

PEOPLE

Evaluation of meeting in Afyonkarahisar, Turkey, on 17-18 March 2014

1. Description of meeting

The fourth meeting of the PEOPLE Grundtvig partnership was held in Afyonkarahisar, Turkey, on 17-18 March 2014. The purpose of the meeting was to summarise the courses delivered within the partnership, present evaluations of those courses as well as lessons learned with a view towards a discussion of emerging good practices; also, to learn about the pedagogical concept of “gamification” and the interactive use of YouTube.

2. Purpose and method of evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation process is to monitor the meetings and make any necessary adjustments for future partnership meetings.

The main areas of evaluation were:

- goals: whether the meeting achieved the goals set for it in the agenda
- relevance: whether the meeting was useful and relevant for the partnership as a whole
- quality of presentations, seminars, lectures, treatment of difficulties, overall cooperation and outcomes of the meeting
- practical arrangements of the meeting

An overall rating was also requested in order to get a general impression of the success of the meeting.

An online questionnaire was sent to all meeting participants directly following the meeting. The participants were instructed to fill in the questionnaire on the basis of their personal impression of the meeting. The questionnaire was anonymous. Participating learners were not required to respond to the questionnaire.

There were 16 participants in the meeting. A total of 13 responses were received, bringing the response rate to 81 %. The total number of participants does not include the Spanish partners who participated via Skype to a section of the meeting, nor the Italian and Finnish students who also participated in the meeting but with a partly separate agenda.

3. Evaluation results

3.1. Goals

	5 - Excellent	4	3	2	1 - Poor	Yhteensä
Reporting work done so far (initial results of PLE courses in partner institutions)	53,85% 7	46,15% 6	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	13
Learning about the pedagogical concept of "gamification"	83,33% 10	8,33% 1	8,33% 1	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	12
Learning about the interactive use of YouTube	66,67% 8	16,67% 2	16,67% 2	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	12
Planning the next stage of the project	50,00% 6	50,00% 6	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	12

3.2. Usefulness and relevance for the project

	5 - Excellent	4	3	2	1 - Poor	Yhteensä
Presentations	58,33% 7	41,67% 5	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	12
Discussions	50,00% 6	33,33% 4	16,67% 2	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	12
Workshop on gamification	75,00% 9	16,67% 2	8,33% 1	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	12
Workshop on YouTube	63,64% 7	18,18% 2	18,18% 2	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	11



3.3. Quality

	5 - Excellent	4	3	2	1 - Poor	Yhteensä
Quality of cooperation (the atmosphere of the meeting)	76,92% 10	15,38% 2	0,00% 0	7,69% 1	0,00% 0	13
Treatment of difficulties (problems were solved constructively and equally)	58,33% 7	33,33% 4	8,33% 1	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	12
Quality of my own participation (I/my organization contributed actively to the meeting)	58,33% 7	33,33% 4	8,33% 1	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	12
Quality of outcomes (We achieved good results)	58,33% 7	33,33% 4	8,33% 1	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	12

Comments:

Not knowing English properly sometimes caused problems.

Some showed very little interest and very little respect. This made the meetings quite messy and disturbing.



3.4. Practical arrangements

	5 - Excellent	4	3	2	1 - Poor	Yhteensä
Meeting facilities	76,92% 10	23,08% 3	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	13
Timing	58,33% 7	33,33% 4	8,33% 1	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	12
Coordination	66,67% 8	33,33% 4	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	12

Comments:

Very good the quality of coordination!

Slow Internet...

3.5. General rating

	5 - Completely agree	4	3	2	1 - Completely disagree	Yhteensä
Overall, I am satisfied with the meeting	84,62% 11	7,69% 1	7,69% 1	0,00% 0	0,00% 0	13

Comments:

Thanks for the good opportunity to know better this project

4. Conclusions and recommendations

The overall satisfaction with the meeting was very high, 4.76/5. It is therefore safe to say that the meeting was successful in terms of both atmosphere and results. The practical arrangements also received a high score for both meeting facilities and general coordination of the meeting. As to the content of the meeting, especially the workshop on gamification pedagogy was considered successful and relevant for the project (Goal: learning about gamification 4.75/5 and Usefulness and relevance for the project 4.67/5). The general enthusiasm about gamification suggests that the theme should be continued in future workshops.

The atmosphere of the meeting was rated at 4.62/5. This is a good score. However, one respondent rated the atmosphere as low as 2. There were also two verbal comments to this section:

*Not knowing English properly sometimes caused problems.
Some showed very little interest and very little respect. This made the meetings quite messy and disturbing.*

These comments perhaps reflect two sides of one problem. Some participants did not have the language skills to fully follow the meeting, which may have led to secondary activities during the meeting. The partners are responsible for 1) ensuring that the participants have the necessary language skills, or 2) arranging interpretation for those participants who do not have proper language skills.

The lowest evaluation scores were given to: timing, treatment of difficulties, planning the next stage of the project, and quality of outcomes, which all received a score of 4.5/5. The usefulness of discussions was rated at 4.33. These scores perhaps all reflect a perceived lack of time: there was very little time for general discussion during the meeting. This is something that should be considered when planning the final meeting.

Even these scores are very high. Any item rated above 4.0 (good) must be considered successful, and since the lowest-rated items still remained above 4.3, the meeting should be regarded as highly successful in its entirety.