

PEOPLE

Evaluation of meeting in Lublin, Poland, on 23 – 24 October 2013

1. Description of meeting

The third meeting of the PEOPLE Grundtvig partnership was held in Lublin, Poland, on 23 – 24 October 2013. The purpose of the meeting was to present summaries of the courses designed using the PLE methodology; to discuss initial results, if available; to learn about social bookmarking and annotation tools; and to discuss the dissemination of the partnership, particularly the use of newsletters.

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 12 responses were received, bringing the response rate to 75 %. This number does not include the Turkish and Finnish students who also participated in the meeting but with a separate agenda.

3. Evaluation results

1. Goals - The meeting achieved its goals						
	5 - Excellent	4	3	2	1 - Poor	Responses
Reporting work done so far	75,0% (9)	25,0% (3)	0,0% (0)	0,0% (0)	0,0% (0)	12
Discussing newsletter template and dissemination plan	50,0% (6)	41,7% (5)	8,3% (1)	0,0% (0)	0,0% (0)	12
Learning about social bookmarking	75,0% (9)	25,0% (3)	0,0% (0)	0,0% (0)	0,0% (0)	12
Planning the next stage of the project	66,7% (8)	25,0% (3)	8,3% (1)	0,0% (0)	0,0% (0)	12
					Comments	0

2. Usefulness and relevance for the project

	5 - Excellent	4	3	2	1 - Poor	Responses
Presentations	50,0% (6)	50,0% (6)	0,0% (0)	0,0% (0)	0,0% (0)	12
Discussions	66,7% (8)	33,3% (4)	0,0% (0)	0,0% (0)	0,0% (0)	12
Workshop on Diigo	66,7% (8)	33,3% (4)	0,0% (0)	0,0% (0)	0,0% (0)	12
					Comments	0

3. Quality

	5 - Excellent	4	3	2	1 - Poor	Responses
Quality of cooperation (the atmosphere of the meeting)	91,7% (11)	8,3% (1)	0,0% (0)	0,0% (0)	0,0% (0)	12
Treatment of difficulties (problems were solved constructively and equally)	75,0% (9)	25,0% (3)	0,0% (0)	0,0% (0)	0,0% (0)	12
Quality of my own participation (I/my organization contributed actively to the meeting)	66,7% (8)	33,3% (4)	0,0% (0)	0,0% (0)	0,0% (0)	12
Quality of outcomes (We achieved good results)	58,3% (7)	41,7% (5)	0,0% (0)	0,0% (0)	0,0% (0)	12
					Comments	0

4. Practical arrangements

	5 - Excellent	4	3	2	1 - Poor	Responses
Meeting facilities	41,7% (5)	50,0% (6)	8,3% (1)	0,0% (0)	0,0% (0)	12
Timing	58,3% (7)	33,3% (4)	8,3% (1)	0,0% (0)	0,0% (0)	12
Coordination	75,0% (9)	16,7% (2)	8,3% (1)	0,0% (0)	0,0% (0)	12
				Comments		0

5. General rating

	5 - Completely agree	4	3	2	1 - Completely disagree	Responses
Overall, I am satisfied with the meeting	91,7% (11)	8,3% (1)	0,0% (0)	0,0% (0)	0,0% (0)	12
					Comments	0

4. Conclusions and recommendations

The overall satisfaction with the meeting was very high, 91,6 % of respondents giving the meeting a rating of 5. The average score for this question was 4,92. This can be seen to reflect the good atmosphere of the meeting, 91,6 % of the participants rating the atmosphere as excellent (average score 4,92).

The lowest evaluation scores were given to:

- Quality of outcomes (4,58)
- Usefulness and relevance of presentations (4,50)
- Discussion on dissemination plan and newsletter template (4,42)
- Meeting facilities (4,00)

Even these scores are relatively high, and therefore the meeting should be regarded as highly successful.

There were no verbal comments so it is difficult to explain the reasoning behind the scores. If there are lessons to be learned, perhaps they concern the content and structure of the presentations. PowerPoint presentations are not the only way to present work done and results. Should we use other methods to present information so as to make it more interesting and relevant for the project?