



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union



TIEREF

“Towards Inclusive Education For Refugee Children” (TIEREF)

Erasmus+ programme

Key Action 3: Support for policy reform - Social inclusion through education, training and youth

Project number: 592142-EPP-1-2017-1-TR-EPPKA3-IPI-SOC-IN

EVALUATION STRATEGY

Del. 3.1

Author:

Center for vocational guidance and information “ZGURA-M” Bulgaria



Table of Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	“TIEREF” project.....	4
3	Evaluation Strategy – Qualitative and Quantitative Criteria	7
4	Product evaluation.....	11
5	Process evaluation	19
6	Dissemination impact evaluation.....	25
7	How the evaluation from the internal evaluator will be carried out	31
8	External evaluation.....	32
9	How the evaluation from the external evaluator will be carried out.....	35



1 Introduction

The evaluation strategy put forward in the document at hand, aims to apply a rigorous quality control of the entire project process and outcomes, using a variety of evaluation approaches.

For most project coordinators the process of evaluating a European Erasmus + Key Action 3: Support for policy reform - Social inclusion through education, training and youth project begins as they construct their application for funding and make their bid to the EACEA and the European Commission. However for many projects the real implementation of an evaluation strategy will begin at the kick-off meeting which was held in Istanbul, Turkey (08-09.03.2018).

Measuring the impact of the project is not easy; it is much more straightforward to measure the outputs - publications, training materials, courses, platforms and websites. Work already carried out on the evaluation of decentralised projects indicates that the most productive form of evaluation is one which involves all project partners, begins with the project itself and is a result of debate and agreement within the partnership. Above all evaluation is a process that must not be left to the final stages of the project. In that case, objectives and results will have been achieved but without evaluation. As a consequence the project team may have failed to put forward or even to note desirable modifications. Thus opportunities will have been lost and the quality of the project impaired.

In the context of European project work, ensuring quality necessitates an evaluation, which is a process:

- it supports the project and acts as a check on whether the targets have been met;
- it allows the results to be improved based upon judgements made about the value and quality of the project;
- it simplifies decision making and can assist with fundamental changes in the project, should these be necessary.



2 “TIEREF” project

Using a range of innovative tools, the project aims to strengthen schools in all partner countries and beyond in their education of migrant children (with a refugee background) by provision of:

- database of good/best practices in 3 domains (guidance, assessing, validation) in all partner languages + English: guidance towards good quality education with best practices models collected via European platform/study; assessing pupils' knowledge via non-intrusive yet efficient manner (guidance), validation of prior learning for pupils
- database of usable and shareable learning material to facilitate inclusive education for migrant children in all partner languages + English
- online collaborative exchange portal and resource repository concept towards inclusive education in all partner languages + English
- introducing peer support learning as innovative method to foster inclusive education
- online tool for assessment methodology for refugee students' prior knowledge & recognition and validation of the learning outcomes gained during the learning process
- white papers towards inclusive education for migrant children, based on the project's outcomes and results.

Direct target groups:

- Pedagogical staff at primary and secondary school education: teachers, trainers, head teachers, principals, headmasters, resource tutors
- Policy makers – local educational authorities, municipality departments on inclusive education policies, dedicated departments at Ministry of education and science, Agencies of refugees and migrants etc.

Expected Project management and implementation deliverables:

- 1.1 Project management handbook
- 1.2 Reporting forms
- 1.3 Report on factual findings - Type
- 2.1 Quality plan

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission (Erasmus+ Programme). This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.



-
- 2.2 Internal quality assurance reports
 - 3.1 Internal evaluation plan and tools
 - 3.2 External evaluation reports – progress and final stage
 - 4.1 Exploitation strategy
 - 4.2 Exploitation agreements
 - 4.3 Exploitation multiplier event – Istanbul, Turkey
 - 8.1 Pilot plan and impact gathering tool
 - 9.1 Dissemination strategy and awareness-raising campaign
 - 9.2 Dissemination promotional materials
 - 9.3 Project website www.teachref.eu

Expected intellectual outputs:

- 5.1 Framework for collection and categorisation of inclusive refugee’s teaching and learning resources, methods, tools and mechanisms
- 5.2 Online tool for assessment methodology for refugee students’ prior knowledge & recognition and validation of the learning outcomes gained during the learning process
- 6.1 Peer supported learning intervention method
- 7.1 Online collaborative exchange portal and resource repository concept towards inclusive education
- 8.2 White papers towards inclusive education for refugee/migrant children, based on the project’s outcomes and results
- 8.3 Case studies from implementers – pedagogical staff who used the inclusive learning resources

The project results will support teachers on the following topics:

- Challenges/barriers in the education system
- Challenges due to the lack of language proficiency
- Challenges related to culture
- Challenges related to parents’ mistrust of EU culture
- Discipline and changed family dynamics
- Student vulnerability in the face of antisocial practices that may besiege their community



-
- Challenges related to home, school and gang violence
 - Isolation/loneliness because of a lack of social support
 - Strategies where there is a lack of knowledge
 - Challenges related to policing and to the judicial system
 - Methods to prevent racism, discrimination/prejudice and stigma
 - Shortcomings related to programming of curricula

Expected impact in figures:

- Minimum number of involved representatives of the pedagogical staff > 500 per country (>4 000 for the project).
- Minimum number of registered users of the portal > 500 per country + minimum 1 000 on EU level (> 4 000 in total)
- Minimum number of educational institutions which are using the portal resources to support the process of implementation of inclusive learning at their agenda > 200 institutions in total for the project.
- Minimum number of involved representatives of policy makers and systematic level gatekeepers > 20 per country + minimum 20 on EU level.
- Percentage of the increased number of refugee students at the school year at the end of the testing phase – 50%
- Percentage of the increased number of stakeholders who have been attracted to use the portal resources by the end of the piloting phase influenced by the results of their colleagues who have participated



3 Evaluation Strategy – Qualitative and Quantitative Criteria

The evaluation of the “TIEREF” project will be conducted on three levels:

- **Outcomes level**
- **Dissemination impact level**
- **Process level**

Aims of the evaluation:

- To support the project and acts as a thorough internal and external check/review on whether the targets, indicators, results, impact have been met;
- To allow the results to be improved based upon judgements made about the value and quality of the project;
- To underline the peculiarities of the performances achieved in the project (Product Level);
- To measure the dissemination impact that is important (Dissemination Impact Level);
- To measure the coherence with what foreseen in the project itself and to identify the necessary actions to correct possible deviations from the expected results (Process Level).
- To recruit and implement an external evaluation approach which included evaluation of the development of project outputs, evaluation of the dissemination/impact of the project outputs, observation of partners’ meetings and identification of possible risk factors and recommendations for improvements.
- To evaluate the effectiveness of the seven transnational partners meetings: Kick off meeting - Istanbul, TR M1 (P1); Second TSN meeting - Plovdiv, BG, M6 (P3); Third TSN meeting - Craiova, RO, M13 (P8); Fourth TSN meeting - Trikala, GR, M19 (P7); Fifth TSN meeting - Bari, IT, M25 (P6); Sixth TSN meeting - Dangavpils, LV, M31 (P5); Final TSN meeting - Istanbul, TR, M36 (P2)
- To build on and draw together quality management procedures embodied in all intellectual outputs.



Envisaged results:

- Production of internal evaluation plan, tools and procedures
- Ongoing implementation of the internal evaluation
- Tender procedure to select external evaluator
- Production of external evaluation plan, tools and reports
- Formative external evaluation
- Evaluation of the reached impact in terms of project target groups at partners' countries and on EU level
- Progress and final external evaluation reports

During the evaluation activities the internal evaluator ZGURA-M will implement the following indicators:

- MST 1. Achievement of project aims and objectives.
- MST 2. Achievement of an effective communication among partners
- MST 3. Achievement of an effective management and leadership.
- MST 4. Smooth and balanced cooperation in the partnership.
- MST 5. Reached innovation on sectoral and higher systematic levels.
- MST 6. Meeting deadlines in accordance with the work programme.
- MST 7. Reached expected impact.
- MST 8. Measures and achieved components of sustainability.
- MST 9. Active participation of target groups during all project stages.
- MST 10. Achieved European added value and contribution to policy
- MST 11. Achieved impact through implemented dissemination and exploitation activities.

Internal Evaluation Tasks & Activities (lead by Zgura-M - P3)
WP3/A1 Creation of internal evaluation plan and tools - lead by P3 and to be agreed by all partners.
WP3/A2 Selection by tender procedure of external evaluator – lead by P3
WP3/A3 Development and provision of on-going external evaluation – lead by the

<p>selected external evaluator</p> <p>WP3/A5 Regular reviews of progress against the work plan and deliverables and of activity against aims and objectives of the project and against the original application – lead by P3 together with P1 + contribution by all partners.</p> <p>WP3/A6 Facilitate evaluation of partner meetings and analyse results for feedback to partners – lead by P3</p> <p>WP3/A7 Evaluation of piloting, including setting of outcome measurement tools for assessing social and educational impact of the project results – lead by P3 + contribution by all partners.</p> <p>WP3/A8 Provision of progress and final external evaluation reports – lead by the selected external evaluator.</p> <p>WP3/A9 Organisation of the sixth transnational partners meeting in Latvia – lead by P5 + participation by all partners</p>

It will be a task for the internal evaluator (ZGURA-M) to highlight the point of excellence performed in the project and/or to define the less effective aspects in the conduction of the activities and to suggest how to correct them. As pointed out above, the levels are in very close relationship: good practice in project management will – with great probability – lead to high standards in the final intellectual outputs and to good practice in dissemination, mainstreaming and multiplication; at the same time, unsatisfactory characteristics of the outcomes might be read as a symptom of specific inefficiency in the conduction of the project itself.

The “TIEREF” evaluation strategy will be based on different steps whose aims are to answer the following questions:

- “Why” it is important to conduct evaluation activities (see Aims of evaluation)
- “Who” will be interested in the evaluation results and what evaluation questions need to be answered
- “What” it is that has to be evaluated and on the basis of what criteria
- “Who” will provide the require information and data
- “How” the evaluation activities will be conducted
- “When” the evaluation activities will be conducted
- “How” the outcomes of evaluation will be used



These are the necessary questions to be made before starting an evaluation process and choose tools, items and methods; at the same time the answer has to be clear and precise.

For the “TIREF” project, three main aims of evaluation have already been identified:

- to underline the peculiarities of the performances achieved in the project (Product Level);
- to measure the dissemination impact that is important (Dissemination Impact Level);
- to measure the coherence with what foreseen in the project itself and to identify the necessary actions to correct possible deviations from the expected results (Process Level).



4 Product evaluation

Evaluating the outcomes of the project requires, first, the identification of which are the final products to be realised and, second, the individuation of the performance indicator of each product. As already established, the final products we decided to evaluate as we consider them the intellectual outputs of the “TIREF” project are:

- 1.1 Project management handbook
- 1.2 Reporting forms
- 1.3 Report on factual findings - Type
- 2.1 Quality plan
- 2.2 Internal quality assurance reports
- 3.1 Internal evaluation plan and tools
- 3.2 External evaluation reports – progress and final stage
- 4.1 Exploitation strategy
- 4.2 Exploitation agreements
- 4.3 Exploitation multiplier event – Istanbul, Turkey
- 5.1 Framework for collection and categorisation of inclusive refugee’s teaching and learning resources, methods, tools and mechanisms
- 5.2 Online tool for assessment methodology for refugee students’ prior knowledge & recognition and validation of the learning outcomes gained during the learning process
- 6.1 Peer supported learning intervention method
- 7.1 Online collaborative exchange portal and resource repository concept towards inclusive education
- 8.1 Pilot plan and impact gathering tool
- 8.2 White papers towards inclusive education for refugee/migrant children, based on the project’s outcomes and results
- 8.3 Case studies from implementers – pedagogical staff who used the inclusive learning resources
- 9.1 Dissemination strategy and awareness-raising campaign
- 9.2 Dissemination promotional materials
- 9.3 Project website www.teachref.eu

The following evaluation modalities of project design will be evaluated to meet the needs of the target group/sector:

Target	Recommendation	Evidence – Examples – not exhaustive
To ensure that knowledge of the establishment and purpose of the project reaches all target users in all partner countries (Turkey, Bulgaria, Greece, Romania, Latvia, Italy) from the beginning of the project	Stakeholder identification should be conducted by all partners to identify targets for dissemination and exploitation of the project. This exercise should identify not only target users but policy influencers to maximise impact.	Records of evidence
The project should clearly identify the needs of the target group, end users and target sectors. This will ensure project sustainability and encourage a philosophy of consultation, dialogue and research.	Partners should regularly liaise with relevant stakeholders and members of the target group to identify prevalent product requirements e.g. during steering group meetings.	Done during project preparation.
Produce formal feedback systems that will provide measurable evidence and inform project development and practise.	Piloting and testing stages should implement tools to measure both hard and soft outcomes. A standard form should be completed by all partners to provide end users' feedback.	User testing and piloting framework
A process of continual analysis to maximise project quality.	Partners to undertake a 'plan, do, review' framework at each transnational meeting.	Partner meeting agendas and minutes.



Target	Recommendation	Evidence – Examples – not exhaustive
	<p>Partners to complete questionnaires as and when required to inform internal quality assurance manager and will facilitate the stakeholder evaluation, as directed by ZGURA-M Project Coordinator (IMEM) to produce reports (every six months) and regularly updated action plan (before each TSN meeting); to identify progress against targets, to highlight delays or problems in a timely fashion to ensure prompt remedial action.</p> <p>Skype meetings to be used between transnational meetings where key decision points or problem solving actions are required between planned meetings.</p>	<p>Partner satisfaction questionnaires.</p> <p>Action plans and management reports.</p> <p>Skype meetings</p>

The Indicators of Performance are as following:

- MST 1. Achievement of project aims and objectives.
- MST 2. Achievement of an effective communication among partners
- MST 3. Achievement of an effective management and leadership.
- MST 4. Smooth and balanced cooperation in the partnership.
- MST 5. Reached innovation on sectoral and higher systematic levels.

- MST 6. Meeting deadlines in accordance with the work programme.
- MST 7. Reached expected impact.
- MST 8. Measures and achieved components of sustainability.
- MST 9. Active participation of target groups during all project stages.
- MST 10. Achieved European added value and contribution to policy
- MST 11. Achieved impact through implemented dissemination and exploitation activities.

Defining instruments

The necessary data to lead the evaluation of the project will be collected by Questionnaires and Interviews depending on the kind of Product to be evaluated. Below is the description of the instruments which will be adopted.

Products	Instruments	Evaluator	Results
1.1 Project management handbook	Monitoring Peer review Written feedback provision Written observations	ZGURA-M External evaluator	Observation on the forms for progress and final reporting Progress and final external evaluation reports
1.2 Reporting forms	Monitoring Peer review Written feedback provision Written observations	ZGURA-M External evaluator	Observation
1.3 Report on factual findings - Type	Peer review	ZGURA-M External evaluator	Observation
2.1 Quality plan	Monitoring Peer review Written feedback	ZGURA-M External evaluator	Observation on the forms for progress and final reporting



Products	Instruments	Evaluator	Results
	provision Written observations		Progress and final external evaluation reports
2.2 Internal quality assurance reports	Monitoring Peer review Written feedback provision Written observations	ZGURA-M External evaluator	Observation on the forms for progress and final reporting Progress and final external evaluation reports
3.1 Internal evaluation plan and tools	Monitoring Peer review Written feedback provision Written observations	ZGURA-M External evaluator	Observation on the forms for progress and final reporting Progress and final external evaluation reports
3.2 External evaluation reports – progress and final stage	Peer review	ZGURA-M External evaluator	Progress and final external evaluation reports
4.1 Exploitation strategy	Monitoring Peer review Written feedback provision Written observations	ZGURA-M External evaluator	Observation on the forms for progress and final reporting Progress and final external evaluation reports
4.2 Exploitation agreements	Monitoring	ZGURA-M External evaluator	Observation on the forms for progress and final reporting Progress and final external evaluation reports
4.3 Exploitation	Attendance	ZGURA-M	Observation on the

Products	Instruments	Evaluator	Results
multiplier event – Istanbul, Turkey	Written feedback provision Written observations	External evaluator	forms for progress and final reporting Progress and final external evaluation reports
5.1 Framework for collection and categorisation of inclusive refugee’s teaching and learning resources, methods, tools and mechanisms	Monitoring Peer review Written feedback provision Written observations	ZGURA-M External evaluator	Observation on the forms for progress and final reporting Progress and final external evaluation reports
5.2 Online tool for assessment methodology for refugee students’ prior knowledge & recognition and validation of the learning outcomes gained during the learning process	Monitoring Peer review Written feedback provision Written observations	ZGURA-M External evaluator	Observation on the forms for progress and final reporting Progress and final external evaluation reports
6.1 Peer supported learning intervention method	Monitoring Peer review Written feedback provision Written observations	ZGURA-M External evaluator	Observation on the forms for progress and final reporting Progress and final external evaluation reports
7.1 Online collaborative exchange portal and resource	Monitoring Peer review Written feedback	ZGURA-M External evaluator	Observation on the forms for progress and final reporting



Products	Instruments	Evaluator	Results
repository concept towards inclusive education	provision Written observations		Progress and final external evaluation reports
8.1 Pilot plan and impact gathering tool	Monitoring Peer review Written feedback provision Written observations	ZGURA-M External evaluator	Observation on the forms for progress and final reporting Progress and final external evaluation reports
8.2 White papers towards inclusive education for refugee/migrant children, based on the project's outcomes and results	Monitoring Peer review Written feedback provision Written observations	ZGURA-M External evaluator	Observation on the forms for progress and final reporting Progress and final external evaluation reports
8.3 Case studies from implementers – pedagogical staff who used the inclusive learning resources	Monitoring Peer review Written feedback provision Written observations	ZGURA-M External evaluator	Observation on the forms for progress and final reporting Progress and final external evaluation reports
9.1 Dissemination strategy and awareness-raising campaign	Monitoring Peer review Written feedback provision Written observations	ZGURA-M External evaluator	Observation on the forms for progress and final reporting Progress and final external evaluation reports
9.2 Dissemination promotional materials	Written feedback provision	ZGURA-M External evaluator	Observation on the forms for progress and final reporting Progress and final



Products	Instruments	Evaluator	Results
			external evaluation reports
9.3 Project website (www.teachref.eu)	Monitoring Peer review Written feedback provision Written observations	ZGURA-M External evaluator	Observation on the forms for progress and final reporting Progress and final external evaluation reports



5 Process evaluation

Evaluating the process of the “TIREF” project requires, first, the identification of the processes to keep under control and to evaluate in order to have a project management evaluation and, second, implementation of the above listed performance indicators during the project lifetime. The main activities of management to be evaluated according to the proposal of the “TIREF” project are:

- Project transnational meetings
- Project management and implementation activities

Partners’ involvement and performance

Target	Recommendation	Evidence – Examples – not exhaustive
Understanding of project deliverables and intellectual outputs aims, objectives and tasks is vital to the success and sustainability of the project.	The Project Coordinator should devise an action plan detailing the role of each partner and their expected contribution to the project. Open communication between partners should be encouraged to enable discussion of any outstanding issues or problems and minimise confusion.	Clearly stated roles and responsibilities in partner contracts. Meeting minutes. Post meeting evaluation.
A committed workforce with low staff turnover will encourage positive partner relationships and project sustainability.	Partners should ensure that they are making a well-balanced contribution to the project and limit staff turnovers. Concerns about partner involvement should be discussed at	Partner representation remains same at meetings – recorded in attendance lists. No staff replacements to date.



Target	Recommendation	Evidence – Examples – not exhaustive
	<p>transnational meetings to highlight methods of improvement.</p> <p>A consistent method of reporting should be adopted.</p>	
<p>Partners to assign appropriate staff to project roles and demonstrate that their knowledge and resources make a positive contribution to the project.</p>	<p>Partners to freely share knowledge, experience and expertise.</p>	<p>Partner representatives are at level to take decisions and to fully contribute – meeting minutes.</p>
<p>A culture of mutual respect and consideration to be adopted between partners to maximise partner satisfaction.</p>	<p>Partners to participate in organised events at transnational meetings (where possible) to develop a greater understanding of partner cultures.</p> <p>Partners to identify methods of cooperation and communication for the duration of the project.</p> <p>All partners should participate in transnational meetings and communicate between meetings via email, telephone and Skype.</p>	<p>Programme of events at each partner meeting, partners get to meet stakeholders from that country.</p> <p>Dropbox</p> <p>All partners have attended partner and Skype meetings – attendance lists and minutes available.</p>
<p>To assess the quality of the partnership throughout the</p>	<p>Partners to complete evaluation questionnaires</p>	<p>Observations.</p>



Target	Recommendation	Evidence – Examples – not exhaustive
project and emphasize strengths and future improvements.	throughout the project. Outstanding quality issues should be addressed during all partner liaisons.	
Project Coordinator to guide partners through intellectual outputs and ensure a clear vision of objectives.	Ensure that the project coordinator is experienced in managing international projects with multiple partners. Partners should know the objectives of the intellectual outputs they are leading and offer constructive guidance to other consortium members.	Coordinators' CV in application.
To produce a high quality of communication between the project partners	Partners should have a representative present at all transnational meetings and Skype meetings. A file repository and communication tool for the partnership shall be used, together with email groups.	All partners send representatives to meetings, attendance lists available.
To encourage timely management of work and completion of tasks. This will enable the smooth transition through intellectual outputs.	Partners should set deadlines for tasks and prompt other members of the consortium to complete work by the requested time. Partners should endeavour to complete work by set deadlines. Should a problem	Action plans reviewed at each meeting and circulated/uploaded on Dropbox.

Target	Recommendation	Evidence - Examples - not exhaustive
	arise, partners should contact the intellectual outputs lead to alert them of the issue and provide an estimated date of completion.	
Clear management and accountability structures with associated responsibilities and authority.	Management and Accountability structures should be devised during the first transnational meeting. This should include clarity between the roles of Contractor and between internal quality evaluation roles. Partners should understand and manage intellectual outputs tasks in order to effectively lead other consortium members. Partners should subsequently be held accountable as intellectual outputs leaders.	A management structure diagram, clearly outlining different roles and responsibilities should be uploaded to internal file repository.

The project managements is the most delicate process in a project, insofar as it deals with objectives, hurdles and limits, which are material and immaterial resources as well as contingencies that could not be foreseen, thus making the project deviate from the initial work plan.

Following Performance Indicators have been identified:

	Indicators
Project transnational meetings	Facilities Agenda Content of meeting Activities Clearness of presented tasks and next steps Working atmosphere Management of meeting by the Coordinator Social programme Fulfilling the items of the Agenda (at least 80%)
Project management evaluation	Transparency of Management Information flow Partners' Communication Time crisis Clearness of tasks Financial and administrative issues Development of project phases Contractual management within the partnership Semi-open question on timing of reporting from partners to the Coordinator Open question on deviations of project implementation

Following instruments were identified:

Products	Instruments	Evaluator	Results
Project transnational meetings	Post meeting evaluation questionnaires	ZGURA-M	Report after each meeting.
	Observations and analysis at the end of each TSN meeting	External evaluator	Report after each meeting.
Project management	For Progress and	ZGURA-M	Dedicated section in



Products	Instruments	Evaluator	Results
evaluation	final report. Observations and analysis at the end of each TSN meeting and monthly Skype meetings.	External evaluator	Progress and Final reports.



6 Dissemination impact evaluation

The dissemination and exploitation of the project outputs is one of the most important aspects of the “TIEREF” project. The main aspects of successful dissemination are a high output quality, a clear definition of advantages for users and the development of a phase-oriented dissemination and exploitation plan.

The products that will be evaluated in order to understand the grade of dissemination related to the “TIEREF” project will be:

- Project website
- Exploitation seminars
- Final conference
- Dissemination strategy

Following Performance indicators will be assessed:

	Indicators
Project website	Attractiveness Information contained Structure and layout Target impact – number of visits (≥ 1000) User-friendliness Accessibility Relevance to the users’ needs Website management Availability of languages Respecting legal frameworks and quality standards (WCAG 2.0)
Exploitation seminars	No of participants (≥ 1000) Materials distributed Content/keynote speakers Level of utility Organisation Relevance to the users’ needs Participants’ profile (at least 80% of the field)

	Indicators
Final multiplier events in Turkey	Professional promotion of conference Content/keynote speakers Materials distributed Facilities Location Reception No of participants (≥ 200) Level of utility Organisation Relevance to the users' needs Participants' profile (at least 80% of the field) Other
Dissemination strategy	Total dissemination activities and by country Means of dissemination Number of organisations reached Future dissemination activities and activities planned in the original dissemination plan and those carried out Relevance of target groups (at least 80% of the field) Levels of dissemination activities No of organisations reached outside the partners countries

The following indicators should be reached by all partners at the end of the project – month 24:

- Minimum number of involved representatives of the pedagogical staff > 500 per country (>4 000 for the project).
- Minimum number of registered users of the portal > 500 per country + minimum 1 000 on EU level (> 4 000 in total)
- Minimum number of educational institutions which are using the portal resources to support the process of implementation of inclusive learning at their agenda > 200 institutions in total for the project.
- Minimum number of involved representatives of policy makers and systematic level gatekeepers > 20 per country + minimum 20 on EU level.



- Percentage of the increased number of refugee students at the school year at the end of the testing phase – 50%
- Percentage of the increased number of stakeholders who have been attracted to use the portal resources by the end of the piloting phase influenced by the results of their colleagues who have participated

WIDER COMMUNITY:

As many as possible via dissemination, promotion and exploitation campaigns - more than 15 000.

Involvement of the target groups

Target	Recommendation	Evidence – Examples – not exhaustive
Target groups and end users to be involved with as much of the project as realistically possible.	Encourage target group participation throughout the project. Where possible at least one user group representative should be present during steering group meetings and members should be involved in all piloting and testing phases and should contribute to the design of the deliverables, to assure usability and inclusive design. Formal feedback systems should be put in place to enable accurate recording for later quality analysis.	Minutes of all meetings, completion of testing and piloting reporting frameworks, case studies and testimonials.
To maintain a vigorous campaign of publicity in all partner countries for the project throughout its	All possible publicity routes should be identified by all partners. These should include those identified in	Publicity opportunities discussed at each meeting. Press releases published. Website and social media



Target	Recommendation	Evidence - Examples - not exhaustive
<p>progress.</p>	<p>the project application, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conferences, presentations, seminars and workshops; • Press releases to mainstream local and national press, specialist press, TV, radio, internet media; • Publicity through end-user organizations • Specialized publications; • On-line dissemination: through project web site; establishment of reciprocal web links; e-mail shots; indexing online resources to search engines; • Face-to-face group and individual meetings with potential end users; • Conference papers for policy makers and other influential people; • Dissemination through networks of disabled 	<p>results.</p> <p>Recorded meetings.</p> <p>Scientific papers published.</p> <p>Links to external networks and websites.</p> <p>Promotional materials produced.</p>



Products	Instruments	Evaluator	Results
	questionnaire		Progress and Final reports Progress and final external evaluation reports.
Final conference	Feedback questionnaire Interviews with the attendees	ZGURA-M External evaluator	Report Dedicated section in Progress and Final reports Progress and final external evaluation reports.
Dissemination strategy	Observation	ZGURA-M External evaluator	Dedicated section in Progress and Final reports. Progress and final external evaluation reports.



7 How the evaluation from the internal evaluator will be carried out

The internal evaluator will use mainly email in order to send questionnaires (including using Survey Monkey online platform – professional edition) to the persons involved in the evaluation.

During each of the scheduled transnational meetings, the internal evaluator (ZGURA-M) will require the partners to complete post meeting questionnaire at the end of the last meeting day.

In some case the evaluator may do phone/Skype calls if further clarification is required.

Regarding the Conference evaluation, the evaluator will send the questionnaires to the host organisation in advance so it can be included in the conference package.

Deadlines:

Evaluation plan	Month 2
Transnational meetings – post meeting evaluation	After each TSN meeting (7 in total)
Internal summary of evaluation	1 progress (M17-18), 1 final reports (M35-36)
Exploitation seminars	Month 30-36
Final conference evaluation	Month 35
Project website	Month 6, 12, 18, 24, 30, 36
Dissemination action plan	Month 18,36
Final evaluation summary on sustainability of project outputs	Month 35-36
Transnational meetings – post meeting evaluation	After each TSN meeting (7 in total)



8 External evaluation

Purpose

- To integrate planning, implementation, evaluation and reporting
- To have an early warning system for problems that could become serious if unattended;
- To become aware of strengths, weakness and problems as well as obstacle to progress;
- To help quantifying results

Approach to evaluation

The external evaluation will start from the stated in the project objectives and assess the net benefit or ultimate impact of the project outputs, the extent of overall change (directly or indirectly attributable to the project) and an analysis of causality and innovations. The external evaluator is committed to improve the quality of all initiatives for integration on education and labour market of people with disabilities under the Erasmus + programme.

Evaluation criteria

Evaluation criteria are drawn from the Erasmus+ guidelines for promoters, which in turn reflect the criteria, applied by evaluators of the project proposals. The criteria can be broadly classified into product and impact issues as well as process issues and attributed to either the interim/formative category or the final/summative category (although there is inevitably a degree of overlap), resulting in four domains for the evaluation. Approximately equal time will be spent on the four domains (definition of performance indicators, data collection, analysis of data, reporting) over the duration of the project, with the Progress Report mainly dealing with interim/formative evaluation of both process and impact issues and the Final Report concentrating more on the final/summative evaluation of both process and impact issues.

The external evaluation of the intellectual outputs will entail the following activities:

- Initial check of project objectives, partnership and procedures against the European evaluation criteria used for project proposals by the EACEA;



-
- Examination of documentation, including the project proposal, decisions on methodology of development of intellectual outputs /minutes of meetings/, templates of methodologies, and draft and final results(outputs);
 - Analyses of each intellectual output and written formal and informal comments;
 - Regular contact with project partners and the project coordinator;
 - Participation in all transnational project meetings;
 - Face-to-face, and/or telephone interviews, focus group discussion, postal/electronic Questionnaires with all members of the partnership, partnership sub groups, representatives of stakeholders in the field of social activities, and learners participating in the project.

Evaluation indicators

Indicators are variables that measure the performance of a project and the level to which the objectives are reached. By quantifying the evaluation questions, they provide a possibility to measure and monitor the progress of the project and assess the extent to which the objectives are attained.

Indicators measuring the project outputs are performance indicators, and relate to the achievement of the aims. The stated indicators include effectiveness of results (outputs), usability and accessibility, validity, reliability, mainstreaming and exploitation of results. Outcomes are defined as medium term effects of project outputs. They are logically linked to the intended impact and to the objectives.

The external evaluation of the outputs will follow some key criteria against which the project will be assessed and accepted for final funding:

- Innovation – whether the intellectual outputs are new and applicable;
- Validity – whether the needs described in the justification are met;
- Dissemination & Exploitation – level of multiplier effects through mainstreaming activity.

Indicators / Measures

- Project outputs available in stated partner languages and according all requirements determined in the proposal;
- Project outputs refer to the targets set out at the beginning of the project;
- Project outputs refer to the needs of the target groups;



-
- Project outputs are developed in the context of the principles of validation of non-formal and informal learning;
 - Effectiveness of results, usability and accessibility (what is the perceived value of your project to your stakeholders?)
 - Active participation of the target groups;
 - Impact;
 - Sustainability;

Instruments for evaluation

- Evaluation forms (questionnaire, partner consultation)
- Online partner communication and document-sharing

Documentation i.e. strategies, work programmes, schedules, monitoring forms, reports, minutes of meetings, templates, working documents, research questionnaire, outcomes, dissemination deliverables

Methods of External Evaluation

- Field interviews with steering committee members;
- A document analysis
- Face to face interviewing stakeholders and partners
- Review of the intellectual outputs
- Written consultation - Interviews will be held with the project staff to determine the project direction, successes, and needs. These interviews will document the understanding of the project partners of objectives and approaches. Interviews with target groups and stakeholders during the multiplier event in Turkey.
- Questionnaire/Survey - a usability/feedback questionnaires will be designed, implemented, and sent (via E-mail) to all partners who have benefited from the project. The questionnaires will be designed to assess information about the views for outputs developments, stakeholders' survey and impact of the results, this method is in support of formative assessment process.



9 How the evaluation from the external evaluator will be carried out

The following tasks will be elaborated by the external evaluator related to the outputs developments:

Activities	Deadlines
External evaluation strategy and plan	Month 2
Review of project documentation	Month 18, 36
Project plan / framework - Ensure appropriate timeline and time allocations for surveying partners.	Month 2
Partners' surveys - Assess partners' views on the project deliverables.	M7, M35
Analysis of Deliverables and Intellectual Outputs	M17-18, M 35-36
Partners' performance - Assess performance of deliverables and outputs against deadlines and project planning.	M17-18, M 35-36
User surveys - Consider user involvement and feedback on the project deliverables.	M17-18, M 35-36
External evaluation reports of Intellectual Outputs	Month 18 (Progress), M36 (Final)