

Project title: TELL ME a story
Programme: Lifelong Learning Programme
Sub-programme: Grundtvig
Action type: Partnerships 2012
Action: Grundtvig Learning Partnerships



Tell Me a Story Project



Evaluation report

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication [communication] reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Evaluation Form - questions

Evaluation of the organisation of the partner meeting

1. Were you satisfied with the means of communication (mailing group) before the partners meeting? (e.g quantity and quality of information flow before the meeting; communication management by the coordinator and another partners)
2. Did the seminar room meet your expectations? (e.g. location, equipment, size, table structure etc.)
3. Were you satisfied with the agenda of the meeting? (e.g. time structure, involvement of the partners, appropriateness of methods and issues etc.)

Evaluation of the quality and relevance of the topics covered during the meeting

4. Were you satisfied with all the information and materials you received during the meeting concerning the agenda and structure of the project? (e.g. work, dissemination and evaluation plans; aims and objectives of the project etc.)
5. Were you satisfied with all the information you received concerning the next project steps and are you aware of what kind of contributions will be expected from you?
6. Were you satisfied with the working atmosphere during the meeting?
7. (e.g. Did everybody have the opportunity and chance to contribute properly and equally to this project meeting? Was everybody's opinion heard and respected? etc.)
8. Do you think the meeting was generally successful? Do you think the project group was able to achieve relevant results and to make some progress in its work?

The Coordination

9. Were you satisfied with the way the meeting was managed (coordinated)? (e.g. communication, moderation and social skills; time/crises/conflict management etc.)

The evaluation of the project partners

10. Were you satisfied with the level and quality of other partners' contributions to this meeting?
11. – 15. Were you satisfied with the preparation and involvement of the partner from.... ? (e.g. finishing their tasks on time, partners respond to questions, partners cooperate, partners are ready to help etc.)

The Evaluation of the Project Website

16. Is the project website available and functions well?
17. Are the information on the project website sufficient?
18. Is the structure of the website clear and are the information you need easy to find?

Analysis of „evaluation reports” made after project meetings

Evaluation of the organisation of the partner meeting, Poland, Portugal, Netherlands, Italy

Question 1

In the questionnaires filled by partners after the meetings, they have shown that they were very satisfied with exchange of information, communication between the meetings, information provided by the project coordinator and contact opportunities made possible by mailing list. Analysis of evaluation reports have shown that for the question: *Were you satisfied with the means of communication (mailing list) before the partners meeting?* 63% of the responders have chosen „very satisfied” answer, 29% - „satisfied” while only 8% claimed that they were „less than satisfactory”. These results plainly show that the exchange of information between consecutive meetings was maintained at an adequate level which allowed exchange of ideas, views and unhindered execution of project's tasks. It is clear that the communication, exchange of information, contact between the partners and the provided means of communication were all more than adequate and performed amiably during the whole TELL ME A STORY project.

Question 2

Question 2: *Did the seminar room meet your expectations?* Results of the poll show that localization, size and furnishings of the conference rooms have met the expectations of meetings' participants. 49% responders stated that conference rooms and meeting places were designed in a satisfactory way. 38% responders thought the furnishings to be very adequate. Only 13% of the participants chosen the less than satisfactory answer. In the light of these results it is reasonable to claim that the location of the meetings and its outfitting were well prepared and satisfactory.

Question 3

Question 3: *Were you satisfied with the agenda of the meeting?*

Polls show that the partners were very satisfied with agendas of the meetings, which were prepared by the hosts. Information regarding the meeting containing among others the key points of the discussion and undertaken tasks was provided by the hosts and sent to the partners in advance. Responders in the evaluation polls have chosen following answers: very satisfactory (68%), satisfactory (30%), less than satisfactory (8%). It is safe to claim that time structure, involvement of the partners, appropriateness of methods and issues were all well thought out and prepared by the hosts. Project's partners have prepared the agendas of the meetings in satisfactory manner, executed them well and chosen adequate means of handling information. All the meetings have been highly rated and all the host countries acquired more than 50% high ratings in the poll.

Evaluation of the quality and relevance of the topics covered during the meeting

Question 4

Participants of the project were satisfied with the information concerning: the project, agenda of the meeting and undertaken actions, which was provided during the meetings. The question *Were you satisfied with all the information and materials you received during the meeting concerning the agenda and structure of the project* have received 57% „very satisfied”, 32% „satisfied” and 11% „less than satisfied” answers. Provided information contained: dissemination and evaluation plans; aims and objectives of the project etc. The information was highly rated. All the necessary aids and information were discussed before, during and after the meetings in the form of written summaries.

Question 5

Question: *Were you satisfied with all the information you received concerning the next project steps and are you aware of what kind of contributions will be expected from you?*

Responders' answers: 40% „very satisfied”, 54% „satisfied”, 6% „less than satisfied”.

Participants of the project were generally satisfied with given information regarding the project, undertaken tasks and upcoming project's stages. Amount of information on the project itself and on the particular tasks assigned to the partners was judged to be adequate by the responders. Project consisted of both cooperatively performed tasks and assignments given to individual participants. They were discussed in detail during the meetings and the summaries were distributed via internet.

Question 6

Question: *Were you satisfied with the working atmosphere during the meeting?*

Responders' answers: 70% „very satisfied”, 20% „satisfied”, 10% „less than satisfied”

The atmosphere of the meetings was rated by the participants as very satisfactory and it may be assumed that it met their expectations. According to the partners all participants of the meeting were treated fairly, given the opportunity to speak their mind and were heard. They could also take part in tasks performed during the meetings. 90% of the project's participants claimed that they had an opportunity to take action and impacted the development of the project. The atmosphere was beneficial to cooperation, exchange of ideas and as a result positively affected the performance of project's tasks.

Question 7

Question: *Do you think the meeting was generally successful? Do you think the project group was able to achieve relevant results and to make some progress in its work?*

72% of the responders deemed the meetings to be very successful and satisfactory. According to the project's partners the tasks performed during the meetings were satisfactory and led to improvement of the project. Remaining 28% of the poll's participants were satisfied with the meetings and believed them to be useful. It is reasonable then to conclude that the meetings were a success and in the eyes of their participants had a positive effect on project's development and achieving planned results.

The Coordination

Question 8

Question: *Were you satisfied with the way the meeting was managed (coordinated)?*

61% of the responders answered that they are very satisfied with the way the partner meetings were coordinated. 34% of the project's partners in response to this question stated that: communication, moderation and social skills; time/crisis's/conflict management etc were adequate. 5% have chosen „less than satisfied” answer. Hosts of the meetings and coordinators have been positively rated. Project's partners have shown excellent management skills which resulted in the meetings rated highly by the participants. The positive feedback from the participants in previous questions is a further proof of their satisfaction with the hosts' performance.

Question 9

Question: *Were you satisfied with the level and quality of other partners' contributions to this meeting?*

58% have answered that they were „very satisfied”, 37% - „satisfied” and only 5% were „less than satisfied”.

Project's partners have shown that they were content with the quality of their peers' work. Project's partners who were visiting in host's country have shown a great deal of involvement which was made manifest in acts such as: active participation in prepared mandatory and facultative tasks, engagement in both essential and artistic activities, exchange of good practice, preparation for the meetings, multimedia presentations and speeches.

Questions 10,12,13,14,15

Question: *Were you satisfied with the preparation and involvement of the partner from...*

Questions 10 to 15 concerned the level of satisfaction with preparation and involvement of all the project's partners who participated in the meetings. Rating was broken down into parts such as: timely finishing the given tasks, response to questions, cooperation, helpfulness etc. The partners usually rated their peers very highly. The preparation work and involvement were most commonly cited as the reasons for high rating. The “less than satisfied” answer was chosen relatively rarely. During the meetings various activities took place: training sessions, performances of acting groups, discussions, coordinators' meetings etc.

The Evaluation of the Project Website

Questions 16,17,18

Project's website has received positive scores in the polls. It met the partners' requirements for both the form and contents. The website has clear design allowing easy and fast access to needed information.

Question: *Is the project website available and functioning well?*

Answers: 64% very satisfactory, 26% satisfactory, 10% less than satisfactory

Question: *Are the information on the project's website sufficient?*

Answers: 57% very satisfactory, 31% satisfactory, 12% less than satisfactory

Question: *Is the structure of the website clear and are the information you need easy to find?*

Answers: 60% very satisfactory, 30% satisfactory, 10% less than satisfactory

Comments of the responders

If there is anything else you want to add or if there was a relevant issue not mentioned in this questionnaire, please be so kind to use the space below:

Response 1: *Generally, the project is being developed with interest and cooperation from all the participants. The structure is adequate to fulfil the final objectives*

Response 2: *We think that in general we could say that in this meeting everything was perfect and I hope that in the future we could do a nice job and create new opportunities and partnerships among us. Probably in Portugal we will have a nice meeting like this one.*

Response 3: *Many thanks to all organisers for providing this great project of understanding!*

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication [communication] reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Recapitulation:

The results of the polls show that the project's partners have prepared the meetings in satisfactory manner in regards to both its content-related and technical aspects. Locations of the meetings and their outfitting were adequate and met the expectations of the project's partners. All content-related issues were handled satisfactorily, as for the meetings - the agendas, courses, conclusions and summaries were adequate. Participants knew beforehand the plans and tasks to be performed during the meetings. Coordinators have designed a fine mixture of both content-related theoretical activities and a more practical tasks to optimize their effect and attractiveness. As a result the participants of the meetings actively took part in both. Various aids prepared by the hosts were an additional benefit to the meetings and were positively received by the project's partners. Tasks required of the hosts and rated in the polls included outlining the project's goals, strategy, undertaken tasks, failures and new ideas. In consequence during the meetings discussions took place regarding upcoming tasks and the direction the whole project should be moving in – this has been perceived as useful and satisfactory by the polls' participants. Considering both the performance of the hosts and participants, the project's meetings have been positively received. The rating included: atmosphere, organization, location, furnishings, involvement of all parties. Project's participants have performed various tasks both mandatory, outlined in the project and many more which moved beyond it. During the meetings there was an ample opportunity for discussion, exchange of good practice, inter-generational exchange and spontaneous artistic acts. The meetings in general had such a powerful and positive effect that participants of the polls' after each meeting stated that they are able to perceive the improvement of the project. They believed that the meetings serve to bring them closer to the planned goals. The rating of project's website was also included in the polls. Content and design of the website have been both highly praised. Information on the website was constantly updated and provided an important orientation point for the project's partners.



This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication [communication] reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

SUMMATION OF THE TELL ME A STORY PROJECT

Weak points of the project:

- communication between partners was sometimes problematic, a new means of communication, especially exploiting the new technologies, should be investigated;
- discrepancies between partners in regards to involvement, communication skills, quality of work; every participant approached their tasks in an individual way in a manner befitting their will and capabilities;
- there should be more meetings, cooperative work, exchange of experiences and practice;
- it was necessary to encourage the participants to achieve their full involvement, active participation and spontaneity.

Subjective issues, mainly concerning individual involvement of project's participants, quality of work, activity during meetings and local initiatives can be perceived as a weak point of the project. It is important to assign tasks fairly, instill an attitude of responsibility for the outcome, focus on mutual goals.

The project included both theoretical and practical tasks due to its educational, scientific and artistic aspects. The focus of the project's participants was to perform mainly practical tasks and use the workshop methods. They are more beneficial for the participants. New methods and techniques should be researched. Activation of participants is also an important skill – the ability to work on their fears, barriers and shyness. The communication is also an issue – new ways should be researched in order to improve the exchange of information and good practice.

Strong points of the project:

- good organization of project's meetings, involvement;
- friendly atmosphere allowing cooperation;
- attractive and useful workshops;
- exchange of good practice;
- international, intercultural and inter-generational exchange;
- possibility of meeting representatives of different countries, ages and environments;
- multi-level integration;
- use of theater in adult education; educational potential of theater in general;
- work with the elderly, acknowledgement of their wisdom and potential;
- activation of the elderly, work with the marginalized group, providing them the way to be active;
- creation of theatrical groups;
- possibility of travel, meeting different cultures, good practice, customs, improving tolerance.

The integrative aspect on all of its levels (international, intercultural, inter-generational) is one of the main strong points of the project. Inspiring reflection, tolerance, forgiveness, curiosity. The project positively affected the exchange of good practice, perception of the potential of the elderly, educational potential of the theater. The project made possible a variety of educational and artistic acts. It created an opportunity to exchange knowledge but also to discuss, reflect and participate in cooperative work. The project has had a positive results on institutional, local and individual levels. It has given a new broader look on an education, integration and culture from a international and inter-generational perspective.

Impact on the education of seniors. How could we improve the education of seniors using our techniques or methods of teaching?

- cooperative inter-generational work which involved on different levels the elderly, adults and adolescent created good atmosphere for learning;
- creating good atmosphere for recreation; creating proper environment for learning improves the results and time requirements;
- performing various, intriguing educational tasks such as theatrical acts – it allows one to improve memory and learn new behaviors, confront with different roles, cooperate with others;
- enriching the educational process with the use of knowledge of both the elderly and the young;
- appreciation of varied life and educational experiences, learning from life and biography;
- plenty of practical workshops; assigning tasks inspires involvement.

According to many partners, the tasks undertaken during the TELL ME A STORY project can be successfully used in education.

Primary focus should be on the theatrical method in education of the elderly and adults. It is creative method which may yield many interesting results. It is useful in inter-generational and international related tasks, it can also be used with variety of themes – it is not rigid therefore it inspires creativity. In the education of the elderly all items that inspire body and mind are important to encourage mental activity, as such theatrical works are well tailored to them since they contain both the physical element and memory training. For the educational purposes the context of inter-generational work is important – learning from biography, exchange of experiences, teaching from life, storytelling, clash of “differing worlds”. Interesting and important from researcher's perspective is the international and intercultural theme and gaining knowledge from disciplines like culture studies, ethnology, theater studies and music studies. The activities of the project therefore have a broad potential of uses in educational practice of the elderly and adults.