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 Project: The influence of emotions in History. A New Tool for Citizenship.

EVALUATION FORM FOR THE TRANSNATIONAL ACTIVITIES

DATA: 10-13 DECEMBER 2018 PLACE: ALBACETE (SPAIN)

TYPE OF MEETING : Short term staff training event/ Project meeting

*Please,rate the following aspects of the Meeting and add comments where relevant:*

*Disagree/Not at all – 0 Agree/Fully -4*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| The meeting programme issued the main working topics |  |  |  |  | 8 |
| The objectives of the meeting were clear |  |  |  |  | 8 |
| The issues on the Agenda were consistent with the Meeting objectives |  |  |  |  | 8 |
| The Meeting was useful for helping us to carry out the expected project planning |  |  |  |  | 8 |
| The Host Team significantly contributed to achieve the Meeting objectives |  |  |  |  | 8 |
| The Host Coordinator significantly contributed to install a collaborative working environment |  |  |  |  | 8 |
| The role of the School Directing Team in the Meeting was according to what they are expected |  |  |  |  | 8 |
| The Meeting was useful for establishing good working relationships among the partners |  |  |  | 1 | 7 |
| All the partners contributed to the success of the Meeting |  |  | 1 | 2 | 5 |
| The opinions of all the partners were taken into consideration in an equal manner |  |  |  | 2 | 6 |
| The Meeting met/fulfilled my expectations |  |  |  | 2 | 6 |
| The Meeting took place in a suitable room |  |  |  | 3 | 4 |
| The infrastructure provided was satisfactory (ICT arrangement, PC, Internet connection, etc.) |  |  |  | 2 | 6 |
| The after – work cultural and leisure programme was adequate |  |  |  | 5 | 3 |
| The hotel accommodation was satisfactory (room , place, etc.) |  |  |  | 5 | 3 |
| The post-work cultural activities were relevant to the knowledge of the host country |  |  |  | 5 | 3 |
| The informal meetings contributed to create a team dynamics and enhanced the team work |  |  |  |  | 8 |
| To which extent work plan and deadlines became clear to you? |  |  |  | 3 | 5 |
| To which extent is each partner’s role and responsibility within the project became clear to you? |  |  |  | 4 | 4 |
| To which extent are the decisions taken clear to you? |  |  |  | 2 | 6 |
| The general organization of the meeting was properly planned |  |  |  |  | 8 |

One answer to the affirmation “The meeting took place in a suitable place” is missing.

|  |
| --- |
| STRONG POINTS  Host team’s hospitality, good level of collaboration among partners .  The hosts were very cooperative, friendly, created a constructive working environment and generally tried to promote a sense of bonding amongst the partners, which will eventually contribute to the successful implementation of the project.  The organizational capacity of the host coordinator and his ability to mediate the various points of view of the participants.  Very nice host. Made us feel very welcome. Friendly atmosphere! Students who guided us in Albacete did it in an enthusiastic manner.  I think everyone had the opportunity to participate in the discussions. A lot of good ideas and interesting conversations.   * Genuine cooperation among partners * Ability of working heterogeneously in a group * Awareness of each specific role within the project * Mutual sharing of fundamental topics necessary to carry out the project   The meeting was quite useful to carry out our project planning. We worked on main topics and planned our next steps. As an inexperienced Erasmus+ Team, all partners were helpful and we managed to establish good working relationships. The Host Coordinator significantly contributed to the meeting and his team was great hosts both in planning stage and during cultural and leisure programme.  The hosts were fantastic. I feel after the meeting that we established a good relationship among the partners and this is important. The meeting was useful and well planned. It was interesting go round and see some school activities and meet some pupils. The students were proud of their school and did a great job. |
| WEAK POINTS  Not all partners were sufficiently prepared or informed about the topic.  Not all partners were adequately prepared for the content of the project as reflected in the Activity description of each partner in the application, but this does not detract from the success of the meeting considering that everyone knows what needs to be done from now on.  No weak points (twice)  The meeting met/fulfilled our expectations.  Maybe the room where the work took place could have been better. A pity that we didn´t go to Chinchilla, but on the other hand, the visit to Alcala was also interesting.  A bit late to have dinners at 21.00 in the evening. Of course, that´s part of the Spanish culture. On the other hand, the food was great!  May be not all the partners were prepared for the meeting equally, but after the meeting I think everyone acquired the knowledge to start to work with it’s part of the project. |
| COMMENTS  The signing of a protocol was a good idea since it clarifies certain basic issues and all partners are expected to abide by it.  I believe that the week has been profitable for the planning of our future work, above all because a close-knit and very collaborative working group has been created. |

|  |
| --- |
| Is there any suggestion you would like to give to help to improve the next partners meeting?  It would be useful to send all partners detailed information well in advance before every mobility (regarding hotels, flights, transportation and detailed expenses analyses) so as to facilitate planning and avoid delays or organizational issues. |

Thank you for collaborating!