

Agnebäckens förskola  
Att. Lotta Lundqvist  
Norra Stomvägen 2  
43238 Landvetter

**Kontaktperson:** Crister Carlsson

**Avdelningen för internationellt  
samarbete**  
Erasmus+

010-470 03 00  
erasmusplus@uhr.se

**Projektnummer**  
2015-1-SE01-KA219-012317

**Datum**  
2018-01-12

**Postadress**  
Box 45093  
104 30 Stockholm

**Besöksadress**  
Wallingatan 2  
111 60 Stockholm

**Telefon**  
010-470 03 00

**Org nr**  
202100-6487

**www.uhr.se**

## Avslutning av projekt inom Erasmus+ med slututbetalning av projektmedel

Tack för den slutrapport ni har skickat in till oss. Rapporten och underlaget är nu granskade och godkända. Vid bedömningen av slutrapporten har ert projekt fått följande omdöme:

### 63 Poäng

#### Relevance of the project/strategy (15 poäng)

The project demonstrated a clear link with policy objectives and addressed objectives and priorities of the action. The main objective of the project has been to break down gender stereotypes and for everyone, staff, children and parents/caregivers to become more norm critical. Project objectives have been wide but acceptably clear and were to a large extent met by the project. The project was on the other hand not very innovative. Focus on gender, equality and norm criticism is not new in preschool projects and other preschool initiatives. Project focus has been more on sharing experiences and strengthening work methods within a narrow but growing field. The main goal was to have a lasting effect on the participating preschools and other surrounding preschools.

Toolkit is the main collection of project results the consortium first of all wants to exhibit. This Toolkit, however, does not yet exist and is for that reason not possible to assess and therefore not of interest. On the other hand, the project website is well elaborated, exposing ambitiously and with quality the main project activities in and around the 8 project meetings.

Project results bring only to some extent added value at EU-level.

#### Quality of the project design and implementation (17 poäng)

Project management is to some part briefly explained. Coordination activities are reported mainly as part of the project meetings. At every project meeting there has been time set off also for project management and evaluation

Project evaluation however is acceptably well explained in terms of activities on different levels group – individual using different evaluation tools and an internal half time evaluation. Well developed reports on the e-twinning website from all 8 project meetings must also be mentioned as well as active focus groups at each participating preschool.

Project implementation has a strong focus on the 8 project meetings, partly very well planned and argued with clear connections between each coming meeting and

between each meeting and local partner activities in between meetings. 8 project meetings in a two year project is very ambitious and can be difficult to manage to successful results in a continuity of active learning and development of new ideas. In this project this continuity was to some extent well planned, also with motivated academic lectures. Every project meeting has had a theme that the staff have been worked with between the meetings

However with each meeting planned mainly from what happened in the meeting before means risking to get caught in a short term methodology with a lack of a structured project whole. Difficult to assess however to what extent this lack of explained structure in reality affected project results.

Difficulties encountered in managing the implementation of the project and how they were handled is well described. No problems reported that seriously lowered the quality of the project management and implementation.

### **Quality of the project team and the cooperation arrangements (11 poäng)**

The project comprised 4 partners with an acceptable geographical spread. None of the partners, including the coordinator, had any experiences in EU-project collaboration Quite clear however that the partners knew each other well and were before the project active in networks focusing on question on preschools and on gender, equality and norm criticism. It is not very well explained why there were 2 Swedish partners in the project, not really motivated for complementary reasons although Nikolaigården-Egalia, was the first preschool in the world to be LGBT-certified. One more non- Nordic partner with different network experiences instead of Egalia could open up new questions for the project. There were no partner dropouts and the cooperation in the project is reported to have worked out very well. Every project meeting had a theme that the staff have been working with between the meetings. The preschools have, with no exception, expressed the value of the discussions and the respectful tone.

### **Impact and dissemination (20 poäng)**

The project's impact on the participants and participating organisations involved in the project is rather briefly explained and not very specific. A bit surprising since the reports from project meetings and preschool activities are strong, indicating clear impacts. Also impact outside of the participating organisations is only briefly explained. Impact of the project at the local, regional, European and/or international levels is also only to some extent and in general terms described and mainly from the horizon of the coordinator.

Dissemination activities and targets are briefly outlined building on local partner initiatives, mainly described from the perspective of the coordinator. No common idea about dissemination strategies is mentioned. No use of all the university connections is reported in disseminating results. Very little use of the well elaborated e-twinning website for dissemination purposes The consortium claims the use of the Toolkit for dissemination purpose, but this Toolkit actually does not yet exist. Project sustainability could be far better explained.

### **Overall comment to the beneficiary**

A clear main aim with this project was to develop methods for working with gender and equality in preschool with both staff, children and care holders and parents. Project implementation has a strong focus on the 8 project meetings, partly very well planned and argued. None of the partners, including the coordinator, were experienced in EU-project collaboration Quite clear however that the partners knew

each other well. The project's impact on the participants and participating organisations involved in the project is rather briefly explained and not very specific . Dissemination activities and targets are briefly outlined building on local partner initiatives and mainly from the coordinator's perspective.

### **Slututbetalning av medel**

Ni har tidigare beviljats **22 850 euro** för ert projekt. Av det rapporterade underlaget godkänner vi projektkostnader på **22 850 euro**. Vi har tidigare totalt betalat ut **18 280 euro**. Vi kommer därför att betala ut ytterligare **4570 euro** till er.

Utbetalningen görs till det bankkonto som ni tidigare uppgivit till oss och som återfinns i ert kontrakt. Vänligen meddela oss snarast om följande uppgifter har ändrats:

IBAN: **SE48 9500 0099 6026 0077 2848**  
BIC/SWIFT: **NDEASESS**

Utbetalningen görs till det bankkonto som ni tidigare uppgivit till oss. Vänligen meddela oss snarast om detta ändrats.

**Kom ihåg att spara projektdokumentation, verifikationer och bokföring i 5 år för eventuell revision.**

Ert projekt inom Erasmus+ anses därmed avslutat och Universitets- och högskolerådet tackar för er medverkan.

Vid frågor kontakta handläggare [joan.eckerman@uhr.se](mailto:joan.eckerman@uhr.se)

Med vänlig hälsning  
Johan Eckerman  
Handläggare Erasmus+  
Universitets- och högskolerådet