

Flipping First Project

2016-1-ES01-KA202-025410

Evaluation report

All Meetings

Date: October 2018

Version: 1

In this evaluation report all summaries of the five project meetings are presented. The reports that were made;

1. Kick off meeting | May 2017 | Madrid (ES)
2. Second meeting | July 2017 | Rzeszów (PL)
3. Third meeting | October 2017 | Budapest (HU)
4. Fourth meeting | January 2018 | Ghent (BE)
5. Fifth meeting | June 2018 | Burgh-Haamstede (NL)

Document Info

Document Name: Final evaluation document off all meetings

Initial version & date: October 2018

Authors: Foundation Knowledge Centre PRO WORK

Editors: Foundation Knowledge Centre PRO WORK

Distribution List

Organisation	Person
JAITEK Tecnología y Formación S.L.	Mariano Sanz Prieto Saturio Rodríguez Fernández
INNEO Studio Twórczego Rozwoju	Michal Ceglinski
Stichting Kenniscentrum PRO WORK	Tessa den Bakker Theo Grefkens
SZÁMALK Szalézi Szakgimnázium	Krisztina Juhász
Arteveldehogeschool	Lut de Jaegher
Exponential Training & Assessment Limited	John Moore

First meeting report Summary

May 2017, Madrid (ES)

Regarding to the additional remarks and the rest of the answers, it seems that the Kick off Meeting was a success, all topics have been discussed, the hosting organisation did great and all partners kept their promises before and during this activity. All the agreements that have been made are clear. Additional information is needed for the shared platform and details of dissemination. The rest from the participants seem to be positive about this meeting and left with a clear role and clear tasks. Some suggestions have been made about:

- More time during the meeting to work on project actions;
- Creating a doodle to plan the next meetings easier;
- And creating/using a flip introducing video by every partner.

Also the remark has been made that a participant would like to see more input from all the partners during the upcoming meetings. It was not a problem for now, because it was the first meeting. All partners seem to looking forward to the future of this project. Two of them are a bit careful about the (upcoming) process and team(work). But that can be explained by the fact that this is just the start.

Second meeting report Summary

July 2017, Rzeszów (PL)

Regarding to the additional remarks and the rest of the answers, it seems that the Second Meeting was a success, all topics have been discussed, the hosting organisation was reviewed ok and all partners kept their promises before and during this meeting. All the agreements that have been made were clear. Additional information is needed for the module regarding the tourism and entrepreneurship in this project.

The rest from the participants seem to be (very) positive about this meeting and left it with a clear role and clear tasks. Another remark that has been made is about the meeting itself. Someone states that during this meeting it was sometimes challenging to keep up with the movement from one file to another during discussions. This can be kept in mind the next time a meeting takes place; keep more structure and follow the agenda.

The other remarks that have been made were very positive about the meeting and project in general. Although some factors were reviewed with unsatisfied and insufficient this seems not of an essential value on the project now, especially because no clarification was made by any remarks.

Third meeting report Summary

October 2017, Budapest (HU)

Regarding to the additional remarks and the rest of the answers, it seems that the Third Meeting was a success, all topics have been discussed, the hosting organisation was reviewed positive and all partners kept their promises during this meeting. The meeting was overall effective and efficient, all partners stated that they left with a clear role and clear tasks. But one remark states that in between meetings some partners seem to forget their tasks and have difficulties with keeping their promises. Besides that, another remark states that the project goals are very ambitious and that he or she not sure is about reaching them, but will try their best.

The input from the partners has been assessed differently. The inputs from ARTEVELDEHOGESCHOOL (BE), JAITEK, Tecnología y Formación (ES), Exponential Training & Assessment Limited (UK) and SZÁMALK - Szalézi Szakgimnázium (HU) have been reviewed with 'very satisfactory' and 'satisfactory' by all participants. The input from Stichting Kenniscentrum PRO WORK (NL) is rated with 'neutral/sufficient' by one participant. The input from INNEO - Studio Twórczego Rozwoju (PL) has been reviewed with 'insufficient' by one participant. The remark that has been made is supporting the outcome of this diagram. It stated that INNEO is very quiet, which can be connected to the answer 'insufficient' and that some partners are arriving late and leaving early, which can be connected to the answer 'neutral/sufficient' that was given for the input of PRO WORK who arrived later.

The quality of development is reviewed positive, one partner filled in 'neutral' as answer but did not explain this in the comments. The partners were positive about the project activities, the project evaluation, IO5 & IO6 and IO3 & IO4 are reviewed by one participant with 'neutral', but there is no clarification for this answer in the remarks. The communication between project partners and the division of roles and task between project partners are also reviewed with 'neutral'. There were no remarks made at this question, but at question 12 two suggestions have been made. The first suggestion that has been made, is about the possibility of online communication and using a discussion platform. The second suggestion that has been made, is about using the project management application for better communication, clarifying tasks and monitor overall.

At question 10 two of the seven positive remarks stated that there were some delays. The other remark that has been made is about the project is at this time centred around the coordinator which makes it difficult to know what is happening, besides that Own Cloud is not helping. Several partners have struggled with using Own Cloud effectively.

The other remarks that have been made were very positive about the meeting and project in general. Although some factors were reviewed with unsatisfied and insufficient this seems not of an essential value on the project now, especially because no clarification was made by any remarks.

Fourth meeting report Summary

January 2018, Ghent (BE)

Regarding to the additional remarks and the rest of the answers, it seems that the Fourth Meeting was a success again, all topics have been discussed, the hosting organisation was reviewed positive and all partners kept their promises during this meeting. The meeting was overall effective and efficient, the partners stated that they left with a clear role and clear tasks. Besides that, a remark states the project is less innovative than expected on beforehand. And the dissemination of the project should be improved.

The input from the partners has been assessed differently. The inputs of all ARTEVELDEHOGESCHOOL (BE), JAITEK, Tecnología y Formación (ES) and Stichting Kenniscentrum PRO WORK (NL) was very sufficient. The Exponential Training & Assessment Limited (UK) and INNEO - Studio Twórczego Rozwoju (PL) have been reviewed with 'satisfactory' by the participants. Only SZÁMALK - Szalézi Szakgimnázium (HU) scored an insufficient score. Which cannot be related to the remark made, that UK and PL lack of an active participation.

The quality of development is reviewed positive, one partner filled in 'neutral' as answer but did not explain this in the comments. The partners were positive about the project activities, only the discussion of IO's scored less. The communication between project partners and the division of roles and task between project partners are also reviewed with 'neutral', but one remark states that in between meetings some partners would like to improve the communication (online). The fact the budget was cut a lot, was mentioned as well, especially with regard to the not equally amount of work for the ES partner in relation to the other partners.

At question 10 all seven participants made a remark, most of them were very positive about the fourth meeting of this project and progress of the project. A remark was made about the very little time to deliver the pilot and evaluate it, and one remark was made about the quality of the project that should be improved. A little bit confusion during the meeting was the third more critical remark made. Next to that the used platforms for the different activities remain unclear to some of the partners.

Fifth meeting report Summary

June 2018, Burgh-Haamstede (NL)

Regarding to the additional remarks and the rest of the answers, it seems that the Fifth and final Meeting was a success again, all topics have been discussed and a lot of progress has been made in the meeting, the hosting organisation was reviewed very positive and all partners kept their promises during this meeting. The meeting was overall effective and efficient, the partners stated that they left with a clear role and clear tasks. On the other hand, some remarks were made regarding the progress, platforms used and timing.

The input from the partners has been assessed differently. The inputs of especially Stichting Kenniscentrum PRO WORK (NL), but also ARTEVELDEHOGESCHOOL (BE) and JAITEK, Tecnología y Formación (ES) was very sufficient. The Exponential Training & Assessment Limited (UK) and SZÁMALK - Szalézi Szakgimnázium (HU) scored least well, especially the UK partners because they were not present at the meeting. INNEO - Studio Twórczego Rozwoju (PL) have been reviewed ‘satisfactory’ by the participants.

The quality of the development is reviewed positive, especially regarding all work done in this meeting. The partners were positive about the project activities, only the discussion of IO 5 and 6 scored less. The communication between project partners and the division of roles and task between project partners are also reviewed ok and better in relation to the progress before in the project.

At question 10 almost all remarks made by the participants were positive, one remark was less positive regarding the unclarity of the use of platforms. Nevertheless, the project evaluation seems to be better than the fourth meeting evaluation which can be linked especially by the fact more things were made clear in this meeting and a lot of practical work has been done.

Summary all meetings

Flipping First project 2016 – 2018

Regarding all meetings and meeting reports, the overall statements that were given in each evaluation report were positive. No major changes needed to be made, as well as progress, structure, content and guidance that were sufficient.

Of course, some remarks, answers and statements were made, which were detected by these surveys and written reports and could be improved during the project period. Therefore this evaluation system was essential for the final positive finalization of the project. that was worked on in the project period. A few head topics;

- Planning/Progress; This topic came back in every survey and was rated differently every time. Concluding; The planning/progress has been improved during the project period and in the final meeting report a lot of positive remarks were made on behalf of the project planning and progress.
- Partner contribution; Some partners stated not all of the partners were delivering or contributed in the project as they should. Luckily no major changes needed to be made and the project coordinator could handle the motivation needed by the partners that needed this. Concluding; some partners contributed on a higher level and on a more motivated/structural level than others. This can be related to priority, expertise and experience.
- Project coordination; The project coordination is reviewed positive during the project period. Especially in the final report there were statements about the sufficient lead of JAITEK in this project.