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# Introduction

Related with the Erasmus plus project 2014-2017 “Water around us”, financed by the EU, Key action 2, we produced a questionnaire for teachers, to collect information from all of the 7 partner schools, in order to measure the quality of the first year of collaborative work.

For the conception of the questionnaire we have considered the major objectives of the partnership, and produced 44 close and scaled questions. All the questions are very simple, objective, and use the same response format, graded on a continuum scale from 1 to 5, with the significance 1- Very poor, 2- Poor, 3- Satisfactory, 4- Good and 5-Very Good.

In order to check the questionnaire we pre-tested it, through a small sample of respondents, who we interviewed and got their impressions to confirm that the questions correctly reproduced their opinions.

The questions were grouped into coherent sections and divided into four central categories so that it could be evaluated: **“1. *Project in my own school*”** (9 questions), the **“2. *Final products”*** (5 questions), ***3. Transnational project meetings and learning activities*** (24 questions), and ***4. Coordination process*** (6 questions).

The questionnaire was fulfilled by each partner school and with the results we elaborate this evaluation report.

# Results Presentation

We collected 7 questionnaires, one from each school partner; all of them fulfilled all categories, except from the Portuguese school “*Agrupamento de Escolas de Valongo”,* who didn’t accomplish the category “*Coordination process*”, since it is the school that coordinated the project and responsible for this evaluation report.

With the collected information, we have done the treatment of the entire data, and presented a standard approach with comments or discussions, supported by figures and graphs.

## First category: “1. *Project in my own school*”

The first set of analyses examines the impact of the project in each school. This category has 9 numbered questions (figure 1), graded on the above discrete scale, from 1- Very poor to 5-Very Good.



**Figure 1**

A simple statistical analysis of the average results obtained from every school, provided the intercorrelations among the answers to the nine questions of the first category *Project in my own school*.

The results obtained from a preliminary analysis of the answers to the nine questions **1.1** to **1.9**, collected in every school, can be compared in the histogram presented in **Graph 1**. The total average of this category and the result was **4.2**.

**Points**
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**Graph 1 – Project in my own school**

Comparisons between the results of the nine question group shows that the strong points of the project in each school, are the items: ***1.2 Enforce students key competences connected with basic skills in science and technology, art and expression, foreign languages and ITC, 1.3 Use new activities which complement academic curricula, 1.6 – Promote the use of more successful teaching / learning method and 1.7 Stimulate the recherché of new innovative methods*** all of them with a rate superior to 4,3 (Good).

**Graph 2** - **Project in my own school** **radar chart format**

The question with lower rates was the ***1.9* *Support by school administration***, with a rate of 3.8 who demonstrate an evident a weak point in this category. Nevertheless the complete results reveal that the rate differences between the questions with the lowest and highest rates were insignificant, which is a strong evidence of a good performance in those areas from all the school partners.

In **Graph 2** above, the radar chart format permitted comparing the average of the results obtained in all schools for each question. This Graph is quite revealing, because it contrasts with **Graph 1**, showing that the majority of rates are between 4.1 and 4.5, with a small difference among the extreme scores, where the maximum was 4,5 (Very good) and the minimum was 3,8 (Good).

These differences are not statistically significant, because the average of this category was 4.4, considered Good, meaning that the project had a good impact on every school.

The most significant observation to emerge from the data comparison of **Graph 1** and **2** is the clear and similar results in all answers, which confirms that there were no major differences between the scores obtained in these answers.

## Second category: “2. *Final products*”

This category has 5 questions numbered from 2.1 to 2.5, below in **figure 2**, graded on the above discrete scale, from 1- Very poor to 5- Very Good. This set of analyses examines the quality of the final products.

The second group of the survey questions concerns to the final products, referring: their quality and sustainability, the extent to which they were disseminated, and also to the way in which they were correlated with the objectives of the project.



**Figure 2**
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**Graph 2 – Final products**

Comparisons between the results of this question group, reveal that strong points of the project in each school are the items: ***2.1 Relation between the objectives of the project and final products*** 2.2 ***Quality of the final products***, ***2.4*** ***Usefulness of products for curricular /extracurricular school activities and 2.5 Promotion innovative methods or approaches and practices*** all of them with a rate superior to 4.5 (Very good).

The questions with lower rates were: ***2.3 Dissemination of products in your country*** even with a rate superiorto 4.2 (Good).

In this group, all the questions have obtained rates, expressed by analogous punctuation, from 4,3 to 4,8. Reviling the standard deviation for this group of questions 0.5, the total average is 4.6, consideredhigh.

In particular, its significant to identify the question with less punctuation, the question ***2.3 Dissemination of products in your country,*** with 4.3points (Good), is the one who demonstrates an apparent a weak point in this category. This point has attained a higher punctuation comparing to last year, revealing the efforts of the partnership in correcting this week element.

However, considering the results obtained in this group, the differences are very small and aren’t statistically significant; revealing that the final products in each school were considered a highlight of this project.

## Third category: “3. Transnational project meetings and learning activities”

The third group of questions, evaluates the relevance of the mobility’s that were effected along the project, the extent to which the pre-established aims were achieved, the involvement of the participants and the impact of the project’s mobility had upon them, as well as various managerial/organisational aspects of the activities performed.

During this first year of project we have done 4 mobility’s: the first in October to Germany, the second in January to Portugal, the third in April to Spain and the fourth in May to Finland. The motilities to Germany and to Finland were transnational project meetings, involving only teachers, the motilities to Portugal and to Spain were learning activities, involving teachers and students.

****

**Figure 3**

In this category, we include 6 similar questions, in order to evaluate the 4 mobility’s done, independently the type of mobility or the participants.

### Transnational project meeting accomplished in Iceland

The first mobility evaluated was the transnational project meeting realised in Germany on October of 2015.
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**Graph 3 – Transnational project meeting realised in Germany**

Within the six questions of this category, the respondents unanimously appreciate, with a high assessment score, ***3.1.2 Time for cultural work and sightseeing*** and ***3.1.4 Reception and attendance of the participants*** with the maximum scores (5).

The questions with less punctuation was ***3.11 Time for project-work* and 3.1.3 *Free-time,*** with 3.2points (Satisfactory), demonstrate a weak point in this category. All the questions have rates higher or equal than 4.5. The standard deviation for this group of questions is 0.6, and the total average, 4.7, isvery high.

### Learning activity accomplished in Portugal

The second mobility evaluated was the learning activity accomplish in Portugal on January of 2016.
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**Graph 4 – Learning activity realised in Portugal**

All the questions have rates higher or equal than 4.5, the question with lower rate was: ***3.2.5 Accomplish of Erasmus aims, develop innovative approaches and practices, exchange experiences and carrying out joint research, evaluated*** with rate of 4.5***.*** The standard deviation for this group of questions was 0.5*,* and the total average was 4.7.

### Learning activity accomplished in Spain

The third mobility evaluated was the learning activity accomplish in Spain on April of 2016.
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**Graph 5 – Learning activity realised in Spain**

Most the questions 3.3.1, 3.3.2 and 3.3.3 have rates equal to the maximum score 5, with the lowest score being given to question ***3.3.5 Accomplish of Erasmus aims, develop innovative approaches and practices, exchange experiences and carrying out joint research, evaluated*** and ***3.3.6 Accomplish the travel grant budget,*** whit a rate of 4,7, which demonstrate an operational strong point. The standard deviation for this group of questions is 0,3, and the total average, 4.8, isvery high.

### Transnational project meeting accomplished in Finland

The fourth mobility evaluated was the transnational project meeting realise in Finland on May of 2016.
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**Graph 6 – Transnational project meeting realised in Finland**

All the questions have rates close to the maximum score 5 (very good), with the lowest score being given to question ***3.4.6*** ***Accomplish the travel grant budget, with 4,8.*** The standard deviation for this group of questions is 0.2*,* and the total average is 4.96, the highest of this group.

## Fourth category: “4. Coordination process”

The six questions belonging to this category refer to the coordination and managerial process/activity of the project, focusing to coordinator – partner’s communication, the personal contribution and involvement of the European project coordinator.



**Figure 4**

**Graph 7 – Coordination process**

The questions with higher rates were: ***4.1 Communication coordinator-partners*** ***4.2 Support from the coordinator to the partners***, **4*.5 Investment of the coordinator in the project*** and ***4.6 Evaluation and motorization of the project activities***, the question who get lower rates were: ***4.3 Instructions for the project work.***

The standard deviation for this group of questions is 0.7, and the total average is 4.7.

# Conclusions

Comparing the average results obtained from the 4 categories, we see that the averages are between 4.2 (*1. Project in my own school)* and 4.8 (*3. Transnational project meetings and learning activities).* The detailed analyses of these results show that the strongest points of the project were the quality of the transnational project meetings and learning activities, revealing that the high quality of the mobility’s, where the project strategy and final products are planned, discussed and presented.

The lowest point was the quality of the project in each school; this category had an average of 4.2, even if the classification was good, we consider important to examine and discuss in order to improve. The most significant observations to emerge from this result are the lower support of the school’s administration in some schools. In order to correct this fact, we suggest to our national agencies to do some courses for headmasters or principal’s staffs about Erasmus.

The most important remark that becomes visible from the judgement of the data in Graph 2 - Final products, is the lower rates obtained from the question dissemination of final products, who still revealed some fragilities although some progress was observed.

The general analysis of this result demonstrates that the differences between the questions with the lowest and highest rates was not significant, because all of them are superior of 4.2 (good) which is a strong evidence of a very good performance and quality in those areas from all the school partners.