting to know other cultures; new acquaintances; practicing a second language; learning how to be independent*

Weaknesses

- *Training experience: only 3-4 hours per day could be increased up to 8 hours per day*
- *It was not possible to put the Croatian students in one class only and this reduced the interactions between students who did not know each other*
- *Differences between the two education systems, subject curricula and grading system*
- *Internship partners not always fulfilling the students' expectations and needs*
- *Selection of the participants should be more accurate; The period of the exchange should be more carefully timed so not to affect deeply the didactic activities of the students in their own countries; Exchange period was too long; Time to develop common activities with matched school was too strict*
- *Mobility period too long*
- *Bad communication between school and company in Trieste; pocket money for students; duration of students' mobility exchange*
- *Little communication between incoming and host students; Internship in company not as expected*
- *Difficulties providing appropriate internship for host students; Difficulties with accommodation at the beginning*

- *Long stay away from home; language; possible non-understanding; finance*

Following question is strictly related to practical/organisational problems met during the mobility exchange (end-program evaluation)

11. Please list main difficulties met in preparation and implementation of the student exchanges (multiple answers are unified for each responder)

- *The program (45 days) is too long; The language course should be aimed at improving the use of the English language; 30 hours of Croatian language are probably useless for Italian students*
- *During the preparation phase: find two technical specializations with similar curricula*
- *Identification of tutoring responsibilities for the whole period and definition of mobility tutors' schedule*
- *There was a lack of communication between the two schools (con Nautical) at the beginning of the mobility and there were difficulties to match partners' requirements concerning the type of work placement activities to be done (the activity already planned was to be changed when the mobility was about to start and in very short time); The students coming from the matched school weren't really interested in taking part in the activities suggested; Brief courses for the safety at work (compulsory in Italy for each student involved in a job activity) weren't taken into account before the mobility and had to be arranged during the first days.*
- *Significant delay in information flow; Absence of productive communication between all the participants; Not properly defined grading system during mobility; Occasionally the instructions were imprecise*
- *language (it should be only in English); conformity of school programs*
- *We didn't have all the necessary information, we didn't get information on time*
- *Modules were not clearly defined; School programs didn't match in many aspects*

- *They (students) are too young; have not been taught a long absence from home; Finance*

Finally, an open question allows to respondents to give further considerations and remarks

12. **Any other comment or suggestion** – no answer.

4. FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

At first glance, none of all three shared final-term surveys (respondents: project partners PP, partner experts PE, stakeholders SK) evidenced negative evaluations of the whole project activity, and the overall average of the answers is satisfying - towards a high level, confirming the level of outcomes collected from the mid-term evaluation surveys (mainly focused on the preparatory aspects of the mobility).

The evaluation outcomes, which all involved respondents contributed, evidence a homogeneity comparing the surveys on the *managerial structure and coordination of the project* (both administrative and financial); the same result emerges from the *capacity of each technical WP coordinator to provide support and supervises activities*. In both cases, the final assumption results more than positive. Similar is the global consideration of the management of the communication issues (both internal and external).

On the whole, more than satisfactory can be confirmed at the end of the project the *level of cooperation in project partnership*, the *capacity to work together*, the *overall meetings' organisation* and the *incentive of PP involvement*, shared both by PPs and PEs. As for the capacity to *cooperate and interact among matched Italian and Croatian schools*, it can be considered more than suitable.

Of some interest result the critical remarks on specific questions and the open answers given by some partner experts' respondents that further contribute from a strict technical perspective with considerations on specific mobility issues on project weaknesses. These can be mainly listed in the project starting delays that implied consequences in the mobility project planning and implementation, made even more complicated by the timing and the differentiation of mobility periods for each school, the different schools' technical educational

programs, making school curricula not enough compatible and consequently too general education modules, creating complications to develop competences. The language and cultural differences were also stressed as potential barriers to a plain project implementation and completion.

Notwithstanding the overall mobility program assessment, the stakeholders (accredited schools) provided for indications from their view after the completion of the students' exchange. It emerged that for some of them the program duration was too long, having the students away from the class for an excessive long period (as excuse provided was also their early age and the financing side). Moreover, schools stated difficulties in individuating the tutors (and their duties), in matching with paired schools due to non-sufficient/delay in information, to not enough defined different technical modules and school curricula and a not properly defined grading system before mobility. Different schools also suggest that courses should have been held in English rather than in national language.

Finally, in the assessment provided by accredited schools on their final-term experience in the project mobility programme, they were asked for an evaluation based on the pairing *Strengths/Weaknesses*. Collected results can be viewed as further mirror of their interest into the BLUE KEP project, their involvement and expectation, including precise proposal and evaluation strictly related to school environment. And moreover, elements that could support the capitalisation of this experience or even the replication of such procedure involving other schools from more countries.

To these evaluations, PP specific-targeted answers were not considered (although being reported).

As positive assets are below enumerated (not exhaustive list) for students: acquired experience and motivation in terms of increased English language, life and social skills development (in primis autonomy and self-confidence), capacity to work in team and technical competences (relevant, entering in contact with work activities), the intercultural exchange and the

knowledge of new economic and social realities; and for teachers and schools: comparison (and better knowledge of) between different educational systems, communication between schools and sharing best practices of teaching methods, techniques and approaches among schools and teachers leading to possible further collaboration between schools from similar vocational sector, development of collaboration among schools and the sea economy manufacturing sector (companies) allowing an easier inclusion for graduated students into the work market.

On the other hand, schools have highlighted some vulnerabilities mainly regarding the duration of mobility deemed too long (if not further implemented common activities within a better timed period of exchange), the difficulty to identify the accompanists teachers, and for some problems in providing appropriate internship and related to expectations, needing an implementation of coordination between schools and companies. On the Croatian side was confirmed the sensitive issue of the absence of availability of pocket money for students during their mobility period exchange in hosting country affecting their stay abroad.

ANNEXES

1. *Final-term Evaluation report questionnaire project partners*
2. *Final-term Evaluation report questionnaire experts*
3. *Final-term Evaluation report questionnaire stakeholders*



PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND COORDINATION OF ACTIVITIES

Final-term Evaluation Report - Project Partners

FINAL-TERM EVALUATION REPORT

The **evaluation activity** aims at gathering qualitative information showing achievements and critical aspects emerging from the implementation of the project for the assessment of overall effectiveness and efficiency of the BLUEKEP project.

Gathered information, through evaluation tools, will enable to assess the project relevance, the project effectiveness and innovation, the consistency between project and achieved results, the coherence within the project, the benefits for beneficiaries and partnership.

Specifically, the final-term evaluation covers the efficiency of implementation, relevance of the project, effectiveness to date, partners' perception of change and potential sustainability. It assesses the achievements of the project with respect to the relevance of its objectives and the attainability of its outcomes. It also assesses the project design including, to what extent the assumptions outlined in AF are valid and identifies unexpected factors beyond the control of the project that affected it negatively or positively. Special emphasis is placed on the degree to which the project has succeeded in carrying out the activities outlined in the AF.

At this purpose, the final-term evaluation foresees the realization and the supplying of the **questionnaire for the project partnership**, addressed to the partnership and aimed at evaluating the overall efficiency in project management and in the project implementation, with specific attention to the implementation of the mobility phase.

Questionnaires results will be proceeded in a **Final-term Evaluation Report** concerning the consistency of the implementation of the project with the results and objectives outlined in the AF.

Project monitoring is ensured by LP, WP coordinators and SC to better adapt and tailor project advancement. Internal quality evaluation will be carried out by SC and managed by LP.

Evaluation tools used are **questionnaire**, interviews to **experts, stakeholders, statistic data** and **media impact**.

Please complete this questionnaire by the **10th September 2019** and mail it back to the Project Lead Partner bluekep@informest.it.

Thank you for your cooperation. We look forward to reading your answers.

Please rate the following statements

1) The Project Leader is providing an effective overall coordination of the project
Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/>

2) The Financial Manager is effectively supporting us in all administrative and financial issues
Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/>

3) The Steering Committee is performing as an effective management tool
Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/>

4) The managerial structure is able to provide a high-level centralized management of the project
Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/>

5) The managerial structure is incentivising the involvement by each partner in the best possible way
Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/>

6) Our budget for the BLUEKEP Project is adequate
--

Strongly disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly agree

7) How do you rate the internal communication within the BLUEKEP partnership?
Poor <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Do you have any suggestion to improve the internal communication within the BLUEKEP partnership? Please explain</i>

8) How do you rate the external communication by the BLUEKEP Project?
Poor <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Do you have any suggestion to improve the external communication by the BLUEKEP Project? Please explain</i>

Please rate the following statements for the WP's you are involved

9) The WP₁ coordinator is providing effective support and supervision of its activities
Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Remarks, if any</i>

10) The WP2 coordinator is providing effective support and supervision of its activities
Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Remarks, if any</i>

11) The WP3 coordinator is providing effective support and supervision of its activities
Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Remarks, if any</i>

12) The WP4 coordinator is providing effective support and supervision of its activities
Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Remarks, if any</i>

13) Overall, how do you rate the level of cooperation within the BLUEKEP Project Partnership?
Poor <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>

14) The progress of your project's activities is
behind schedule <input type="checkbox"/> on schedule <input type="checkbox"/> ahead of schedule <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>If the progress of your project's activity is behind schedule, why?</i>

15) Do you attend the project's meetings on regular basis?
Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>If not, why? ...</i>

16) Up to today, how do you rate your participation in the BLUEKEP Project?
Poor <input type="checkbox"/> Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Very Good <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>

17) Is there any further issue you would like to signal?

-
-
-

Weakness

-
-
-
-

16) Is there any further issue you would like to signal?



PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND COORDINATION OF ACTIVITIES

Final-term Evaluation Report – Interviews to
Experts

FINAL-TERM EVALUATION REPORT – INTERVIEWS TO EXPERTS

The **evaluation activity** aims at gathering qualitative information showing achievements and critical aspects emerging from the implementation of the project for the assessment of overall effectiveness and efficiency of the BLUEKEP project.

Gathered information, through evaluation tools, will enable to assess the project relevance, the project effectiveness and innovation, the consistency between project and achieved results, the coherence within the project, the benefits for beneficiaries and partnership.

Specifically, the final-term evaluation covers the efficiency of implementation, relevance of the project, effectiveness, partners' perception of change and potential sustainability. It assesses the achievements of the project with respect to the relevance of its objectives and the attainability of its outcomes. It also assesses the project design including, to what extent the assumptions outlined in AF are valid and identifies unexpected factors beyond the control of the project that affected it negatively or positively. Special emphasis is placed on the degree to which the project has succeeded in carrying out the activities outlined in the AF.

At this purpose, the final-term evaluation foresees the realization and the supplying of the **questionnaire for the project experts** supporting Project partners in technical tasks, aimed at evaluating the overall efficiency in project management and implementation, and the experts' involvement in project technical activities, with specific attention to the implementation of the mobility phase.

Questionnaires results will be proceeded in a **Final-term Evaluation Report** concerning the consistency of the implementation of the project with the results and objectives outlined in the AF.

Project monitoring is ensured by LP, WP coordinators and SC to better adapt and tailor project advancement. Internal quality evaluation will be carried out by SC and managed by LP.

Evaluation tools used are questionnaire, interviews to experts, stakeholders, statistic data and media impact.



*Please complete this questionnaire by the **10th September 2019** and mail it back to the Project Lead Partner bluekep@informest.it. Thank you for your cooperation. We look forward to reading your answers.*

The evaluation is based on a scale of values starting from **Poor** (low rate) to **Excellent** (high rate). The scale is present in all the items of the questionnaire in order to allow an effective data processing.



1) How do you rate the capacity of the Project Leader to provide an effective overall coordination of the project?

Poor Fair Good Very good Excellent

2) How do you rate the capacity of the managerial structure to provide a high-level centralized management of the Project?

Poor Fair Good Very good Excellent

3) How do you rate the capacity of the managerial structure to incentive the involvement by each partner in the Project?

Poor Fair Good Very good Excellent

4) How do you rate the internal communication within the BLUEKEP partnership?

Poor Fair Good Very good Excellent

5) How do you rate the external communication by the BLUEKEP Project?

Poor Fair Good Very good Excellent

Please rate the following statements for the WP's you are involved with:

6) *The WP₃ coordinator is providing effective support and supervision of its activities*

Poor Fair Good Very good Excellent

Comments ...

7) *The WP₄ coordinator is providing effective support and supervision of its activities*

Poor Fair Good Very good Excellent

Comments ...

8) *Overall, how do you rate the level of cooperation within the BLUEKEP Project Partnership?*

Poor Fair Good Very good Excellent

9) *Up to today, how do you rate your involvement in the implementation of the BLUEKEP Project activities?*

Poor Fair Good Very good Excellent

10) *In your opinion there are any gaps (both in activities implementation and expected results)? please indicate them and the critical situation related to them*

-
-
-
-

11) *What is the assessment of the ability of the partnership to work together (the extent of the collaboration, mainly referred to common activities)?*

Poor Fair Good Very good Excellent

12) *What is the assessment of the overall organization of the activities of the Project, (mainly regarding the meetings and the events)?*

Poor Fair Good Very good Excellent

13) *What is the assessment of the validity of the assumptions of the Project idea after the implementation of the activities to date?*

Poor Fair Good Very good Excellent

14) *Please, indicate any unexpected factor or new information that might jeopardize or change the Project idea:*

-
-
-
-

15) *Please list the strength and weakness of the Project to date*

Strength

-

-
-
-

Weakness

-
-
-
-

16) Is there any further issue you would like to signal?



PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND COORDINATION OF ACTIVITES

Final-term Evaluation Report – Interviews to
Stakeholders

The **evaluation activity** aims at gathering qualitative information showing achievements and critical aspects emerging from the implementation of the project for the assessment of overall effectiveness and efficiency of the BLUEKEP project.

Gathered information, through evaluation tools, will enable to assess the project relevance, the project effectiveness and innovation, the consistency between project and achieved results, the coherence within the project, the benefits for beneficiaries and partnership.

Specifically, the final-term evaluation covers the efficiency of implementation, relevance of the project, effectiveness, partners' perception of change and potential sustainability. It assesses the achievements of the project with respect to the relevance of its objectives and the attainability of its outcomes. It also assesses the project design including, to what extent the assumptions outlined in AF are valid and identifies unexpected factors beyond the control of the project that affected it negatively or positively. Special emphasis is placed on the degree to which the project has succeeded in carrying out the activities outlined in the AF.

At this purpose, the final-term evaluation foresees the realization and the supplying of the **questionnaire for the stakeholders**, aimed at evaluating the overall efficiency in project management and in the project implementation and the stakeholders' involvement in project activities, with specific attention to the implementation of the mobility phase.

Questionnaires results will be proceeded in a **Final-term Evaluation Report** concerning the consistency of the implementation of the project with the results and objectives outlined in the AF.

Project monitoring is ensured by LP, WP coordinators and SC to better adapt and tailor project advancement. Internal quality evaluation will be carried out by SC and managed by LP.

Evaluation tools used are **questionnaire**, interviews to **experts, stakeholders, statistic data and media impact**.

Please complete this questionnaire by the 19th September 2019 and mail it back to the Project Lead Partner bluekep@informest.it.



Thank you for your cooperation. We look forward to reading your answers.

FINAL-TERM EVALUATION REPORT – INTERVIEWS TO STAKEHOLDERS

The evaluation is based on a scale of values starting from 1 (unsatisfactory) to 4 (very good): the scale is present in all the items of the questionnaire in order to permit an effective data processing.

<input type="checkbox"/> 1 Unsatisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 Average	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 Good	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 Very good
--	---------------------------------------	------------------------------------	---

The mid-term questionnaire will provide to the partnership qualitative information for the project efficiency assessment on mobility and organisation procedures and issues, highlighting weakness and strengthens and providing important components for the ongoing activities of the project.



1. What is the overall assessment of the involvement of your school in the implementation of the project activities?

<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------

Remarks, if any

2. What is the assessment of the quality of communication and information flow between your school and the project partner?

<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------

Remarks, if any

3. What is the assessment of the quality of communication and information flow between your school and the matched school?

<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------

Remarks, if any

4. What is the assessment of the extent of the implementation of the mobility program compared to the foreseen plan?

<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------

Remarks, if any

.....

5. What is the assessment of the extent of the implementation of the project with respect to expected results?

<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------

Remarks, if any

.....

6. What is the assessment of the ability of the matched schools to work together (the extent of the collaboration, mainly referred to common activities related to student exchange?)

<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------

Remarks, if any

.....

7. What is the assessment of the overall organization of the activities of the project?

<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------

Remarks, if any

.....

8. What is the overall assessment of the project management?

<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------

Remarks, if any

.....

9. What is the assessment of the validity of the assumptions of the project idea after the implementation of the mobility activities?

<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------

Remarks, if any

.....

10. Please list the strengths and weakness of the student mobility exchange

Strengths:

-
-
-
-

Weakness:

-
-
-
-

11. Please list main difficulties met in preparation and implementation of the student exchanges

-
-
-
-
-
-
-



12. Any other comment or suggestion: