

VOLUNTEERS IN PLAY – EMPOLYMENT ROUTES (VIPER)

2013-1-GB2-LEO05-10638

(Lifelong Learning Programme Transfer of innovation, multilateral projects, Leonardo da Vinci)

External evaluation

The College of Physical Education and Sport PALESTRA, L.t.d.

Evaluation report May 2015 (Jan-April 2015)

Contents

Evaluation - First Quarter 2015	2
FOREWORD	2
EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT ViPER DEVELOPMENT IN THE PERIOD JANUARY - APRIL 2015.....	3
EVALUATION OF THE LANGUAGE VERSIONS.....	4
ASSESSMENT OF THE TEAM COOPERATION	4
EVALUATION OF THE TRAINERS TRAININGS	4
EVALUATION OF THE FURTHER PROJECT DEVELOPMENT, VISIBILITY	5
SKYPE MEETING EVALUATION.....	6
SUMMARY OF THE EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE	6
PROJECT PUBLICITY	7

Evaluation - First Quarter 2015

The evaluation was focused on the following areas:

- Development and keeping schedule of the project ViPER,
- Evaluation of the trainers trainings,
- Evaluation of the language versions of study materials that the
- Instructor will work with.
- Realized skype meeting evaluation

FOREWORD

Evaluation questionnaires were sent 19th of April, 2015 to the project partners (7 subjects, total of 23 e-mail addresses), the partners sent back the questionnaires in the period from 20th to 30th April. Fully completed questionnaires were just three, one questionnaire was returned blank and two were only partially filled. Overall, the answers came from 5 subjects (blank questionnaire is excluded), therefore return was 71%. If we take only fully completed questionnaires, the return was 43%. This situation could negatively affected the ability to create high-quality output report and assessment of the particular areas because some parts of the document were only from three partners. After discussion, we decided to use just returned back questionnaires including the incomplete ones because the intensity of the feedback in each period is significant inherent value.

Evaluation of the individual areas is presented separately; evaluation survey is a summary of the obtained data and recommendations from the interviewed teams. For further evaluation of the project would be good to specify one particular person to be in charge and responsible for completing the documents for evaluation, to avoid situations when all people in the team get an e-mail and nobody responds. External evaluators could significantly simplify the ability to communicate with the individual partners. Within this monitoring period, we used the database of e-mail addresses from a standard communication within the project, unfortunately, not very satisfactorily. We see this situation seemingly not completely transparent to the partners.

EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT ViPER DEVELOPMENT IN THE PERIOD JANUARY - APRIL 2015

The project development is perceived positively by the teams, some teams (three out of five) rather frequently referred that the project is carried out with slight changes from the original schedule, two other teams see the process unchanged.

The reason for the slight changes is:

- **high interest in the training of volunteers;**
- extension of the time devoted to the training of students and the training of larger number of volunteers than was originally planned;
- Delays in the implementation process in proofreading of the language versions which led to a delay in the organization of the training courses.

Teams do not perceive delay negatively, in their opinion; there is any negative impact on the pilot testing.

Important moments in the project ViPER development in the first quarter of 2015

- Preparation and implementation of the pilot training courses for trainers and students, including the evaluation of these courses.
- 13th National Playwork Conference in Eastbourne organization
- Training of trainers realization, trainers satisfied with the level of the project. Positive feedback on the training.
- Establishing cooperation of the trained trainers together with the project team.
- Training students realization and positive feedback from them
- Initiation of the piloting process and trainings, positive feedback from trainers and students is very important for the development of further phases of the project.

Teams agree that the important point was the opening of training courses for trainers and students. Courses are evaluated positively by students and trainers as well. The question is, what is the attitude to this project phase of those who did not reply the questionnaire.

EVALUATION OF THE LANGUAGE VERSIONS

In the evaluation of the language versions the teams state that language versions were received according to the schedule, in the previous investigation, however, most of the teams could not assess the language version because language versions were not available (according to the project schedule were supposed to be available in the previous quarter - see reviews Previous project phase).

The teams distinguish in evaluating the quality of the language versions, which could be attributed to the different linguistic background and the expected quality of the various translations of the particular versions in the particular country.

At the same time one team in verbal commentary stresses that there was no delay in translation but delay in proofreading.

The English team did not complete this part; logically their version did not require translation.

ASSESSMENT OF THE TEAM COOPERATION

Teamwork assessment is an important feedback for each team as well as for the overall project, which is explicitly based on high quality teamwork. Evaluation rates on the scale from 1 to 5. One team evaluates all points of the teamwork on the scale by 1. When checking the questionnaire we can assume that completing the questionnaire did not go according to instructions, the entire questionnaire is filled by the value 1 (also in evaluating the quality of the project, and the evaluation of the meeting skype). If this team really evaluates all of the monitored evaluation survey by 1 - a very low level - then it is in the teamwork necessary to support the project team, set clear rules for cooperation, or obtain assistance for the promotion of the teamwork. In addition to the low assessment of the teamwork is very low-assessed mutual cooperation between teams, that would be convenient to communicate at the next meeting or team meetings. This considerable dissatisfaction of one member has to be addressed comprehensively.

EVALUATION OF THE TRAINERS TRAININGS

Evaluating the trainers training, the teams agreed (again, except of one team that reviews the entire process significantly negatively) that training took place according to the schedule; the number of trainers has been adequate. Based on the experience the teams see the time set for the trainers training as not sufficient and for the final version of the project would be appropriate to extend the time.

Trainers training met the teams expectations (except for one team).

In the area of promotion is the opinion of teams different, as they suggested that the project promotion could be more significant.

Surprising is the result of replies received from the teams mapping the competences that trainers should have acquired. Two teams reported that they are not sure what competences the trainers should master. Teams reporting uncertainty about the target competences, is not clear from the didactic point of view, how is it possible to train participants in the pilot course, if the final result of training is not clear to them (i.e., the competencies participants should acquire).

When evaluating the acquisition of competencies - the individual teams managed to reach different results - fully achieved specified competencies and situations where certain competencies were not achieved.

According to one team is not necessary to achieve the specified competencies in the training, because in some cases the trainers will not participate in the students education but actually supervise in the Playwork centres.

The question is whether it is possible to agree with this argument, as there can be a preferable option - for any member of the Playwork project to acquire the core competencies and correctly support the further development of the project.

EVALUATION OF THE FURTHER PROJECT DEVELOPMENT, VISIBILITY

Evaluation of the motivational phase is not univocal - the teams evaluate the motivational phase in the full scale - 1 to 5. Each team takes one value on the scale. Therefore we can assume that the motivational phase was from the perspective of teams not prepared enough.

Regarding the conditions assessment for the project dissemination, most of the teams see these conditions as well prepared, only one team has repeatedly negative opinion.

Evaluation of the web sites updating is low, the range is 2 to 3. The team that evaluated the entire questionnaire with grade 1 has not answered this question.

The evaluation result is necessary to see from different perspectives as well, one team does not know the website is open, two teams visited the website last week for the last time. Two teams reported relatively high frequency tracking the website - three times a week, one team admits that is watching just the first page. One team mentioned that active Facebook is used and updated more frequently than the website.

Evaluating the project website the teams mentioned that the missing information is

- Educational documentaries and films
- New events in the partner countries concerning the project
- Information about specific country was delivered, but still not listed on the website

- Creating a blog.
- Website should also include links to social media channels or receive automatic updates from these partners

According to the teams there is not too much extra information on the Web.

SKYPE MEETING EVALUATION

Some teams reported that most of the team members did not attend the Skype meeting. As the reason was indicated the fact that they did not know until the last moment whether this meeting is actual or not. Another reason was that Skype meeting is regularly attended by one member as the lower number of members for Skype communication is perceived as more effective. Skype meeting results are then promptly sent to all team members.

Three teams reported that Skype meeting met their expectations, one team states no fulfilment, one did not answer.

Specific reasons for satisfaction - fulfilled expectations:

- familiar with the agenda;
- clear and concise communication with partners in the discussion of individual points;
- from the teams perspective is the project motivational and useful in practice.

Specific reasons for dissatisfaction - fail to meet expectations:

- the meeting was very short and quick;
- absence of other partners;
- lack of information about the last meeting.

The technical quality of the meeting differed - from very low to higher (grades 1,3,4). Proposal for solving technical problems was not suggested, used argument was - less technical skills therefore not competent to advice.

SUMMARY OF THE EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

When evaluating the data we can see an interesting contradiction in the acquired data. Most of the teams that completed the questionnaires is satisfied with the project development, sees its educational contribution, and positively evaluates the satisfaction of trainers and students trained in the training sessions. Most teams also assessed the high quality work within a team and teams to collaborate with. One team evaluates all these phases negatively, on a low level.

For the website evaluation is obvious that it depends how much the website is used. Teams that use the website frequently for work reported the need to increase the quality of the website, it is appropriate to respond to these comments. An interesting observation is related to the comparison of Facebook and the website, in general we can say that the younger generation is used to work with Facebook more than with website; however, to reach the widest possible number of candidates is appropriate to forge both information sources.

PROJECT PUBLICITY

From the perspective of an external project evaluator we suggest greater emphasis on the project publicity. The project website is not sufficient to motivate those who are interested. Even to get specific information in this moment is not possible.

University of Gloucestershire, one of the project partners sends the newsletter to all partners of the project, to summarize the activities associated with the project as well as with the Playwork concept. This information is very interesting and inspiring (number 13 came March 2, 2015). To use this newsletter (or its parts concerning the overall Playwork concept), to add information relevant to the national level (e.g. the possibility of involvement in pilot testing, etc.), to translate it into the national language and send it via own contact database could be a very valuable information channel, which could lead to the better concept dissemination as part of the pilot verification, or in time after the project is finished.

Regarding the target group (for the concept dissemination after the pilot verification and after the project) is in our opinion insufficient use of the social networks. E.g. if we typed the word "Playworks" on FB appeared the US community as the largest. "Viper - Volunteers in Playwork" community has 104 members, which is a very low number for wider dissemination of the concept. If people do not find the information and do not find the way, it will be very difficult for the concept to communicate further.

Evaluation of the insufficient communication before the Skype meeting was part of the evaluation questionnaires. Overall communication in this monitoring period was significantly lower than in previous periods. This may be due to specifically allocated tasks that are already settled in the project course and ongoing pilot verification which is realized within each partner separately.

On the other hand, the lower communication, in a way resulted in the insufficient number of partners participating in the Skype meeting