

REFRAME

**WP6 - Quality Assurance and Evaluation
Final Report**

REFRAME

**REGIONAL NETWORK FOR WORK BASED LEARNING
2017/1616/585162-EPP-1-2017-1-IT-EPPKA3-VET-APPREN**

January 2020

Table of Content

| | | |
|--------|---|----|
| 1 | Objectives and Scope of the WP6 Final Report | 4 |
| 2 | The Quality Assurance in REFRAME | 4 |
| 2.1 | The REFRAME project (from the application form)..... | 4 |
| 2.2 | Main elements of the Quality Assurance Plan | 6 |
| 3 | Methodology for the Evaluation of REFRAME | 6 |
| 3.1 | Evaluation principles as they are implemented in REFRAME | 7 |
| 4 | Implementation of the Evaluation Process..... | 8 |
| 4.1 | Evaluations Instruments | 8 |
| 5 | Organisation and presentation of the evaluation results..... | 10 |
| 5.1 | Satisfaction | 10 |
| 5.1.1 | Evolution of the general vision of the project | 10 |
| 5.1.2 | The Tags characterising the identity of the project: | 11 |
| 5.1.3 | Level of satisfaction regarding the Plenary meetings..... | 11 |
| 5.2 | Results: productions, outcomes, and achievements..... | 11 |
| 5.2.1 | What partners are particularly proud of..... | 11 |
| 5.2.2 | The interim report and follow-up (WP1)..... | 12 |
| 5.2.3 | Internal Communication (WP1) | 12 |
| 5.2.4 | The final conference in Bologna (WP1)..... | 12 |
| 5.2.5 | The European Lab on WBL (WP2) | 12 |
| 5.2.6 | The local stakeholders' networks (WP2)..... | 13 |
| 5.2.7 | The methodological approach and the Handbook and the infographic framework (WP3) | 13 |
| 5.2.8 | The piloting phase (WP4) | 13 |
| 5.2.9 | External communication (WP5) | 14 |
| 5.2.10 | Quality Assurance and Evaluation (WP6)..... | 14 |
| 5.2.11 | Project deliverables..... | 15 |
| 5.3 | Lessons learnt: which knowledge gained, which reflections and actions to sustain in the future | 15 |
| 5.4 | Impacts and value created | 16 |
| 5.5 | Sustainability | 17 |
| 6 | Risk Management..... | 18 |
| 6.1 | Initial risks assessment | 18 |
| 6.1.1 | General risks | 18 |
| 6.1.2 | Specific risks | 21 |
| 6.2 | Risks monitoring during the project..... | 24 |
| 7 | Appendices..... | 26 |
| 8 | Appendix 1 – Evaluation Instruments | 26 |
| 8.1 | Plenary meetings | 26 |
| 8.1.1 | Kick-Off – Bologna | 26 |
| 8.1.2 | Plenary Barcelona..... | 27 |
| 8.1.3 | Plenary Lyon | 29 |
| 8.1.4 | Plenary Helmond | 30 |
| 8.1.5 | Plenary Barcelona #2..... | 32 |
| 8.1.6 | Plenary Bologna Final | 34 |
| 8.1.7 | Final conference in Bologna | 34 |
| 8.2 | General questionnaires | 35 |

| | | |
|-------|---|----|
| 8.2.1 | Early vision..... | 35 |
| 8.2.2 | Advanced vision..... | 36 |
| 8.3 | On-line evaluation questionnaire for the web-site/platform | 38 |
| 8.3.1 | First version (during the Pilot Phase) | 38 |
| 8.3.2 | Final version on-line for the evaluation of the platform (Teachers and Schools) | 39 |
| 9 | Appendix 2 – Evaluation Data | 40 |
| 9.1 | Plenary meetings | 40 |
| 9.1.1 | Kick-Off – Bologna | 40 |
| 9.1.2 | Plenary Barcelona..... | 42 |
| 9.1.3 | Plenary Lyon | 46 |
| 9.1.4 | Plenary Helmond | 48 |
| 9.1.5 | Plenary Barcelona #2..... | 52 |
| 9.1.6 | Final conference in Bologna | 55 |
| 9.2 | General questionnaires | 58 |
| 9.2.1 | Early vision..... | 58 |
| 9.2.2 | Advanced vision..... | 59 |
| 9.2.3 | Elements from the evaluation of the platform | 59 |

1 Objectives and Scope of the WP6 Final Report

This document presents the practical implementation of the Quality Assurance methodology and tools during the REFRAME project (February 2018 – January 2020) and the results associated.

The methodology and detailed description of the Quality Assurance is available in the Quality Assurance Plan.

2 The Quality Assurance in REFRAME

2.1 The REFRAME project (from the application form)

Despite young people being more highly qualified than ever in the regions involved, employers often remark that school graduates entering the labour market lack job readiness. The combination of 'soft' skills with technical skills that employers want is best acquired in the workplace, but at the moment only a quarter of students in upper secondary vocational education attend WBL in European countries. The project is focused on the critical issues characterising the transition to work of young people, more specifically in mechatronic and automation sectors.

The project recognises the difficulty, on the part of all stakeholders, to consider WBL as a teaching method that combines classroom training with periods of learning in the workplace, acknowledging the company as a place of educational project development

REFRAME aims at

- *building effective cooperation structures between VET teachers and in-company trainers for delivery of WBL;*
- *introducing a structural change at regional level to develop high-quality WBL systems, involving long-term commitment by employers and policymakers;*
- *creating the “European Laboratory for Regional Work Based Learning” based on a platform involving the main stakeholders in 4 countries (Italy, France, Netherlands, Spain);*
- *designing and implementing targeted and scalable strategies, methodologies and related operational toolset to be tested in pilot actions;*
- *designing and implementing curricula and courses on WBL according to skills needs and in line with the European transparency instruments (EQF, EQAVET, ECVET);*
- *contributing to the Building Capacities of intermediary bodies;*
- *and validating strategies for WBL at regional level.*

Through its platform, REFRAME offers to companies, schools and VET providers, knowledge, guidance, and practical tools to design, implement and monitor WBL experiences, direct support in the implementation and tools to achieve good quality training.

As a final result, REFRAME network will play a role as Excellence Centre promoting WBL, able to provide information, training, support, training path suggestions, methodological guidance, legal assistance, networking and benchmarking facilities and quality assurance tools to companies, schools and VET providers that start or improve/extend their competencies in WBL in all economic sectors.

Target groups

The primary target group of the project are Companies, Schools and VET providers (mainly teachers and trainers, tutors and mentors) in the Mechatronic and electronic-automation sectors.

The second target group is composed by policy makers operating in the areas of Education and Training and related WBL fields.

The third target group is represented by young people (and their families).

Methodology

The project adopts the following principles for its methodological development:

1) collaborative work: the key-actors of each region involved jointly design, implement, evaluate and disseminate a European approach, through mutual learning towards continuing improvement;

2) context awareness: the project is based on the analysis of the policy reforms process undertaken by the regions involved; there is no single model that fits all national/regional (institutional, legal, economic, social, cultural) contexts in Europe; an in depth analysis is be carried out in the first phase, aiming at collecting evidence of territorial needs and constraints;

3) stakeholders' full involvement in all phases of the project: from design to evaluation, review and mainstreaming, it is a condition for sustainability and practice enrichment, benefitting from the collective intelligence of all parties involved;

4) policy awareness and development: the project establishes all possible links with other policy-led pilot projects and parallel initiatives launched by European, national and regional authorities.

Expected impacts

During the first quarter of the project, a territorial network (10 stakeholders at least) is created in each Region, in order to share ideas, promote the exchange of good practices and increase the knowledge in WBL approaches.

Each network is organising two regional seminars for each Region, addressing key actors: the first one on WBL and the second one on ECVET (60 key actors involved in each region).

In parallel, the project team together with the territorial network, launches initiatives related to a Consensus Building Process at territorial (and further European) level in the preparatory phase in order to raise awareness on network building.

The project is working on WBL at several levels:

- design and development of content*
- quality assessment of the content and process*
- issuing of a competence framework in the specific area of Mechatronic, electronic and Automation sector, in reference and compliance with the European Qualification framework and ECVET*

- *offer of a set of service to external stakeholders, through the platform (knowledge, guidance, practical tools to design, implement and monitor WBL experiences, direct professional support in the implementation and a set of tools to achieve good quality training).*

The validation phase provides evidence of the effectiveness, user acceptance and learning impact of the key elements of REFRAME, taking into account national and cultural differences, with particular reference to: 1) The Teacher and Trainers Training Model 2) Common pedagogic modelling and content and 3) Development of innovative 'mentor' role.

In such a project, the idea of Quality is intended as "Quality assurance", in the sense that the project quality is built all along the project. The Quality Assurance Plan is the reference documents. The quality procedures are embedded in the management processes. The quality evaluation process is implemented within the evaluation process for the project.

The Quality Assurance Process includes a full internal and external Evaluation Process.

2.2 Main elements of the Quality Assurance Plan

The quality Assurance plan presents the main elements of methodology regarding the implementation of Quality assurance in REFRAME. It specifies all actions and instruments, and how they are used all along the project. This includes:

- the risk management policy;
- the quality of Deliverables, Results and Outcomes;
- the graphic standards;
- the Project Vademecum;
- the Stakeholders management;
- the Impacts Management Policy;
- the evaluation methodology, instruments and processes.

3 Methodology for the Evaluation of REFRAME

Evaluation is the process through which the participants are able to appreciate the project, its unrolling, its management, and its capacities to fulfil – and even overpass - its objectives, issue the required products, create the expected value and impacts.

The evaluation process is the main pillar of the implementation of the Quality Assurance.

Evaluation enables to give an appreciation through the systematic and regular examination of the resources, realisations and products of the project vis-à-vis what was forecasted in the beginning of the project – for the most part what is stated in the candidacy and agreed by the commission. Thus, it enables to investigate on a permanent basis the value created by the project. For example, it gathers, reports and enables to share information about the innovation potential, quality level, relevance of actions, and capability to sustain the impacts of the project.

The kind of evaluation implemented in **REFRAME** is mainly formative, meaning that its aim is to help all project participants to improve the project along its whole unrolling. It is neither an audit, nor a simple mirror of what is happening (not prove but improve).

It is undertaken in a spirit of benevolence. It first evidences what is going well in the project in order to capitalise on achievements and potentials to work positively on improvements, according to the spirit of Appreciative Inquiry.

3.1 Evaluation principles as they are implemented in REFRAME

The Evaluation Methodology is designed according to principles emerging from Research works in the area and comprising four pillars: Action Research, Qualitative Evaluation, Appreciative Inquiry and Actor Network Theory.¹

As it is implemented in **REFRAME**, the evaluation is:

- **qualitative**

It uses qualitative evaluation methods together with quantitative information when they are available. Information are mainly collected through four processes: open interviews, questionnaires, participative observations and analysis of documents.

- **systemic and longitudinal**

It concerns the project as a whole system embedded in and interacting with its environment, as well as its different subsystems; it takes place all along the project, from beginning to end.

- **contextualized**

It is tailored for the project. It takes into account the specific conditions of its unrolling. It takes place within the project works. Nevertheless, it provides means to overlook what is happening, to sit back and reflect in order to make better decisions, solve problems and provide continuous improvement in an efficient way.

- **enabling**

It does not intend to standardize or impose sanctions in any way. It is meant to support, facilitate, optimise the project unrolling and maximise its impacts and value. It let the participants realise the value of what they are doing. It enable the project management to better value and disseminate the project products, and thus promote them towards the external stakeholders.

- **participative**

It requires the full participation of all project participants (and even possibly some external stakeholders when available) through the participative evaluation activities. It favors and sustains the dialogue between project actors, and enables them to express their concerns, interests and viewpoints. Its respects the fundamental rights of the persons, the state of the art discretion, and the specific rules established for the project (by making the data anonymous, for example).

In the kind of evaluation developed in **REFRAME**, the main criterium of evaluation is the perception by the project actors of the state of the project. The main indicator is thus the

¹ Latour, B., (1999) On Recalling ANT, in *Actor network Theory and After*, John Law and John Hassard editors; Blackwell Publishing, Oxford, UK.

Law, J., (1992) Notes on the Theory of the Actor-Network: ordering, strategy, and heterogeneity, *Systems Practise*, 5(4), pp379-393

degree of appreciation of the persons gathered through the interviews and the questionnaires. In addition, some "objectives" criteria may be used to complete the appreciative ones, such as:

- quantity of tangible productions;
- appropriateness of deliverables productions and compliance with the planning;
- number of events (meetings, workshops, conferences, etc.)
- number of external publications, participation in research conferences, broadcasting shows, etc.
- number of participants in the events
- etc.

4 Implementation of the Evaluation Process

In REFRAME, evaluation is undertaken through a full WP, WP6. The deliverables are:

- the Quality Assurance Plan (initial version in Spring 2018, final version at the end of the project);
- a progress report at mid project;
- a final report at the end of the project (this document).

The **Action Plan** for evaluation as presented in the Kick-Off meeting in Bologna and actualised for the Barcelona meeting was successfully followed during the project.

4.1 Evaluations Instruments

Participatory Observations

Participatory evaluation took place during the two plenary meetings of Bologna (January 30-31, 2018) and Barcelona (June 26-27, 2018).

Questionnaires

Two kind of questionnaires were issued:

- the questionnaire at the end of the plenary meetings (Bologna and Barcelona);
- the first general questionnaire "early vision" (sent end of May 2018).

Documents (deliverables)

The expected deliverables of **REFRAME**:

WP1

D 1.1 Project Management and Communication Plan

D1.2 Financial and Administrative Reports

WP2

D 2.1 European Laboratory for Regional Work Based Learning

WP3

- D 3.1** Methodological framework and toolbox for best practices collection and ECVET methodology
- D 3.2** Training of trainers, teachers, tutors and mentors
- D 3.3** How to implement RE-FRAME approach Handbook

WP4

- D.4.1** Report on piloting and validation and Lessons learnt

WP5

- D.5.1** Sustainability Plan
- D.5.2** Regional Seminars
- D.5.3** Final Conference
- D.5.4** Guidelines and Policy Recommendations

WP6

- D. 6.1** Quality Assurance Plan
- D.6.2** Evaluation Plan
- D.6.3** Progress and final evaluation reports

Specific elements

There was a specific process set up for the quality assurance of the web site and the collaborative platform.

5.1.2 The Tags characterising the identity of the project:



The identity of the project was rather clear since the beginning and did not fundamentally change along the project unrolling.

5.1.3 Level of satisfaction regarding the Plenary meetings

The level of satisfaction regarding the plenary meetings is rather good, even if there are always some discrepancies regarding the organisation or the content of the agenda. But nothing above usual, it could be said.

5.2 Results: productions, outcomes, and achievements

5.2.1 What partners are particularly proud of

The most significant outcomes for the partners consortium are:

- the interest shown by other Regions, not initially involved in the project;
- the European REFRAME Network that should be the base for a sustainable one;
- the connections created among all the stakeholders with a European dimension;
- the perspective to develop a framework for sustainable European strategy and transnational partnership to promote WBL paths in the Regions.

What they are really proud of:

- the discussion and cooperation;
- the possibility to engage and experience;
- the toolbox, the infographics and video tutorials;
- the Platform;
- the partnering process for WBL;
- the shift towards a more European approach (e.g. Learning Outcomes, ECVet, ...).

What they report as main success factors

- the ability to create a space for dialogue among key actors at Regional level, and to formalise it regarding the relationship between schools and companies, through the Platform, to implement quality in WBL;
- the ability to develop and implement a common methodological approach and tools, based on European standards;
- the mutual enrichment of partners' knowledge and tools across Regions and across actors;
- the ability to build something (the Platform, the methodology, the toolbox) that is usable and adaptable to different local situations.

5.2.2 The interim report and follow-up (WP1)

The Interim Report assessment suggested some enhancements and evolutions that were thoroughly taken into account and implemented.

5.2.3 Internal Communication (WP1)

The internal communication was seen as satisfying. The use of the google drive was rather good, though some partners had difficulties in the beginning. The main communication takes place through mail, and Skype for the steering committees. The face-to face plenary meetings enables to sort out good decision and to work rather fruitfully on the project content.

5.2.4 The final conference in Bologna (WP1)

The final conference of the REFRAME project took place on January 28th, 2020 in Bologna. It was housed by the Region Emilia-Romagna. It enabled to gather about participants originated from the different countries represented in the project, with a larger part from Italian Regional and national representatives. It was an opportunity to promote Work Based Learning using the realisations of the REFRAME project as a window and a support. The three workshops

- How a Centre of Vocational Excellence (COVE) could include quality in WBL - Maria Pascual and Irma Núñez – ENSE - Andrew McCoshan
- From technical to transversal skills to develop high quality of work based learning - Axel Joder – FREREF - Liliane Esnault
- Why International mobility for students, adult people, teachers and trainers - Hans Vasse and Alessia Toffetti -Jan van Brabant College

Enabled to discuss elements of interests and to start to reflect on how things could develop within the different Stakeholders networks after the end of the project. The conference was highly appreciated by the participants (see appendix 2).

5.2.5 The European Lab on WBL (WP2)

The Lab is materialised by the on-line platform <http://www.reframe-wbl.eu/en/reframe> .

The final version of the Platform was delivered rather late into the project, so there is not much results of evaluation from the users' side (only 5 users filled the on-line evaluation questionnaire, and 5 more during Pilot Actions in Catalonia).

The "local part" of the network is build up from the Reginal Stakeholders networks, which developed rather well in Emilia-Romagna – where nothing was really formalised before the

project – and in Catalonia, - where there was already a solid basis for them. In the Netherlands, there was also an existing partnership that was not much impacted by the project.

In fact, we can say the project has produced the constituting elements of a European Network of Regional Labs for Work Based Learning. At the Regional level, it works well in Emilia-Romagna, where the role of the project was decisive, and in Catalonia, where there was already an history of structured collaboration.

5.2.6 The local stakeholders' networks (WP2)

The meetings organised for and with the local Stakeholders networks in the different partner regions were rather very successful in Emilia Romagna and in Catalonia. In Emilia-Romagna it was a real opportunity to sensitize the local actors – schools, companies and other institutional structures – to the importance of WBL, and all the benefit that could derive from its larger implementation, and to the use of European standards, such as Learning Outcomes and ECVET. In Catalonia, it was an opportunity to enlarge the concerns of the already existing networks towards the possibility of working with new partners in Emilia-Romagna and the Netherlands, as well as to renew the focus on the European standards. In the Netherlands, it was more an opportunity to disseminate the project within already existing events and programmes.

(see the reports of WP2 for more details).

5.2.7 The methodological approach and the Handbook and the infographic framework (WP3)

The work of WP3 consisted in setting the solid basis for a common understanding of WBL, mobility (both "professional", from school to company, and international, from one country to another)), and the standards and tools to support and successfully implement them, for the common benefit of all actors implied – school, companies and students.

The first deliverable (D3.1) presents the core European standards – WBL, ECVET, EQF descriptors, Learning Outcomes - and the methodological elements and steps of the Reframe approach – Planning, Co-Design, Monitoring, Evaluation.

From that, the second deliverable (D3.3 – which in fact covers D3.2 and D3.3) elaborates a more detailed description linked with the two areas that were taken as basis for REFRAME – Mechatronic and Automation, together with a set of practical recommendations and tools for teachers, trainers and tutors.

One of the most interesting products issued from that is the Infographic framework available from the REFRAME website, which organises and structures the mobility process as a social cooperation between the school, the company and the student. It presents all the tools available in the REFRAME platform to make contact, elaborate and sign the contract, and ensure the assessment and follow-up for all actors.

5.2.8 The piloting phase (WP4)

The piloting phase took place mostly during the last six months of the project, even if some ongoing actions from the part of partners could also be taken as pilot actions.

A method, including the Quality Assurance Principles of REFRAME, and an organization plan were proposed at the Lyon Plenary end of November 2018. They are detailed in the document "Guidelines for the WP4 Pilot Actions" (see WP4 deliverable).

There were in total:

- 4 Pilot Actions in Emilia-Romagna (renewable in 2020)
- 1 Pilot Actions in Catalonia
- 4 Pilot Actions in the Netherlands (+2 in 2020°)

Most of the Pilot Actions were dedicated to the use of the Platform, either as a test of functionalities, or to conduce a full process between a school and a company? Some were more dedicated to actions that were taking place as on-going processes and where the project concerns about promoting WBL were valorised.

In conclusion, one may say that the REFRAME project produced some valuable tools to promote WBL and sustain the mobility of VET students across Europe (The Platform, the Infographics, the documents, etc.). Now it is up to the partners, on their territory, to continue. Some examples of what could be "the Life after the Project" are given in the WP4 Report.

5.2.9 External communication (WP5)

General project communication: the web site and collaborative platform

The website/platform is available at

<http://www.reframe-wbl.eu/en/reframe>

Reframe on social networks

On Facebook

<https://www.facebook.com/ErasmusPlusReframe/>

on LinkedIn

<https://www.linkedin.com/company/erasmus-plus-reframe/>

Partners' roles in dissemination

Each partner was responsible for the external communication and dissemination tasks on their territory. They filled a report all the actions in the Journal of Valorisation.

5.2.10 Quality Assurance and Evaluation (WP6)

(It is the object of this document).

The methodology was presented in the Kick-Off meeting in Bologna.

Participatory Appreciative Evaluation: Method and principles

- Motives and targets
- Method, process and outcomes
- Quality Assurance Plan
- Internal, External, Embedded Evaluation
- Report(ing) on Evaluation

Motives and Targets

- Evaluate = appreciate, i.e. investigate the perceived value of the project and its outcomes
i.e. : quality, pertinence, efficiency, impacts, potential for innovation, sustainability of outcomes ...
- Aims at helping the project to reach its targets (and more) "not prove but improve"
- The objectives are ambitious, the process is adapted to the resources
- The "reference": candidacy

Method, process and outcomes

- Method

| | |
|-------------------------------|----------------|
| Participative | |
| Appreciative | Longitudinal |
| Qualitative | Systemic |
| Formative | Contextualised |
| Enabling Supporting Fostering | |



The process was followed during the whole project:

- each plenary session ended with a questionnaire (see Appendix 1 for the questionnaires and Appendix 2 for the results);
- two general questionnaires were issued (Early Vision and Advanced Vision);
- the platform benefited from a specific on-line questionnaire; an updated version of this questionnaire was added at the end of the project to collect a more precise view from the part of schools and teachers (see Appendix 1);
- a specific questionnaire was issued for the final conference in Bologna (see Appendix 1 for the questionnaire and Appendix 2 for the answers);
- participatory observations took place during all the plenary meetings and during the final conference.

5.2.11 Project deliverables

All deliverables were produced in time and according to what was expected from the application form.

The mid-project report mostly acknowledged the agreement of the Agency (after some corrections made).

5.3 Lessons learnt: which knowledge gained, which reflections and actions to sustain in the future

A specific deliverable is dedicated to this in WP5. Below is a summary of the main issues.

At institutional / territorial level:

(Taken from the questionnaire Advanced Vision and from the pilot Actions Reports)

- the dynamic of cooperation between local actors, stakeholders and decision makers needs to be supported and nurtured through active networks and concrete elements;
- there is a constant need to improve the cooperation model between Regional and European key actors

At European level

(taken from the questionnaire "Advanced Vision and from the animation of the Final Conference in Bologna)

- the use of European standards in Educational structures (Learning Outcomes, ECVET) is key to facilitate the mobilities abroad;

- the cooperation between countries having different systems and even different "WBL-cultures" was fruitful, but nevertheless it was complicated to build a platform that could suit the different Regional organisations and concerns; there is still some work to be done to have the different VET national / regional systems converge across Europe;

As conclusion, we can say that the REFRAME project has settled the basis for a transregional common platform

- to support WBL, culturally and practically;
- to enable a successful process of mobility among the different actor;
- to continuously promote quality enhancement of WBL Learning Programmes.

This Platform constitutes a good opportunity to start a broader dissemination, with new countries / Regions and new partners through local, regional and European new initiatives.

5.4 Impacts and value created

Impacts vs Implication

The management of impacts is a key aspect of the value creation within a European project like **REFRAME**. An impact is not something which is recorded after the fact. It has to be built in, right from the beginning of the project. Thus, it is the role of evaluation, together with project coordination, to sensitise project partners and to accompany them all along the project in order to have them put the maximum attention to the question of "maximising" impacts on the field. All activities undertaken are possible levers to multiply, enhance and enlarge projects impacts. The issue of impact is important because it is the way to evidence the fact the project creates value for its stakeholders. The value creation is central, the impacts are the concrete materialisation of it.

The Impacts Management policy and processes were presented at the Kick-Off in Bologna.

Impacts Management (1/3)

- Target audiences... or actors?
- Required outcomes, expected/desired impacts
- WHO: Everybody
- WHY: an impact is not something "acted", it has to be built explicitly all along the project
- It is how value is created and sustainability achieved

Impacts Management (2/3)

- Erasmus+ programme is hoping
 - qualitative impacts: on policies, practices, territories, target audiences, stakeholders, etc.
 - quantitative impacts: numbers of ... Institutions, teachers, students, companies, mobilities, etc.
- Project partners are also expecting positive changes for themselves (as individuals and Institutions)

Impacts Management (3/3)

- How do we manage to have all this (and possibly more...) happen?
 - The role of Assurance Quality
 - Sensitize, enable, foster → Check
 - Evaluation as part of Managing for Impacts
 - It is you who make things happen
 - the Impacts Management (maximisation) Plan
 - The Value Management Plan
 - The Journal of Valorisation

Elements of Impacts management from the part of partners were collected in the two general questionnaires. The vision of impacts at the end of the project is summarised by the following word cloud:

6 Risk Management

A significant part of Risks Management consists in acting within the framework of a Quality Assurance process that provides some guarantees that, if the "work is well done", it will prevent a lot of risks to occur.

For example, the quality of the consortium and a thorough consortium management all along the project will mostly prevent the risks regarding a poor consortium management.

The competences of partners in different areas, competences recognised and valued within the consortium will enable a smooth unrolling of the project, a guarantee of good achievement of the tasks, the production of good quality deliverables, and thus clearly minimise a lot of organisational risks and risks linked to the productions of poor products.

The mid-project assessment also provides with a good safeguard to avoid letting things go beyond what would be manageable.

6.1 Initial risks assessment

Risks generally encountered within similar European projects. (The risks linked to financial issues are not analysed here, as the financial aspects are not concerned as such by the Quality Assurance Plan and evaluation process). They are supposed to be managed within the range of the project coordination processes).

This tables below were issued at the beginning of the project and updated after the mid-project assessment.

6.1.1 General risks

| Risk | Probability | Impact | Action |
|--|-------------|--------|---|
| <i>Risks linked to the consortium and consortium management</i> | | | |
| Failure of a partner | Low | High | All partners are mobilised to find a replacement and minimise impacts on the project. |
| Failure of an WP leader | Low | High | Another partner within WP is asked to take over, or another partner with no WP responsibility. The project coordination may act as an interim leader to ensure continuity and avoid heavy impact on schedule. |
| Lack of commitment of a partner | Medium | Medium | The WP leader tries to solve the question by meeting the partner and discussing with them. A mediator may be search among other partners. If necessary, the problem could be escalated to project coordination. |
| Conflict management between partners, | | | an escalation procedure is put in place: as possible, the conflict should be solved at the closest of its appearance (e. g. if a |

| | | | |
|---|---------------|--|--|
| or with the coordination | | | conflict appears between two people of the same partner, it should be solved by the persons themselves, with a mediator if necessary ; if a conflict appears between two different partners, a conciliation should be tried by both partners, and a third party as mediator, etc. ; if the conflict cannot be sold at level 1, it is escalated at level 2 or 3 (from person to partner to coordination); if there is a strong risk of putting te project in danger or if the solution implies an important change in the project (repartition of work or budget, for examples), the Agency might be put into the circuit, but it is really a last resort |
| Risks regarding the scheduling | | | |
| Late start of the project (or not?) | <i>High</i> | <i>High</i> | <i>Consider M0 as January 2018 Ask for 6 months delay for the end of the project</i> |
| Inability to realise a task | low | Depends on the criticality of the task | In case of severe difficulty or impossibility to realise a task, the partner must contact the WP leader as soon as possible. |
| Inability to deliver a deliverable according to the schedule | Low to medium | High | The question of delays is to be discussed first within the WP and then with the project coordination. Nevertheless, in case of difficulty or impossibility to deliver the question has to be raised as soon as possible. Every late decision is potentially damageable for the project. In case of changes regarding what was written in the candidacy, the Agency must be advised rapidly. |
| High number of tasks to be performed within 2 years (38 tasks for the whole project) | <i>Medium</i> | <i>Medium</i> | Careful management of schedule by partners. Possibility to make "chunks" of tasks |
| Risks linked to the project outcomes | | | |
| <i>Difficulty to reach the quantitative goals</i> | <i>Medium</i> | <i>High</i> | The fact that the partners belong to several levels of networks (European, national, local) and their long commitment in LLL should avoid having |

| | | | |
|--|--------|----------------|---|
| Deliverables: 16 deliverables in two years | | | main difficulties in this area. Nevertheless, the attention of partners will be attracted by project coordination and evaluation on this point. |
| Two regional seminars in each country (60 key actors in each country) | Medium | Medium | Adapt to local constraints and give accompaniment to local actors |
| Pilot Actions | Medium | High | Sharing examples of Pilot Actions between partners can help those who are less advanced or more hesitating |
| Poor value of deliverables and outcomes | Low | High | The professionalism and qualification of Partners actors in the project should guarantee a good level of quality for the deliverables. A careful monitoring by the project management will enable taking appropriate measures if necessary The evaluation will proceed to a quality review of the deliverables and may alert the deliverable owners and project management if necessary. The mid-project assessment play a safeguard role. |
| Poor value of recommendations | Low | Medium to High | Partners and stakeholders are sensitised to this issue and are regularly asked about what the lessons learnt are and what could be the recommendations towards policy and decision makers. The final conference will be a place to test and enrich them. The fact that partners are also belonging to other European activities and Network. Keeps them aware of the contributions that the project is able to achieve at this level. |
| Risks linked to the project impacts and sustainability | | | |
| Difficulty to evidence project impacts | Medium | High | The question of impacts is central to any European project. Thus, a specific effort is asked to the partners to understand this key issue and make all their possible efforts in order to get, and evidence, the largest possible impacts on the different |

| | | | |
|--|---------------|--------|---|
| | | | target audiences and at the different level of territories. Questionnaires and templates help them to reflect upon these issues and formalise their thinking. |
| Difficulty to prove sustainability after the project | Low to medium | Medium | It is always difficult to imagine the life after the project, not even speaking of how to sustain it. Nevertheless, the project partners will be asked to reflect upon this issue, and to put in place all reasonable elements (structures, processes, resources) which could contribute to the sustainability of the project outcomes after its end. The participatory evaluation process pays particularly attention to this issue. |
| | | | |

6.1.2 Specific risks

| Risk | Probability | Impact | Action |
|--|--------------------|---------------|--|
| Management | | | |
| <i>Compliance with candidacy</i> | <i>Medium</i> | <i>Medium</i> | One key preoccupation of management, of all partners, and of evaluation all along the project |
| <i>Compliance with Agency requirements</i> | <i>Low</i> | <i>High</i> | Be sure to have Agency informed of all possible evolutions and changes |
| <i>Schedule management</i> | <i>Low</i> | <i>Medium</i> | Regular reporting should avoid big gaps, or, at least will enable taking early corrective actions from the part of the project management and all partners. |
| <i>Budget issues</i> | <i>Low</i> | <i>High</i> | <i>idem</i> |
| <i>Consortium management</i> | <i>Low</i> | <i>High</i> | It is very important to ensure a good functioning of the consortium. The fact that (at least some) partners are already knowing each other and have already been working together previously should prevent such risk. The regular meetings, on-line and face-to-face, the monitoring of the results and the longitudinal appreciative process of evaluation ensure to be able to react quickly if anything should go less well than expected. |
| <i>Delivering of QAP and methodology</i> | <i>Low</i> | <i>High</i> | The participatory evaluation process was successfully implemented in several European projects before and proved to be efficient. The reports always get a good appreciation. |

| | | | |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|---|
| <i>Implementing the evaluation activities</i> | <i>Low</i> | <i>Medium</i> | The partners are generally willing to contribute though they sometimes think that it gives a supplementary amount of work. The evaluation activities are schedule in order to minimise that. The answers to the questionnaires is mandatory. |
| <i>Delivering evaluation outcomes to coordination and partners in time to ensure smooth unrolling of the project</i> | <i>Low</i> | <i>Medium to High</i> | A presentation of the results of questionnaires and interviews is done very quickly after the collection so that everybody can make the possible decisions and adjust if necessary. Furthermore, the successful elements (as appreciated by the partners) contribute to the good atmosphere and sustain motivation. |
| <i>Dissemination</i> | | | A report is asked regularly to the partners about their dissemination activities to be sure not to forget about them at the end of the project. They are constantly reminded of the importance of disseminating. The sharing of examples of activities during the meetings is a good opportunity to find new ideas and opportunities. |
| <i>Exploitation</i> | | | The key issue in such projects is always about the "life after the project", and mostly the maintenance of the Platform after the end of the project. In REFRAME, the contract with the developer will ensure by anticipation that they will guarantee the maintenance after the end of the project. |
| WP1 - Management | | | |
| <i>Understanding of project key elements</i> | <i>Low to medium</i> | <i>High</i> | Work closely with project coordination and all partners to agree on what has to be done |
| <i>Relevance and practicality of the methodology</i> | <i>Low</i> | <i>High</i> | Work closely with project coordination and all partners to validate the propositions done by coordination |
| <i>Supporting partners in gaining ownership</i> | <i>Low to Medium</i> | <i>Medium to High</i> | This action is facilitated and supported by the evaluation. |
| <i>Production of the relevant management tools</i> | <i>Low to Medium</i> | <i>Medium to High</i> | Work closely with all partners to verify the adequacy of tools proposed. Ensure enough flexibility to adjust if necessary. |
| | | | |

| WP2 – European Laboratory for Regional WBL | | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|---|
| <i>Inability to gather enough key stakeholders</i> | <i>Medium</i> | <i>High</i> | Find a way to maximise opportunities of meetings at local level, by mobilising the networks of the local partners. The "dimension" and reputation of the local partners is a facilitator for that. |
| <i>Difficulties in animating the Regional labs</i> | <i>Medium</i> | <i>High</i> | Guidelines, recommendations and support are given to the partners |
| <i>Low acceptance of the collaborative platform</i> | <i>Low</i> | <i>Medium</i> | The quality of the Platform is essential. This requires a good development partner and a close monitoring, by all partners, of the development process. The Pilot Actions, and, more generally, the opening on-line to a large audience will guarantee the level of quality and reliability |
| | | | |
| WP3– Collaborative design based on ECVET approach | | | |
| <i>Poor ability to gather European information</i> | <i>Low</i> | <i>Medium</i> | Use all documents already published (European reports, etc.) |
| <i>Difficulties in designing curriculum</i> | <i>Low</i> | <i>High</i> | The competence of partners in the area should avoid this. Nevertheless, the diversity of situations in the different regions is a source of risk, hampering the building of a "common" approach. It will be a constant concern of project management, evaluation and consortium management to smoothen the way and take appropriate decisions to solve problems if any. |
| | | | |
| WP4 – Piloting and validation | | | |
| <i>Problems with prototype</i> | <i>Low</i> | <i>High</i> | <i>Be sure to deliver something appropriate by users</i> |
| <i>Difficulties in organising the trialling</i> | <i>Low</i> | <i>Medium</i> | <i>Number of actors to be involved, time and place</i> |
| <i>Difficulties in implementing the trialling</i> | <i>Low</i> | <i>High</i> | <i>Provide partners with enough support</i> |
| <i>Difficulties in integrating results with the European qualification framework</i> | <i>Low</i> | <i>Medium</i> | <i>Importance of the evaluation phase and tools</i> |

| | | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|--|
| <i>Not enough good information to design scenarios for the future</i> | <i>Low</i> | <i>Medium</i> | <i>Idem</i> |
| <i>Poor recommendation and guidelines</i> | <i>Low</i> | <i>High</i> | <i>Experience of partners in such work should avoid main difficulties.</i> |
| WP5 | | | |
| <i>Implication of partners in dissemination activities</i> | <i>Medium</i> | <i>High</i> | <i>Attract attention of partners from the very beginning of the project Use a tool to help them record dissemination information as they happen</i> |
| <i>Difficulty to undertake the networking with other projects</i> | <i>Medium</i> | <i>Medium</i> | <i>The consortium is already experienced in European projects and should have enough links to avoid a total "flop"</i> |
| <i>Organisation of final conference</i> | <i>Low</i> | <i>High</i> | <i>Should be prepared enough in advance and rely upon the links with other projects and key stakeholders</i> |
| WP6 – Quality assurance and evaluation | | | |
| <i>Project evaluation: appropriation of the method and tools by the consortium</i> | <i>low</i> | <i>High</i> | |
| <i>Difficulty to mobilise external stakeholders in the appreciation of the project results</i> | <i>Medium</i> | <i>Medium</i> | <i>Include the evaluation process in the pilot actions and existing meetings to avoid multiplying the mobilisation of external stakeholders</i> |
| <i>Outcomes evaluation: difficulty to involve partners and stakeholders in the participatory process (questionnaires, interviews)</i> | <i>Medium</i> | <i>Medium</i> | <i>Include the evaluation process in the pilot actions and existing meetings to avoid multiplying the mobilisation of external stakeholders + use "natural" opportunities of partners to meet with external stakeholders</i> |

6.2 Risks monitoring during the project

Evolution of risks as seen by the partners

From the first questionnaire "Early Vision":

7 Appendices

8 Appendix 1 – Evaluation Instruments

8.1 Plenary meetings

Meaning of the scales, depending on questions;

1 "really not good" ... to 5 "very good" Or 1 "not agree at all" ... to 5 "totally agree"

(1 is the bottom and 5 the top of the scale)

8.1.1 Kick-Off – Bologna

| General organisation of the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Location | | | | | |
| Rooms | | | | | |
| Duration | | | | | |
| Food | | | | | |
| Organisation of activities | | | | | |
| The agenda was well dealt with | | | | | |
| Other (please specify) | | | | | |
| Roles and expression of partners | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Everyone could express themselves as they wished to | | | | | |
| I fully understand everyone's work | | | | | |
| The role of each partner seems clear to me | | | | | |
| Difficulties were clearly stated | | | | | |
| Others (specify) | | | | | |
| Comments | | | | | |

| Project general organisation and coordination | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| The objectives are clear for me If not, please precise | | | | | |
| I think that the organisation is well adapted to the project If not, please precise | | | | | |
| I understood well the financial issues and the tool for the financial reporting There are some points left that I did not understand regarding organisational and/or financial aspects. Please, list them below | | | | | |
| I understand the keystones of the project If not, please precise Here are the three most important issues for me in this project | | | | | |
| Comments | | | | | |

| Project content and unrolling | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| I now have a better understanding of the WPs organisation. If not, please specify what is not clear | | | | | |
| I understand the schedule and its implications on my work Here are the first three activities I plan to start with when I come back | | | | | |
| I have a good idea of the project productions and outcomes and what will be my role in there If not, please specify what is not clear | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| I agree with the overall organisation of workload and time and tasks attribution for me and my Institution If not, please specify what are the pending issues | | | | | |
| For me, here are the three most difficult things that I will have to do in the next three months (regarding REFRAME) | | | | | |
| For me, here are the three main assets that I represent for the project (or my three main contributions) as I see them at the moment | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Others, comments | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Quality Assurance and Evaluation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| I understand the process, principles and methods of evaluation used for REFRAME If something is not clear, or problematic, please precise below | | | | | |
| I understand that my commitment is important in this process, and that I will have to participate to the main activities (questionnaires, interviews, ...) to ensure a good quality of the process. If something is not clear, or problematic, please precise below | | | | | |
| Others, comments | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Impacts and Value Management | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| I understand the importance of taking care of impacts management and value creation during the whole project life If something is not clear, or problematic, please precise below | | | | | |
| I understand that my commitment is important in this process, and that I will have to participate to the main activities (dissemination, impacts forecasting and measurement, etc.) to ensure a good quality of the process. If something is not clear, or problematic, please precise below | | | | | |
| Others, comments | | | | | |

8.1.2 Plenary Barcelona

| | | | | | |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| General organisation of the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Location | | | | | |
| Rooms | | | | | |
| Duration | | | | | |
| Food | | | | | |
| Organisation of activities | | | | | |
| The agenda was well dealt with | | | | | |
| Other (please specify) | | | | | |
| Roles and expression of partners | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Everyone could express themselves as they wished to | | | | | |
| I fully understand everyone's work | | | | | |
| The role of each partner seems clear to me | | | | | |
| Difficulties were clearly stated | | | | | |
| Others (specify) | | | | | |
| Comments | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Project general organisation and coordination (WP1) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| I find the unrolling of the project smooth enough | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| If not, please precise | | | | | |
| I think that the organisation of project management and the repartition od management tasks are functioning well If not, please precise | | | | | |
| I am at ease with the financial reporting There are some points left that I did not understand regarding organisational and/or financial aspects. Please, list them below | | | | | |
| I clearly see where we are in the project, where I am myself and how to organise my work to go on successfully Here are the three most important things that I will do when coming back home | | | | | |
| Comments | | | | | |

| Project content and unrolling | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| WP2 I now have a good understanding of the WP outcomes and how to produce them If not, please specify what is not clear | | | | | |
| WP2 I know what I still have to do and I have no problem to do it | | | | | |
| WP3 I have a good idea of the WP organisation and outcomes and what will be my role in there If not, please specify what is not clear | | | | | |
| For me, here are the three most difficult things that I will have to do in the next three months (regarding REFRAME) | | | | | |
| Others, comments | | | | | |

| Communication and collaboration between partners (WP1-WP5) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| I think there is a good "horizontal" collaboration in the consortium If "yes" (answers 4-5), please give us an example If "no" (answers (1-3) what could be improved and how? | | | | | |
| I have all the materials necessary to communicate about the project in my environment (my institution, my territory, the local stakeholders) If no, tell us what you are missing | | | | | |
| Others, comments | | | | | |

| Quality Assurance and Evaluation (WP6) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| I have a better understanding of the process and methods of evaluation used for REFRAME If you still have questions, or if you do not agree, please precise below | | | | | |
| I understand that my commitment is important in this process, and that I will have to participate to the main activities (questionnaires, interviews, ...) to ensure a good quality of the process. If you still have questions, or if you do not agree, please precise below | | | | | |
| Others, comments | | | | | |

| Dissemination Impacts and Value Management (WP5-WP6) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| I am aware of the importance of disseminating REFRAME productions and outcomes | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Here are three-four examples of actions I will take in the next few months | | | | | |
| I understand the importance of thinking about impacts to make them happen. If not, please share below | | | | | |
| I am at ease with the idea of evidencing and appreciating the degree of change in practices that could result from the REFRAME project in my environment (myself, my institution, my territory) If not (answers 1-2), please share below If yes (answers 3-5), give us one or two examples of how you will do that | | | | | |
| Others, comments | | | | | |

8.1.3 Plenary Lyon

| General organisation of the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Location | | | | | |
| Rooms | | | | | |
| Duration | | | | | |
| Food | | | | | |
| Organisation of activities | | | | | |
| The agenda was well dealt with | | | | | |
| Other (please specify) | | | | | |
| Roles and expression of partners | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Everyone could express themselves as they wished to | | | | | |
| I fully understand everyone's work | | | | | |
| The role of each partner seems clear to me | | | | | |
| Difficulties were clearly stated | | | | | |
| Others (specify) | | | | | |
| Comments | | | | | |

| Project general organisation and coordination (WP1) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| I find that the project is on track and doing well If not, please precise | | | | | |
| I think that the organisation of project management and the repartition of management tasks are functioning well If not, please precise | | | | | |
| I am at ease with the financial reporting | | | | | |
| There are some points left that I did not understand regarding organisational and/or financial aspects. Please, list them below | | | | | |
| I clearly see where we are in the project, where I am myself and how to organise my work to go on successfully | | | | | |
| Here are the three most important things that I will do when coming back home | | | | | |
| Comments | | | | | |

| Project content | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|-----------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| WP2 – European Lab for WBL | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| I am pleased with the current outcomes of WP2 for my institution for the project in general If not, please precise why | | | | | |
| WP2 – European Lab for WBL I think there is still a lot of work to do to achieve WP2 objectives Here are the three main actions I will undertake when going back to achieve the objectives of WP2 | | | | | |
| WP3 I have been able to contribute successfully to WP3 so far If not, please precise why | | | | | |
| WP3 There is still some important job to be done in WP3 to achieve its goals here are the three main actions that I will undertake in order to complete my work in WP3 | | | | | |
| WP4 I understand clearly what I have to do and how to do it If not, please precise what you are missing | | | | | |
| WP4 Here are the three main actions I will undertake when going back home regrading WP4 | | | | | |
| WP5 - Web site and platform I am pleased with the current state of the web site / platform If not please precise why Please precise how you will contribute to the web site / platform in the next months | | | | | |
| WP5 - Dissemination I have been able to disseminate successfully the works of Reframe in my institution / territory If yes, please give us some examples If not, please precise what you are missing Here are the main dissemination actions I will undertake during the next months | | | | | |
| Others, comments | | | | | |

8.1.4 Plenary Helmond

| General organisation of the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| Location | | | | | |
| Rooms | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Duration | | | | | |
| Food | | | | | |
| Organisation of activities | | | | | |
| The agenda was well dealt with | | | | | |
| Other (please specify) | | | | | |
| Roles and expression of partners | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Everyone could express themselves as they wished to | | | | | |
| I fully understand everyone's work | | | | | |
| The role of each partner seems clear to me | | | | | |
| Difficulties were clearly stated | | | | | |
| Others (specify) | | | | | |
| Comments | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Project general organisation and coordination (WP1) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| I find that the project is on track and doing well If not, please precise | | | | | |
| I am on time with the financial reporting | | | | | |
| If you are still experiencing some difficulties, please, list them below | | | | | |
| I clearly see where we are in the project, where I am myself and how to organise my work to go on successfully | | | | | |
| Here are the three most important things that I will do when coming back home | | | | | |
| Comments | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Project content | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| WP2 – European Lab for WBL I am pleased with the current outcomes of WP2 for my institution for the project in general If not, please precise why | | | | | |
| WP2 – European Lab for WBL I think there is still a lot of work to do to achieve WP2 objectives Here are the three main actions I will undertake when going back to achieve the objectives of WP2 | | | | | |
| WP3 – ECVET Approach I have been able to contribute successfully to WP3 so far If not, please precise why | | | | | |
| WP3 - ECVET Approach There is still some important job to be done in WP3 to achieve its goals here are the three main actions that I will undertake in order to complete my work in WP3 | | | | | |
| WP4 – Piloting and validation I understand clearly what I have to do and how to do it | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| If not, please precise what you are missing | | | | | |
| WP4 – Piloting and validation | | | | | |
| Here are the three main actions I will undertake when going back home regrading WP4 | | | | | |
| WP5 - Web site and platform | | | | | |
| I am pleased with the current state of the web site / platform | | | | | |
| If not please precise why | | | | | |
| Please precise how you will contribute to the web site / platform in the next months | | | | | |
| WP5 - Dissemination | | | | | |
| I have been able to disseminate successfully the works of Reframe in my institution / territory | | | | | |
| If yes, please give us some examples | | | | | |
| If not, please precise what you are missing | | | | | |
| Her are the main dissemination actions I will undertake during the next months | | | | | |
| Others, comments | | | | | |

| |
|-----------------------------------|
| Other remarks and comments |
|-----------------------------------|

8.1.5 Plenary Barcelona #2

| General organisation of the conference | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Location | | | | | |
| Rooms | | | | | |
| Duration | | | | | |
| Food | | | | | |
| Organisation of activities | | | | | |
| There was enough "space" for everyone to express and share | | | | | |

| Project general organisation and coordination (WP1) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| I am confident that the project is a real success in the end | | | | | |
| If not completely, please precise what to put attention to | | | | | |
| I am in the clear with the final financial reporting | | | | | |
| If you are still experiencing some difficulties, please, list them below | | | | | |
| I am clear about what to do till the end of the project | | | | | |
| Here are the three most important things that I will do when coming back home | | | | | |
| Comments | | | | | |

| Project content | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| <p>WP2 – European Lab for WBL I am aware of the importance of sustaining the Platform after the end of the project</p> <p>Here are the three main actions I will undertake when going back to achieve this objective now and in the next future</p> | | | | | |
| <p>WP3 – ECVET Approach I am aware of the importance of disseminating the outcomes of WP3 among my networks and stakeholders</p> <p>Here are the three main actions I will undertake when going back to achieve this objective now and in the next future</p> | | | | | |
| <p>WP4 – Piloting and validation I am satisfied with what was done at my level (Regional/Institutional) regarding the Pilot Actions</p> <p>If yes, could you share with us the main success factors, key positive elements, that you can get from these actions?</p> <p>If no, what could still be done before the end of the project to improve things?</p> | | | | | |
| <p>WP5 - Web site and platform I am satisfied with the current state of the web site / platform</p> <p>If yes, could you share with us the main success factors, key positive elements?</p> <p>If no, please precise what it is really crucial to improve until the end of the project</p> | | | | | |
| <p>WP5 - Dissemination I am concerned by the importance of disseminating successfully the works of Reframe in my institution / territory</p> <p>Her are the main dissemination actions I will undertake during the next months</p> | | | | | |
| Others, comments | | | | | |

| Project outcomes, policy recommendations and sustainability | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| <p>I think the project has achieved a great part of its objectives</p> <p>If not really, please shar your concerns with us</p> <p>If yes, for me, the 3 key outcomes of the project that I will sustain after the end of the project are the following</p> | | | | | |
| <p>I think we are now able to issue some key recommendations regarding policy developments in WBL</p> <p>Here are for me the main ones</p> | | | | | |
| Other, comments | | | | | |

| |
|---|
| Other remarks and general comments about the meeting |
|---|

8.1.6 Plenary Bologna Final

No questionnaire for the final meeting (no time left to improve)

8.1.7 Final conference in Bologna

| Organisation of the Conference | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Location | | | | | |
| Room | | | | | |
| Duration | | | | | |
| Catering | | | | | |
| Agenda | | | | | |
| Speakers | | | | | |
| Debates | | | | | |
| Workshops | | | | | |
| Thank you for specifying, to your opinion: What was the most successful? | | | | | |
| What could have been improved? | | | | | |

| Content of the conference and interest regarding the REFRAME project issues | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| The conference was interesting and well moderated | | | | | |
| I think that the conference has set a few interesting points about the importance of Work Based Learning | | | | | |
| I think that the conference has well emphasized the importance of students' mobility in developing key competences | | | | | |
| The conference has presented some valuable European initiatives in the areas linked with these issues | | | | | |
| How to go further? I could envisage the following actions in my Region/territory to "propagate" the outcomes of the conference and of the REFRAME project: | | | | | |
| I would like to participate in a further project on the same kind of concerns. If yes, please give us your e-mail! | | | | | |
| Here is what for me was the most interesting in this conference | | | | | |
| Here is what I missed most in this conference | | | | | |

| |
|--|
| General comments about the Conference |
|--|

Thank you!

8.2 General questionnaires

8.2.1 Early vision

1. Your general vision of the project

1.1 How would you describe in a few words the vision that you have currently of the REFRAME project?

Which are, for you, the main objectives and characteristics of this project?

How would you phrase the Key Success Factors of the project?

What could be the main pitfalls the project could encounter?

1.2. What is your role in the project? Does it meet your expectations?

What are your personal objectives and concerns in the project?

What do you expect from your participation?

What are your main responsibilities?

1.3. Keywords (or Tags)

Which keywords would you use to describe the project (as many as you want)?

2. Project Advancement

2.1. What are your contributions up to now? How do you appreciate them (over expectations, as forecasted, less than forecasted, different from what was planned...)? Precise your arguments.

2.2. How do you appreciate the work done in general (over expectations, as forecasted, different from what was expected...)? Precise your arguments.

2.3. How do you appreciate the general unrolling of the project?

2.4 How do you appreciate the project management?

3. Cooperation between partners

3.1. How do you appreciate the "horizontal" collaboration within the consortium?

Do you think there should be more of it?

Do you have any idea on how to improve it? (processes, tools, etc.)

3.2. Use of Google Drive

How do you appreciate the use of Google Drive?

Which are the best points?

Which is missing or less satisfying?

How to improve things?

4. Risks Analysis

NB: seeing "no risks at the moment" is a risk in itself; an endeavour like our project is definitely something risky; it just means that one is not aware of what may happen that could hamper the smooth unrolling of the project and possibly endanger its success. So we encourage you to take this exercise very seriously and try really to figure out which are the main risks and how to cope with them (either to avoid them or to manage them if they happen)

4.1. What do you see as general risks for the project and how to tackle them?

Example: Inability to deliver a product or a deliverable on schedule, poor functioning of the consortium, difficulties to mobilise the actors in one partner institution, lack of time, lack of motivation, etc?

4.2. What do you see as specific risks during the early stages of the project (and how to tackle them)?

4.3. What do you see as specific risks for yourself and/or your institution (and how to tackle them)?

5. Impacts Analysis (early stage)

NB: an impact is something that inflicts a change in what is happening. One generally tries to minimise the "negative" impacts (that produces changes that are not wished, or not in the right direction), and to maximise the "positive" impacts (changes that are in the right direction according to the expected results of the action).

Please reflect upon which impacts (changes) you already see or forecast

At the general level on the different target audiences

At your institution / Region level

At your personal level

6. Orientation of the project for the coming year

6.1. To your opinion, what are the most successful achievements so far?

6.2. What are for you the most crucial steps for the project during the next year?

How do you intend to contribute to them?

6.3 Do you think there should be some reorientations for the project (even minor ones)? If yes, which ones?

7 Role of evaluation

What kind of information are you expecting from the evaluation to help you improve your own position and your work in the project?

8. Further remarks: thank you for sharing your other remarks and/or suggestions

8.2.2 Advanced vision

1. Your general vision of the project

1.1 How would you describe in a few words the vision that you have now of the RE-FRAME project?

1.2. What has been the most successful for you?

Do you perceive some significant changes with the situation before the project?

What could be improved during the last 4 months?

1.3. How would you appreciate the adequacy between what was done and what was supposed to be done (i.e. the proposal)?

What are the most positive changes?

What are the less positive ones?

1.4. What about your role in the project?

Does it meet your expectations? How are you and your institution implied in the project? Is it different from what you expected? To what extent?

What are you especially proud of in your participation in the project?

What could have been done better from your part?

1.5. After two years, which kind of keywords (or tags) do you think best represent the project?

Please list below

2. Project productions and outcomes

- 2.1. For you what are the most important production of RE-FRAME?**
- 2.2. What are you the proudest of?**
- 2.3. What could have been done better?**
- 2.4. What to do to be sure to have a success at the end of the project?**

3. Lessons learnt

- 3.1. what would be the main lessons learnt from the work done in the project at personal level?**
- 3.2. what would be the main lessons learnt from the work done in the project at institutional level?**
- 3.3. what would be the main lessons learnt from the work done in the project at European level?**

4. Your appreciation of the project contribution to the building of a Regional Network for Work-Based Learning

- 4.1. Now that the project is almost over, how would you analyse the main success factors in this process?**
- 4.2. To what extend did the project contribute to evidence/develop/enhance them?**
Give as many points as possible which show that, to your opinion, the contribution was effective
- 4.3. What remains to be done?**
How could we make a step further?

5. Your appreciation of the project outcomes

- 5.1. What are the most significant outcomes for you at Regional/local level?**
Please try to be concrete and specific and explain why they are important for you
- 5.2. What are the most significant outcomes at European level?**
Please, again, try to be concrete and specific and explain why they are important for you

6. Impacts Analysis (end of project)

NB: an impact is something that inflicts a change in what is happening. One generally tries to minimise the "negative" impacts (that produces changes that are not wished, or not in the right direction), and to maximise the "positive" impacts (changes that are in the right direction according to the expected results of the action).

Thank you for answering in the most thorough and accurate way.

6.1. Impacts that you can identify already:

for you? for your institution? for your territory? at European level?

6.2. Impacts that you forecast at short range (just after the end)

for you? for your institution? for your territory? at European level?

6.3. Impacts that you (hopefully) will be able to create and sustain after the end of the project

for you? for your institution? for your territory? at European level?

7. The life after the project

- 7.1. What are you willing to do in the next year(s) to continue the work started during the project at Regional/local level?
- 7.2. What are you willing to do in the next year(s) to continue the work started during the project at European level?
- 7.3. Which recommendation would you make to your institution, your local decision makers, the European policy makers in order to continue to progress on the main issues developed during the project?

8. Further remarks: thank you for sharing your other remarks and/or suggestions

8.3 On-line evaluation questionnaire for the web-site/platform

8.3.1 First version (during the Pilot Phase)

PARTNER DATA:

NAME (Optional): _____

SURNAME(Optional): _____

COUNTRY: _____

GENDER: F M

CURRENT POSITION: _____

COMPANY/ORGANISATION (Optional): _____

DOMAIN OF ACTIVITY: _____

This semi-structured questionnaire is aimed at collecting your feedback and comments on the REFRAME website and platform.

CIS, as partners responsible for the platform and website, informs you that the completion of the present questionnaire is part of this project activity. All data will be treated as confidential and only for evaluation and improvement purposes.

I authorised the use of the data for evaluation proposes:

Yes No

What do you like?

What do you like less?

FEEDBACK OF WEBSITE IN GENERAL

(1= very poor, 2=poor, 3=adequate, 4=good, 5=excellent)

| Main features of the website | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| The website is <i>user-friendly</i> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

| | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| The website is <i>able to attract interest</i> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| The interface is <i>satisfactory</i> for you | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| The menus and tool bars are <i>well structured and organised in a functional way</i> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| The web pages are <i>structured in a coherent/adequate way</i> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| The website is <i>accessible and usable for people with different disabilities</i> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| It is <i>easy to navigate in the website</i> (it is easy to find what you are looking for) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| The information available is <i>clearly organised</i> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| The information available is <i>useful</i> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| The information available is <i>accurate</i> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| The <i>size and colour</i> of the textual elements are <i>adequate</i> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| The balance of <i>text, links, headers, font sizes and white spaces</i> is <i>adequate</i> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Is there any information/part missing? Please list what is not available here but that you would like to find:

What is the added value of the REFRAME website from your perspective?

Open suggestions

8.3.2 Final version on-line for the evaluation of the platform (Teachers and Schools)

The Google Form may be found at:

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSe3POUlgur3hZV_EaffvOaMCX8jC0aEyXqUxJW5bgRXeihqeA/viewform

9 Appendix 2 – Evaluation Data

9.1 Plenary meetings

Meaning of the scales, depending on questions;

1 "really not good" ... to 5 "very good" Or 1 "not agree at all" ... to 5" totally agree"

(1 is the bottom and 5 the top of the scale)

9.1.1 Kick-Off – Bologna

13 answers

| General organisation of the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| Location | | | 1 | 2 | 10 |
| Rooms | | | 1 | 1 | 10 |
| Duration | | | 2 | 1 | 10 |
| Food | | 1 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| Organisation of activities | | 1 | 1 | | 11 |
| The agenda was well dealt with | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| Other (please specify) <i>Lots of repeating homework e.g. reading out text on ppt → be brief and concise</i> <i>We agreed on any things and followed the agenda</i> | | | | | |
| Roles and expression of partners | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Everyone could express themselves as they wished to | | | 2 | 2 | 9 |
| I fully understand everyone's work | | 1 | 2 | 2 | 9 |
| The role of each partner seems clear to me | | | 4 | 1 | 8 |
| Difficulties were clearly stated | | | 5 | 2 | 7 |
| Others (specify) <i>Role of union?</i> | | | | | |
| Comments <i>Ambitious project</i> <i>Lots of potential</i> | | | | | |

| Project general organisation and coordination | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| The objectives are clear for me If not, please precise | | 1 | 1 | ' | 7 |
| I think that the organisation is well adapted to the project If not, please precise | | | 1 | 3 | 9 |
| I understood well the financial issues and the tool for the financial reporting There are some points left that I did not understand regarding organisational and/or financial aspects. Please, list them below | | | 2 | 2 | 7 |
| I understand the keystones of the project If not, please precise Here are the three most important issues for me in this project <i>Sharing best practices</i> <i>Enhancing WBL in my region</i> <i>Make my network and that of my institution stronger</i> | | | 3 | 2 | 8 |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Platform Testing Evaluation | | | | | |
| Comments | | | | | |

| Project content and unrolling | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I now have a better understanding of the WPs organisation. If not, please specify what is not clear Do we address Higher Ed? | | | 2 | 5 | 6 |
| I understand the schedule and its implications on my work Here are the first three activities I plan to start with when I come back Talk with the headmaster transfer office | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 8 |
| I have a good idea of the project productions and outcomes and what will be my role in there If not, please specify what is not clear | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 7 |
| I agree with the overall organisation of workload and time and tasks attribution for me and my Institution If not, please specify what are the pending issues | | 1 | 1 | 4 | 7 |
| For me, here are the three most difficult things that I will have to do in the next three months (regarding REFRAME) To interpret Italy curriculum To interpret NL curriculum To establish correspondences Creating space in colleagues' timetable find key players in different organisations designing the platform None (sic) | | | | | |
| For me, here are the three main assets that I represent for the project (or my three main contributions) as I see them at the moment Curriculum criteria WBL criteria to establish correspondences distribute good practice support partners with the wanted info designing the platform profiles identification testing two templates guidelines participating in online meetings following-up on the partners' work | | | | | |
| Others, comments | | | | | |

| Quality Assurance and Evaluation | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--|---|---|---|---|----|
| I understand the process, principles and methods of evaluation used for REFRAME If something is not clear, or problematic, please precise below | | | 3 | 3 | 7 |
| I understand that my commitment is important in this process, and that I will have to participate to the main activities (questionnaires, interviews, ...) to ensure a good quality of the process. If something is not clear, or problematic, please precise below | | 1 | 1 | | 11 |

| |
|------------------|
| Others, comments |
|------------------|

| Impacts and Value Management | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| I understand the importance of taking care of impacts management and value creation during the whole project life If something is not clear, or problematic, please precise below | | | 2 | 2 | 9 |
| I understand that my commitment is important in this process, and that I will have to participate to the main activities (dissemination, impacts forecasting and measurement, etc.) to ensure a good quality of the process. If something is not clear, or problematic, please precise below | | | 2 | 1 | 10 |
| Others, comments | | | | | |

9.1.2 Plenary Barcelona

9 answers

General comments

The meeting was considered rather productive.

Some people still struggle with project organisation, Google drive folders, financial reporting ...

Try to fix this quickly because we are already close to mid-project 😊

Everybody is still in productions of elements of WP2 (Job profiles, Learning Outcomes), and starting to worry about WP3 (Pilot Actions).

It seems that no one is really creative regarding communication and dissemination, which is probably not that problematic, because the main target are education professionals (not the large public) 😊.

In the same way, nobody puts a lot of attention into impacts management.

| General organisation of the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Location | | | 1 | 2 | 6 |
| Rooms | | | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| Duration | | | | 5 | 4 |
| Food | | | | 4 | 5 |
| Organisation of activities | | | 1 | 5 | 3 |
| The agenda was well dealt with | | | 2 | 5 | 2 |
| Other (please specify) <i>We changed the agenda accordingly, all the partners agreed immediately</i> | | | | | |
| Roles and expression of partners | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Everyone could express themselves as they wished to | | | | 4 | 5 |
| I fully understand everyone's work | | | 2 | 4 | 3 |
| The role of each partner seems clear to me | | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 |
| Difficulties were clearly stated | | 1 | 1 | 5 | 2 |
| Others (specify) | | | | | |
| Comments <i>Productive meeting</i> <i>NB: one person has all the "poor" answers but no explanations</i> | | | | | |

| Project general organisation and coordination (WP1) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I find the unrolling of the project smooth enough If not, please precise | | 1 | 1 | 5 | 2 |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| I think that the organisation of project management and the repartition od management tasks are functioning well If not, please precise Can't share with Google Drive. Have to solve this | | | 3 | 5 | 1 |
| I am at ease with the financial reporting There are some points left that I did not understand regarding organisational and/or financial aspects. Please, list them below Schedule Justification docs | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| I clearly see where we are in the project, where I am myself and how to organise my work to go on successfully Here are the three most important things that I will do when coming back home Google drive - folder Animation Dissemination administration not so clear about involvement of my organisation in one or another work platform finalisation of WP2 planning regional activities be committed to the decision taken templates WP3 website revision platform revision templates users' guide qualifications / Job profiles my time sheets control google drive redefine the leaflet disseminate | | | 3 | 4 | 2 |
| Comments | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Project content and unrolling | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| WP2 I now have a good understanding of the WP outcomes and how to produce them If not, please specify what is not clear | | 1 | | 7 | 1 |
| WP2 I know what I still have to do and I have no problem to do it Stakeholders meeting, workshop, seminar | | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| WP3 I have a good idea of the WP organisation and outcomes and what will be my role in there If not, please specify what is not clear Pilot phase unclear Final outcome of the project | | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 |

| |
|---|
| <p>For me, here are the three most difficult things that I will have to do in the next three months (regarding REFRAME)</p> <p>Prepare the workshop</p> <p>Push colleagues to do something for the project</p> <p>Finalise platform</p> <p>Design pilot use of the platform</p> <p>Get in touch and get feedback from field actors in my Region</p> <p>Share the Job profiles</p> <p>Developing a shared approach to task</p> <p>Launch training activities for teachers involved</p> <p>Complete and finalise the platform: contents – functionalities</p> <p>Quality assurance plan</p> <p>Comparison of curricula taking into account Los, not all regions have their curricula split in Los</p> <p>Platform info</p> <p>Users' guide</p> <p>Qualifications (LOs)</p> <p>Stakeholders' reach</p> <p>Redefine and improve the project management</p> <p>Plan future activities of dissemination</p> <p>Find contents for the platform</p> <p>Others, comments</p> |
|---|

| Communication and collaboration between partners (WP1-WP5) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| <p>I think there is a good "horizontal" collaboration in the consortium</p> <p>If "yes" (answers 4-5), please give us an example</p> <p>Seen several bilaterals</p> <p>Contact with WP leaders without the "help" of coordinator</p> <p>The meeting allows to share language, methods, and way of working</p> <p>Partners reply to e-mails quite quickly, especially the leader</p> <p>Skype meetings</p> <p>Google drive</p> <p>Define the agenda: who does what and when</p> <p>Increase understanding</p> <p>If "no" (answers 1-3) what could be improved and how?</p> <p>Sometime things have to be clearer</p> <p>Everyone has to share their expertise</p> | | 1 | | 7 | 1 |
| <p>I have all the materials necessary to communicate about the project in my environment (my institution, my territory, the local stakeholders)</p> <p>If no, tell us what you are missing</p> <p>Site and other w. still under construction – will be of great help to get stakeholders aboard</p> <p>OK, worked on during the meeting</p> <p>Others, comments</p> | | | 2 | 5 | 2 |

| Quality Assurance and Evaluation (WP6) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| <p>I have a better understanding of the process and methods of evaluation used for REFRAME</p> <p>If you still have questions, or if you do not agree, please precise below</p> | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|
| I understand that my commitment is important in this process, and that I will have to participate to the main activities (questionnaires, interviews, ...) to ensure a good quality of the process. If you still have questions, or if you do not agree, please precise below | | | | 3 | 6 |
| Others, comments | | | | | |

| Dissemination Impacts and Value Management (WP5-WP6) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I am aware of the importance of disseminating REFRAME productions and outcomes Here are three-four examples of actions I will take in the next few months Create digital folder Animation summary Talk with colleagues and principal Help and finalise the website CdR Other projects Website Social networks Article in the press Attending a conference in E&T Organising a new stakeholders' meeting Promote internally and externally Finalise Flyer Improve stakeholders' network Present the project in mobility seminars Upload the logo and a summary of the project on our mobility platform website Disseminate it among stakeholders We'll meet the stakeholders again We'll present the platform to our organisation We'll write 1 or 2 press documents Articles Presentation Distribution of flyers | | | | 2 | 6 |
| I understand the importance of thinking about impacts to make them happen. If not, please share below | | | | 3 | 6 |
| I am at ease with the idea of evidencing and appreciating the degree of change in practices that could result from the REFRAME project in my environment (myself, my institution, my territory). If not (answers1-2), please share below If yes (answers 3-5), give us one or two examples of how you will do that Will try to get some WOL mobility in place Contact with other regions local stakeholders not directly involved in the project Too early | | | | 5 | 4 |
| Others, comments | | | | | |

9.1.3 Plenary Lyon

7 answers

General comments

The location of the meeting place and the meeting rooms were definitely not appreciated! Nevertheless, the consortium is functioning well and everybody was pleased with the organisation and unrolling of the meeting 😊

Regarding the project organisation and general unrolling (WP1), there seems to be a bit of uncertainty or unease ; most answers are around "3" which is more or less "I don't know" or "I am not sure"

As for the project content (other WPs):

WP2: still some work to be done, but people seem to know what they have to do: implementing, putting info, promoting the platform by any means, etc.

WP3: idem; work is clear: handbook, on-line tutorial, deliverables

WP4: the Pilot Actions seem to be a bit more concrete and the task more precise: find the actors, organise, launch, pilot!

WP5: partners are aware of the importance of dissemination and are starting to take charge of it.

| General organisation of the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| Location | | 4 | | 2 | 1 |
| Rooms | | | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| Duration | | | 1 | 4 | 1 |
| Food | | | 1 | 4 | 2 |
| Organisation of activities | | | | 5 | 2 |
| The agenda was well dealt with | | | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| Other (please specify) | | | | | |
| Roles and expression of partners | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Everyone could express themselves as they wished to | | | | 2 | 5 |
| I fully understand everyone's work | | | | 4 | 3 |
| The role of each partner seems clear to me | | | | 5 | 2 |
| Difficulties were clearly stated | | | | 6 | 1 |
| Others (specify) | | | | | |
| Comments | Venue hard to reach! Takes quite some time. | | | | |

| Project general organisation and coordination (WP1) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I find that the project is on track and doing well If not, please precise | | | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| I think that the organisation of project management and the repartition of management tasks are functioning well If not, please precise | | | 3 | 4 | |
| I am at ease with the financial reporting There are some points left that I did not understand regarding organisational and/or financial aspects. Please, list them below | | | 4 | | 1 |
| I clearly see where we are in the project, where I am myself and how to organise my work to go on successfully Here are the three most important things that I will do when coming back home | | | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| Platform adoption to partners' requests | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Draft of the handbook Organise the workshops Activity plan Coordination and design of the workshops Activity plan (process and platform) Drafts of the WP3 deliverables Send to all parties the posters for dissemination activities Organise the definitive programme of the Regional ECVet Check the minutes out and send to our partners Mailed that | | | | | |
| Comments | | | | | |

| Project content | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|--------|--------|
| WP2 – European Lab for WBL I am pleased with the current outcomes of WP2 for my institution for the project in general If not, please precise why | | | 2 | 3 2 | 1 2 |
| WP2 – European Lab for WBL I think there is still a lot of work to do to achieve WP2 objectives Here are the three main actions I will undertake when going back to achieve the objectives of WP2 Info about schools Info about my Region Promote it to our stakeholders Write press articles and send media news Organise a meeting with our VET providers Have to fill the still empty box and let people work with it Will be our main focus Now starting at my institution and gradually upscaling from there Meeting with stakeholders Dissemination activities Implementation of platform | | | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| WP3 I have been able to contribute successfully to WP3 so far If not, please precise why | | | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| WP3 There is still some important job to be done in WP3 to achieve its goals here are the three main actions that I will undertake in order to complete my work in WP3 draft of handbook draft of on-line tutorial activity plan draft of the deliverables help to build a pack of common competences in mechatronics finalisation of 3 deliverables | | 1 | 2 | 2 | |
| WP4 I understand clearly what I have to do and how to do it If not, please precise what you are missing | | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| WP4 Here are the three main actions I will undertake when going back home regrading WP4 | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| Identify the actors (2) Create the instructions (2) Pilot the actions (2) Take part in organising a Pilot Action Increase the stakeholders group on which the Pilot Actions will be based Involve schools and companies Launch activities | | | | | |
| WP5 - Web site and platform I am pleased with the current state of the web site / platform If not please precise why It needs this "users" overview Please precise how you will contribute to the web site / platform in the next months Online tutorials Information about schools/Region Work withand CIS to implement the platform | | | 2 | 4 | 1 |
| WP5 - Dissemination I have been able to disseminate successfully the works of Reframe in my institution / territory If yes, please give us some examples Via the congress We are starting now If not, please precise what you are missing Here are the main dissemination actions I will undertake during the next months Involve companies, schools, training agencies Network (dual tutors) (2) Network mobility (tutors and coordinators) (2) Workshops (2) Present REFRAME in a lot of meetings Next week is the first dissemination workshop taking place in my institution | | | 5 | 3 | |
| Others, comments Thanks to FREREF for the organisation! Merci ! (2) | | | | | |

9.1.4 Plenary Helmond

10 answers

General comments

The organisation was generally appreciated

Regarding the project, people felt like they are somewhere in mid-stream and not yet sure of what they could or have to do to complete their objectives, apart from the fact that they need to nurture their regional networks of stakeholders.

There is still a lack of concrete elements to disseminate, apart from the platform, which is still to be improved.

Nevertheless, people are really aware of the fact that there are still a lot to do.

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| General organisation of the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| Location | | | | 1 | 8 |
| Rooms | | | | 2 | 7 |
| Duration | | | | 3 | 6 |
| Food | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 |
| Organisation of activities | | | 2 | 2 | 5 |
| The agenda was well dealt with | | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| Other (please specify) | | | | | |
| Roles and expression of partners | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Everyone could express themselves as they wished to | | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| I fully understand everyone's work | | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 |
| The role of each partner seems clear to me | | | 5 | 3 | 2 |
| Difficulties were clearly stated | | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| Others (specify) | | | | | |
| Comments | <i>I think it could be a good idea to set up a process for distributing the talk and offer the possibility to talk without being interrupted</i> | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| Project general organisation and coordination (WP1) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| I find that the project is on track and doing well If not, please precise There are still a lot of things to do | | | 3 | 7 | |
| I am on time with the financial reporting If you are still experiencing some difficulties, please, list them below Just have to get my colleagues to upload | | 2 | 2 | 5 | 1 |
| I clearly see where we are in the project, where I am myself and how to organise my work to go on successfully Here are the three most important things that I will do when coming back home Sending elements for the toolbox Translation Organisation of events to present the project and the platform Try to be consistent with the deadlines agreed: website, handbook, and all the decisions that have been taken Looking for materials for the website Organising next meeting (flights and hotels) Coordinating the minutes of this meeting Send contributions for the website Contribution to the dissemination activities Organisation of regional workshop Write content Send the financial docs Organise a stakeholders' committee | | | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| Comments | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| Project content | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| WP2 – European Lab for WBL I am pleased with the current outcomes of WP2 for my institution for the project in general | | | | 3 | 1 |
| | | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| If not, please precise why Focus on good practices in order to promote the tool Not user-friendly platform | | | | | |
| WP2 – European Lab for WBL I think there is still a lot of work to do to achieve WP2 objectives Here are the three main actions I will undertake when going back to achieve the objectives of WP2 Populate the platform Involve regional stakeholders Launch a plan at European level Review the content structure of the website Deadlines commitment Meeting with webmaster Analyse and research documentation Organise the workshops about WBL and Mobility | | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| WP3 – ECVET Approach I have been able to contribute successfully to WP3 so far If not, please precise why | | | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| WP3 - ECVET Approach There is still some important job to be done in WP3 to achieve its goals here are the three main actions that I will undertake in order to complete my work in WP3 contribution to the handbook I will work on the tools I will coordinate the upload Monitor and support the responsible of WP3 Modify the WP3 Collect and send materials and docs | | | 5 | 2 | |
| WP4 – Piloting and validation I understand clearly what I have to do and how to do it If not, please precise what you are missing | | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| WP4 – Piloting and validation Here are the three main actions I will undertake when going back home regrading WP4 Describe piloting actions Start piloting actions Dissemination of actions Meeting with actors Analyse the possible testing of the process developed Organise, if possible, piloting focus groups Checking the google drive for all documents needed Plan the pilot actions with my regional partners Organise the launch at regional level Integrate activities at European level Follow up for partners | | | | | |
| WP5 - Web site and platform | | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| <p>I am pleased with the current state of the web site / platform</p> <p>If not please precise why We should fill the content It is empty</p> <p>Please precise how you will contribute to the web site / platform in the next months Send a list of docs and links to website on WBL Review Content part Undertake the decision taken in the Netherlands Review website structure I have been working on it all the time Looking for new documents to be uploaded Organise new presentations Write letters and mails to schools and professionals organisations We will send the materials Send docs, videos and others</p> | | | | | |
| <p>WP5 - Dissemination I have been able to disseminate successfully the works of Reframe in my institution / territory</p> <p>If yes, please give us some examples Presentation at conference Articles Regional workshop Information note sent Website article Local events with stakeholders Presentation in the network Meeting with WBL responsible Meeting at the regional level We organise an event and two presentations of the platform The work has been done in collaboration with other partners Workshops Articles Social media Send the link to the platform to VET providers</p> <p>If not, please precise what you are missing Some results to show So far I miss a concrete thing to disseminate</p> <p>Here are the main dissemination actions I will undertake during the next months Consolidate the stakeholders' networks at regional and European level, using the last meeting and the final conference Stakeholders' committee Articles What about the participation in the EU VET Skills week? Populate the platform in order to have the opportunity to promote it</p> | | 3 | 3 | | 1 |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Involve a community manager Working groups to populate the platform Big conference on 10th of June Write articles I will contribute to regional and international connections and training activities as planned Organise event | | | | | |
| Others, comments | | | | | |

| |
|--|
| Other remarks and comments Thank you Hans! Jan van Brabant College looks very nice! |
|--|

9.1.5 Plenary Barcelona #2

Answers - 11 answers

General comments

The partners are globally satisfied with the organisation of the meeting, and the discussion was friendly and fruitful.

Three months before the end of the project everyone is rather clear about what they have to do, but a bit unquiet about their ability to fulfil all the goals of the project.

The most disturbing part is the fact that the platform is just now available in its final version.

Nevertheless, partners are rather confident and able to issue valuable recommendations regarding the development and adoption of WBL.

| General organisation of the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| Location | | | 2 | 5 | 4 |
| Rooms | | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 |
| Duration | | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4 |
| Food | | 1 | | 5 | 5 |
| Organisation of activities | | 1 | | 6 | 4 |
| The agenda was well dealt with | | | 1 | 6 | 4 |
| Other (please specify) | | | | | |
| Roles and expression of partners | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Everyone could express themselves as they wished to | | | 1 | 6 | 4 |
| Difficulties were dealt with | | | 2 | 5 | 3 |
| Others (specify) | | | | | |
| Comments Really useful meeting, even not scheduled | | | | | |

| Project general organisation and coordination (WP1) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| I am confident that the project is a real success in the end If not completely, please precise what to put attention to I am concerned that there is a lot of things to do in a short time Some work to be done some of which is not in our hands The project needs a strong commitment by all partners in these last months We still need to involve schools and companies | | 1 | 5 | 4 | 1 |
| I am in the clear with the final financial reporting If you are still experiencing some difficulties, please, list them below | | | 2 | 4 | 3 |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| <i>I am not sure about the use of the budget sections</i> | | | | | |
| I am clear about what to do till the end of the project Here are the three most important things that I will do when coming back home <i>Contract an extern to validate material summaries</i> <i>Write on WBL and internationalisation strategies</i> <i>Prepare workshops</i> <i>Fill toolbox</i> <i>Make animations</i> <i>Administration</i> <i>More company registered on the platform</i> <i>Promote the platform</i> <i>Finalise the main deliverables</i> <i>Finalisation of WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6: all WPs are work in progress</i> <i>Report to the local team</i> <i>Send expected materials</i> <i>Contact local stakeholders</i> | | 1 | 1 | 6 | 3 |
| Comments <i>We need a big effort till the end</i> | | | | | |

| Project content | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| WP2 – European Lab for WBL I am aware of the importance of sustaining the Platform after the end of the project Here are the three main actions I will undertake when going back to achieve this objective now and in the next future <i>Check the website</i> <i>Organise (try to) an event to present the platform to local stakeholders</i> <i>Disseminate flyers at the LLL Week and local event</i> <i>Involve partners to develop a complete report of European Lab</i> <i>Manage smoothly the first reporting activities</i> <i>Promoting the use of the platform</i> <i>Subscribe schools</i> <i>Invite more companies and schools</i> | | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4 |
| WP3 – ECVET Approach I am aware of the importance of disseminating the outcomes of WP3 among my networks and stakeholders Here are the three main actions I will undertake when going back to achieve this objective now and in the next future <i>Send review of the doc to partners</i> <i>Kennisfestival 19</i> <i>TCA Dublin</i> <i>Store them in our networks</i> <i>The development of a Regional network</i> | | | | 6 | 2 |
| WP4 – Piloting and validation I am satisfied with what was done at my level (Regional/Institutional) regarding the Pilot Actions If yes, could you share with us the main success factors, key positive elements, that you can get from these actions? <i>We must start the piloting phase</i> <i>Not yet started</i> | | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| <p>If no, what could still be done before the end of the project to improve things?</p> <p><i>We were waiting for the platform to be functional and now we have little delay to organise pilot actions</i></p> <p><i>Platform was late, so we still have a lot of work to do</i></p> <p><i>It is only possible to do it since November 1st because of the difficulty with subscribing to the platform</i></p> <p><i>We could not do much because the platform was not ready enough</i></p> | | | | | |
| <p>WP5 - Web site and platform</p> <p>I am satisfied with the current state of the web site / platform</p> <p>If yes, could you share with us the main success factors, key positive elements?</p> <p><i>I think it is well organised</i></p> <p><i>Chance in the subscription form to be "Other Countries tab"</i></p> <p><i>The registration of first two companies</i></p> <p><i>Now it is very easy to register in</i></p> <p><i>It begins to be filled with materials</i></p> <p>If no, please precise what it is really crucial to improve until the end of the project</p> <p><i>Not particularly user friendly</i></p> <p><i>To put more materials as we have agreed to do</i></p> <p><i>Tools / content to support the use of the website</i></p> <p><i>Completing the sections tools and guidance with quality contents</i></p> <p><i>We need to populate the platform</i></p> <p><i>Still not very user friendly</i></p> | | 2 | 7 | 1 | |
| <p>WP5 - Dissemination</p> <p>I am concerned by the importance of disseminating successfully the works of Reframe in my institution / territory</p> <p>Here are the main dissemination actions I will undertake during the next months</p> <p><i>Dissemination through our networks</i></p> <p><i>Make presentations during our next events</i></p> <p><i>Kennisfestival</i></p> <p><i>TCA</i></p> <p><i>Get VET providers to subscribe</i></p> <p><i>Promoting the final conference via newsletter / mail / website</i></p> <p><i>Reporting the final meeting on the company website / social media</i></p> <p><i>We will try to collect more clicks on the website</i></p> <p><i>Dissemination at local, regional, national level</i></p> <p><i>Workshop on WBL</i></p> <p><i>Final conference</i></p> <p><i>Laboratory with stakeholders</i></p> <p><i>Disseminate flyers in pilot actions of other projects</i></p> <p><i>Write a web article</i></p> <p><i>Disseminate flyer at the LLL week</i></p> <p><i>Try to organise a seminar of presentation with local stakeholders</i></p> | 1 | | 2 | 4 | 3 |
| Others, comments | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Project outcomes, policy recommendations and sustainability | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| <p>I think the project has achieved a great part of its objectives</p> <p>If not really, please shar your concerns with us</p> <p><i>Need to involve more stakeholders</i> <i>We need to develop the policy dimension at all</i> <i>The piloting phase is still missing</i> <i>We are not there yet</i> <i>More materials in the website</i> <i>Very weak improvements in terms of stakeholders</i></p> <p>If yes, for me, the 3 key outcomes of the project that I will sustain after the end of the project are the following</p> <p><i>Platform</i> <i>infographics</i> <i>platform</i> <i>networking among partners</i> <i>networking among schools and companies</i> <i>cooperation between partners</i> <i>platform</i> <i>dissemination</i> <i>dissemination</i> <i>maintain the platform live among students, teachers and companies</i></p> | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 | |
| <p>I think we are now able to issue some key recommendations regarding policy developments in WBL</p> <p>Here are for me the main ones</p> <p><i>Support involvement of schools in organising mobility at the institutional level</i> <i>Support the involvement of companies thanks to Chamber of Commerce or Cité des Métiers</i> <i>Strong partnership Vet / Companies</i> <i>More attention to students' professional development from teachers, trainers, tutors</i> <i>Improve training for teachers</i> <i>Raise more funds from EU</i> <i>Focus on Learning Outcomes</i> <i>Chance of mindset is needed: common interest</i> <i>Info structure on WBL like on Catalunya / NL</i> <i>To foster WBL in a foreign country</i> <i>To help teachers and students to have an international mindset</i></p> | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| Other, comments | | | | | |

Other remarks and general comments about the meeting

9.1.6 Final conference in Bologna

24 answers

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|---|---|----|----|
| Organisation of the Conference | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Location | | | 2 | 12 | 10 |
| Room | | | 1 | 12 | 10 |

| | | | | | |
|---|----------|--|----------|-----------|----------|
| Duration | | | | 15 | 6 |
| Catering | 1 | | 3 | 6 | 3 |
| Agenda | | | 2 | 14 | 6 |
| Speakers | | | 3 | 12 | 7 |
| Debates | 2 | | 8 | 10 | 5 |
| Workshops | | | 5 | 11 | 8 |
| <p>Thank you for specifying, to your opinion: What was the most successful? The topic The use of English language and the translation in Italian Workshops, number 3 was really interesting Workshop (5) The interaction / debates Discussion Sharing knowledge and methodologies Initial intervention to present REFRAME The workshops, very stimulating experience of Brainport and Italy Speakers</p> <p>What could have been improved? No, I don't know. The organisation is good and clear Focus on WBL, especially referring to Italian and foreign Education Systems Translation makes the presentation slow and not entertaining Having separate rooms for the workshop: easier to hear each other 2 workshops in the same room are too much The foreign contribution Organisation, technical issues More time for the workshops for making more concrete International collaboration for school and school/company interaction Debates and introduction</p> | | | | | |

| Content of the conference and interest regarding the REFRAME project issues | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--|----------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|
| The conference was interesting and well moderated | | 1 | 2 | 11 | 7 |
| I think that the conference has set a few interesting points about the importance of Work Based Learning | 2 | | 1 | 12 | 7 |
| I think that the conference has well emphasized the importance of students' mobility in developing key competences | 1 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 4 |
| The conference has presented some valuable European initiatives in the areas linked with these issues | 1 | 2 | 6 | 8 | 4 |
| How to go further? | 1 | | 1 | 2 | 3 |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| <p>I could envisage the following actions in my Region/territory to "propagate" the outcomes of the conference and of the REFRAME project:</p> <p>To register in the Platform To have a network for applying WBL The Italian Ministry of Education will promote the REFRAME results Dissemination actions: promotion and support to schools with regards to the PCTO, in collaboration with promoters Strengthen the territorial network of stakeholders (enterprises, policy makers, schools) Implement WBL, apprenticeship, alternance between school and company</p> | | | | | |
| <p>I would like to participate in a further project on the same kind of concerns. If yes, please give us your e-mail!</p> <p>6 e-mails collected</p> | | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| <p>Here is what for me was the most interesting in this conference</p> <p>The opportunity of meeting people from other countries and learning from their experiences Discussion and brainstorming in workshop about soft skills and how to detect and improve them The workshop concerning transversal skills The presentation of Reframe Platform Workshop Soft skills focus The international aspects and the platform Workshops in general, and #1 in particular The project idea Explanation + matching for COVE The debate about opportunities, difficulties in implementing WBL</p> | | | | | |
| <p>Here is what I missed most in this conference</p> <p>The practical part, admitting that it was not the focus of the meeting WBL experiences and good practices More workshops to share good practices More concrete examples The foreign contribution Case history</p> | | | | | |

General comments about the Conference
Thank you for the opportunity of meeting and discussing
Good and interesting
All good, thank you.
Interesting (2)
Very good!
Probably possible collaboration at local level (simple schools or networks of schools) in order to promote the platform

9.2 General questionnaires

It is very difficult to keep the answers to the general questionnaire "anonymous". Thus, the verbatim of the answers is not disclosed here, only the synthesis that was presented to the partners.

9.2.1 Early vision

General vision



Project advancement, unrolling, management

- Quite content, interesting, well done so far for us ...
- ... but not enough from others ;-)
- Necessity for things to get in place
- "I did my best ...", I am "reasonably satisfied"
- "work is not constant ..."
- So far so good for project management



Roles



What is going well

- Profiles defined, reports on-going, some methodology available
- Start building networks, implying school delegates, explaining, participating, ...
- Achievements so far (6 months/24):
 - Regional network(s) and Regional WBL Laboratory(ies)
 - good and productive relationship
 - a [bit] of paperwork ;-)



Tags



Horizontal collaboration between partners

- Modalities
 - conference calls: more? Webcam?
 - templates: helpful
 - good participation of partners
- Content
 - great differences between countries: what do we do?
- Google drive
 - good for what it is useful ... and used



"A little more of enthusiasm" would be great!

Risks (all together)



Most crucial steps for the months to come

- Define a common understanding, produce common knowledge, a common vision
- Platform: built it, open it to target, and enrich it
- Ensure the continuity of collaboration at regional level and between Regions
- And how to reach them:
 - be more focused on practical things
 - work in close contact
 - stay motivated
- No major changes necessary



Risks (specific)



What is expected from evaluation

- Information about ...
- Support for dialog, reflexion and motivation
- Suggestions about ...
- On the content:
 - evaluation of pilot actions
 - how the WBL is evaluated in the school path
 - If you want to know something, you have to ask it ☺



Remember: you are the ones who know!!!

Impacts



9.2.2 Advanced vision



9.2.3 Elements from the evaluation of the platform

Questionnaire for the Evaluation of the REFRAME Web-Site and Community Area

PARTNER DATA:

7 answers from the Pilot Action in Catalonia

GENDER: **3 F 4 M**

CURRENT POSITION:

- Mobility coordinator (3)
- Teacher (2)
- Dual training responsible and teacher
- Vocational training coordinator

COMPANY/ORGANISATION: __

- Technology Institute - Secondary and VET Education (6)
- VET provider (1)

I authorised the use of the data for evaluation proposes:

7 Yes 0 No

FIRST IMPRESSIONS ABOUT THE REFRAME WEBSITE

What do you like?

It is visually attractive and easy to use

The materials and video

The purpose of the webpage is good

The layout of the webpage and colours are clear and correct

The platform is quite friendly and would be useful when it would be fully functioning

The search engine to find partners is handfull and friendly, with a lot of information and parameters to check

What do you like less?

It is not clear when you publish if you want to receive information or you are looking for mobility. The searcher does not find what you have published

Given the fact that there are no partners and offers yet, it is quite difficult to give a correct analyse of the webpage

I do not like the platform to be separated for the different countries. I think it would be better to have country searcher but only one database with all proposals

The organisation of the materials offered, they are hard to find

Little translations issues

FEEDBACK ON THE WOODUAL WEBSITE IN GENERAL

(1= very poor, 2=poor, 3=sufficient, 4=good, 5=very good)

| Main features of the website To what extent | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| the website is <i>user-friendly</i> | | 1 | | 4 | 2 |
| the website is <i>able to attract interest</i> | | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| the interface is <i>satisfactory</i> for you | | 1 | 1 | 5 | |
| the <i>menu and tool bars</i> are structured and organised in a functional way | | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 |
| <i>the web pages</i> are structured in a coherent/adequate way | | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| the website is <i>accessible and usable for people with different disabilities</i> | | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| it is <i>easy to navigate in the website</i> (it is easy to find what you are looking for) | | | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| the <i>information available is clearly organised</i> | | | 3 | 4 | 1 |
| the <i>information available is useful</i> | 1 | | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| the <i>information available is accurate</i> | | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 |
| the <i>size and colour of the textual element are adequate</i> | | | 4 | 4 | 1 |
| the balance of <i>text, links, headers, font sizes and white space is adequate</i> | | | 1 | 3 | 3 |

Is there any information/part missing? Please list what is not here available but you would like to find (and specify if there are technical or content related)?

There is not enough information yet

More partners and offers are needed

More companies from other countries, but I guess there will be in the future

Yes, maybe the organisation could be linked by their location (google maps for instance).

When you are looking for organisations it is welcomed to know the location

What is the added value of the REFRAME website from your perspective?

It proves to be a useful tool to find companies abroad

It will save a lot of times to mobility coordinators

I think it will be useful for teachers and companies to find partners

A webpage in which ou can find or upload offers and partners

If there is quite a lot of companies and VET schools it would be useful to find partners

The quick communication with potential partners

We expect to use the platform to improve DUAL and compare with different countries which kind of features they teach

Open suggestions

It is an excellent idea

Work hard to involve a great amount of organisations