

# PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND COORDINATION OF ACTIVITES

## Mid-term Evaluation Report

## MID-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, 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 mid-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 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 mid-term evaluation foresees the realization and the supplying of **questionnaires** for **the project partnership** (PP1 Adriatic Ionian EuroRegion, PP2 Region Marche, pp3 Istria Region, PP4 RRA Public Institution Development Agency of Šibenik-Knin County, PP5 RERA - Public institution for coordination and development of Split Dalmatia-County), for **the partners' educational experts** and for **the stakeholders** (accredited schools from: Friuli Venezia Giulia Region: ISIS Malignani Udine, ISIS Brignoli Einaudi Marconi (BEM) Staranzano-Gradisca d'Isonzo (GO), Istituto Nautico Tomaso di Savoia Duca di Genova – Luigi Galvani Trieste, ENAIP FVG Pasian di Prato (UD); from Marche Region: ISIS Fazzini Mercantini Grottammare (AP), ITT Montani Fermo, ISIS Volterra Elia Ancona; from Istria Region: Technical School Pula; from Sibenik-Knin County: Industrial Craft School Sibenik, Traffic Technical School Sibenik, Technical School Sibenik; from Split-Dalmatia County: Nautical High School Split), aimed at evaluating the efficiency in mid-term project management and in the project implementation from different points of view.

Questionnaires results are proceeded in a Mid-term Evaluation Report concerning the consistency of the implementation of the project with the results and objectives outlined in the Application form.

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

Addressed questionnaires are mainly composed by scaled questions, Yes/No question 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 answer specified. The open answers have been reported in full, omitting only the name of the respondent.

On April 2, 2019, the LP sent Mid-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 ENAIP Pasion di Prato school, reporting the opinion of the whole set of involved subjects in the activities.

May 2019

## *Index*

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

## *Annexes - Templates*

## 1. PROJECT PARTNERS QUESTIONNAIRE

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

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?** 4 out of 5 consider it good, while 1 very good.
- 8) **How do you rate the external communication by the BLUEKEP Project?** 3 out of 5 consider it good, while 2 very 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.** 4 out of 5 agree to this question, while 1 declares neutral.
- 10) **The WP2 coordinator is providing effective support and supervision of its activities.** 4 out of 5 agree to this question, while 1 strongly agree.
- 11) **The WP3 coordinator is providing effective support and supervision of its activities.** 4 out of 5 agree to this question, while 1 strongly agree.
- 12) **The WP4 coordinator is providing effective support and supervision of its activities.** 4 out of 5 agree to this question, while 1 declares neutral.

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 5 consider it good, while 2 very 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 5 consider them on schedule, while 2 behind schedule.

- Delay on the start on the project activities
- Project has started later than it is planned. Also, problems in communication who is covering which costs and problems of eligible project costs that results on progress report with possibilities of rejection of spent cost by FLC and problems with Croatian law.

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

15) **Do you attend the project's meetings on regular basis?** 5 out of 5 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?** All respondents consider it very 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 2 respondents gave a contribution.

- The involvement of a fewer number of schools would have improved the efficiency of matching process between schools. A more coordinated/synchronised time framework of the mobilities could have facilitated the jointly evaluation of the exchange results and the tutoring activities.
- In next project that are like this better selecting of the school so the matching could be done easier. Also, better elaboration of budget costs, so that at very beginning of the project is known what are eligible project costs.

## 2. EXPERTS' PROJECT PARTNERS QUESTIONNAIRE

The first 3 questions contained in the project Mid-Term Evaluation Questionnaire for experts acting in 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?** 2 out of 5 consider it as very good, 1 excellent, 1 good and 1 fair.
- 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, 1 excellent, 2 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, 1 excellent, 1 very good.

Following questions are related to communication evaluation.

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

Evaluation on technical WP coordinators.

**6) The WP<sub>3</sub> coordinator is providing effective support and supervision of its activities.** 3 out of 5 consider it as very good, 2 good.

As remarks, it has been highlighted the capacity to solve the problem of school matching, but some delays in sharing models and grids could have been avoided. Some details about module were not defined as details of agreement with companies.

**7) The WP<sub>4</sub> coordinator is providing effective support and supervision of its activities.** 2 out of 5 consider it as excellent, 1 very good, 1 good, 1 fair.

As comments, many issues, both minor and important, related to the exchange programme were solved and all the materials (reports, assessment forms, etc.) have been timely delivered and shared with the partnership. Some details about evaluation of the module are not clearly defined.

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 good, 1 very good, 1 excellent.

**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, 1 very good, 1 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.** 3 out of 5 responded to the question, as follow:

- Up to date, all the issues have been solved in a positive way. The work-based learning programme in Companies is still to be held, but the first part of the exchange has been managed successfully.
- Since the request to extend the project duration has been accepted by the Managing Authority, the partnership will have enough time to accomplish all the activities.
- The delay with the start of the project activities (including of WP3 activities that essentially started after Summer 2018) has remarkably reduced available time for the partnership for coordinating joint activities of WP3 activities.
- School programs are not compatible enough, so modules should be too general. It is too difficult to develop competencies if the modules are too general.

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

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, 1 good, 1 fair.

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?** 2 out of 5 consider it as excellent, 2 good, 1 fair.

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

- New Italian law, that has lowered the total number of hours of “Alternanza scuola lavoro”, might affect the involvement of the students in the exchange activities
- Just writing this questionnaire without having done the practical lessons of Italian students is debatable, for the objectivity of the evaluation.
- Unclear definition of the module may jeopardize the final outcomes.

**15) Please list the strength and weakness of the Project to date. (gathered answers)**

Strengths:

- Similar education systems in both Countries
- Similarities in culture and society organization help the student to live at ease during the exchange.
- Good technical facilities in the schools involved (laboratories, ...).
- Strong commitment of the Lead partner to solve minor problems (before and during exchange).
- Easy path to new co-operation
- Both use and informal implementation of positive things in concrete teaching
- The speed for new adjustments is decreasing
- Friendship
- Multiculturalism
- Life experience
- Project consortium

Weaknesses:

- Lack of a perfect matching between Nautical schools (Croatia) and other technical schools (Italy, mainly FVG) due to the School system organization.

- Students underage must be accompanied in all the activities during the exchange and in the Companies' facilities; organization would be simpler with students of age
- Lack of sufficient time to coordinate activities with special regard to technical activities during the Steering Committee and project meetings. With this regard, in our opinion it would be convenient to dedicate 1 and half working days for each SCM and PM to jointly evaluate and plan project activities.
- Variety of school calendars
- Some undefined details
- Language barriers
- Differences in the educational systems

16) **Is there any further issue you would like to signal?** 1 consideration.

- The role of Regione FVG in some dissemination events could be important to spread information about this project

### 3. STAKEHOLDERS QUESTIONNAIRE

The opening questions contained in the project Mid-Term Evaluation Questionnaire for stakeholders (11 responding accredited schools (only ENAIP Pasion di Prato did not answer to the questionnaire -we have also to consider that Nautico-Galvani Trieste compiled only a questionnaire even if they had an exchange with two Croatian schools) were about the project overall implementation, communication and organisation viewed from the point of view of the accredited schools. The addressed questions were asked, using a Likert-type scale. Four options were provided: "Unsatisfactory", "Average", "Good" and "Very good".

1. **What is the overall assessment of the involvement of your school in the implementation of the project activities?** 8 out of 11 respondents consider it as very good, 3 good.
2. **What is the assessment of the quality of communication and information flow between your school and the project partner?** 8 out of 11 respondents consider it as good, 3 very good
3. **What is the assessment of the quality of communication and information flow between your school and the matched school?** 7 out of 11 respondents consider it as very good, 2 good and 2 on average  
One remark was the lack or delay of proper information.
4. **What is the assessment of the extent of the implementation of the mobility program compared to the foreseen plan?** 5 out of 11 respondents consider it as very good, 5 good while one did not answer not having yet started (the activity).

5. **What is the assessment of the extent of the implementation of the project with respect to expected results to be achieved?** 6 out of 11 respondents consider it as good, 3 as very good while 2 on average.
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, 3 as good while 2 on average.
7. **What is the assessment of the overall organization of the activities of the project?** 9 out of 11 respondents consider it as good, 2 as good.
  - One remark highlighted that the ongoing definition and improvements of documents has sometimes created some difficulties
8. **What is the overall assessment of the project management?** 9 out of 11 respondents consider it as good, 2 as good.
  - One remark highlighted that Hopefully many aspects of the mobility should have been more precisely defined in advance
9. **What is the assessment of the validity of the assumptions of the project idea after the implementation of the activities to date?** 6 out of 11 respondents consider it as good, 3 as very good and 2 on average.
  - One remark highlighted that School programs are not compatible enough
10. **Please list the strengths and weakness of the student mobility exchange to date** (multiple answers are unified for each responder)

### Strengths

- Communication between Schools; Motivating activities carried out during the school time and in the free time; Better knowledge of the school system
- Knowledge 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*
- *great experience for students; multiculturalism; language competences; technical competences ; friendship; new experience*
- *Intercultural exchange; New experiences; Very good matching school; Very good students participating in the exchange program*
- Languages (Croatian: elementary; English: general knowledge improvement); Full immersion in Croatian culture; Life skills development (autonomy; self-confidence; motivation; resilience)
- good preparation phases and good planning of the range of the activities; organized for the students

### Weaknesses

- Training experience: only 4-5 hours per day could be increased up to 8 hours per day

- It was not possible to put the Croatian students in a single class and this reduced the interactions between students who did not know each other
- *Differences between the two education systems, subject curricula and grading system*
- *not so good accommodation; untimely information; no pocket money for students*
- *limited authority in companies; long duration in companies*
- *No pocket money for the students; Almost constant change of important information; Very stressful and unprofessional "school matching meeting" in Pula; It would have been better if the practical part had lasted only three weeks instead of four*
- Internship partners not always fulfilling the students' expectations and needs
- Period of mobility was too long to be carried out during the normal school activity. It would have been a better solution to plan it during the summer or for fewer weeks at the end of the school terms
- Excessive lasting of the mobility period

Following question is strictly related to practical/organisational problems met during the project preparation.

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
- During the preparation phase: find two technical specializations with similar curriculum; During the implementation phase: replace a sick teacher
- *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*
- *No difficulties*
- *Some project definitions are not defined at the beginning; Define of matching dates*

- *No pocket money for the students; Almost constant change of important information; Very stressful and unprofessional "school matching meeting" in Pula; It would have been better if the practical part had lasted only three weeks instead of four*
- Identification of tutoring responsibilities for the whole period and definition of mobility tutors' schedule
- There were delays in the communication of the requests and needs of the Croatian partner-school (the work placement activity already arranged by the school in Fermo had to be changed when the students arrived); Two of the Croatian students in Fermo showed unwillingness and poor collaboration in carrying out the work placement activities organized for them, even if those activities had been re-arranged after specific requests on behalf of the Croatian partner

**12. Any other comment or suggestion**

- Beautiful experience and new friendship

#### 4. FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

At first glance, none of all three shared surveys (respondents: project partners PP, partner experts PE, stakeholders SK) evidenced negative evaluations, and the overall average of the answers is satisfying.

The evaluation outcomes do not differ significantly by comparing the three 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, and from the global consideration of the management of the communication issues.

On the whole more than satisfactory can be assessed the level of cooperation in project partnership, the capacity to work together, the overall meetings' organisation and the incentive of PP involvement expressed 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 remarks and the open answers given by some PPs and PEs respondents that further contribute with considerations on specific mobility issues on project weaknesses. These can be mainly listed in the starting delays that implied consequences in the project implementation specially upon the coordination of activities, the large number of selected schools with different technical educational addresses, making school programs not enough compatible and impacting on the optimal matching among some schools. The school decision to request for a mandatory accompanying of the students, delays and undefined details on modules, were also stressed as potentially barriers to a plain project implementation.

In the ***assessment provided by accredited schools on their mid-term experience in the project mobility programme***, the answers given to the Strengths/Weaknesses interview question are the best mirror of their interest into the BLUE KEP project, their involvement and expectation. To these, specific-targeted answers were not considered (being reported).

As positive atouts are enumerated (not exhaustive list) the acquired experience and motivation for students in terms of increased language, life skills and technical competences, the intercultural exchange, the comparison between different educational systems and the approach of the same, the sharing of communication and best practices among schools and teachers leading to possible further collaboration and the development of collaboration among schools and the sea economy manufacturing sector (companies).

On the other hand, vulnerabilities met by schools regard mainly the duration of traineeship in companies (primarily on the part of Croatian schools) if not the excessive lasting of the entire mobility period (for Croatian part) and the difficulty to cope with different educational systems and school curricula some delays and unproper information flows in mobility organisation and the difficulties to individuate the accompanists. A very heard element on the Croatian side was the absence of availability of pocket money for students during their mobility period exchange in hosting country.

# PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND COORDINATION OF ACTIVITIES

Mid-term Evaluation Report - Project Partners

## MID-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 mid-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 mid-term evaluation foresees the realization and the supplying of the **questionnaire for the project partnership**, addressed to the partnership and aimed at evaluating the efficiency in project management and in the project implementation.

Questionnaires results will be proceeded in a Mid-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 **19<sup>th</sup> April 2019** and mail it back to the Project Lead Partner [bluekep@informest.it](mailto:bluekep@informest.it).

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

**Please rate the following statements**

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

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

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

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

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

<b>6) Our budget for the BLUEKEP Project is adequate</b>
Strongly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Disagree <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree <input type="checkbox"/>

<b>7) How do you rate the internal communication within the BLUEKEP partnership?</b>
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>

<b>8) How do you rate the external communication by the BLUEKEP Project?</b>
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**

<b>9) The WP<sub>1</sub> coordinator is providing effective support and supervision of its activities</b>
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>

<b>10) The WP2 coordinator is providing effective support and supervision of its activities</b>
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>

<b>11) The WP3 coordinator is providing effective support and supervision of its activities</b>
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>

<b>12) The WP4 coordinator is providing effective support and supervision of its activities</b>
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>

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

<b>14) The progress of your project's activities is</b>
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>

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

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

<b>17) Is there any further issue you would like to signal?</b>

# PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND COORDINATION OF ACTIVITIES

Mid-term Evaluation Report – Interviews to Experts

## MID-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 mid-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 mid-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 efficiency in project management and implementation, and the experts' involvement in project technical activities.

Questionnaires results will be proceeded in a Mid-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 **19<sup>th</sup> April 2019** and mail it back to the Project Lead Partner [bluekep@informest.it](mailto: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 WP<sub>3</sub> coordinator is providing effective support and supervision of its activities*

Poor   Fair   Good   Very good   Excellent

**Comments ...**

7) *The WP<sub>4</sub> 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 ACTIVITIES

Mid-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 mid-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 mid-term evaluation foresees the realization and the supplying of the **questionnaire for the stakeholders**, aimed at evaluating the efficiency in project management and in the project implementation and the stakeholders' involvement in project activities.

Questionnaires results will be proceeded in a Mid-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 5<sup>th</sup> April 2019 and mail it back to the Project Lead Partner [bluekep@informest.it](mailto:bluekep@informest.it).

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

## MID-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 to be achieved?**

<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 activities to date?**

<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 to date**

**Strengths:**

- 
- 
- 
- 

**Weakness:**

- 
- 
- 
- 

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

- .....
- .....
- .....
- .....
- .....
- .....

**12. Any other comment or suggestion:**