

## MEETING EVALUATION FORM - HOW WAS THE EVENT?

DATE AND PLACE OF THE MEETING: **10th -14th April 2015,Mersin,Turkey**

NAME OF THE HOST ORGANISATION: **Toroslar Public Education Centre**

NAMES OF THE PARTNER ORGANISATIONS– **Pakruojis Education Centre (Lithuania), Balvi Further Education Centre (Latvia), Dodo (Finland), Messzelátó Association (Hungary)**

Every partner in the “**NEW FLAVOUR OF YOUR LIFE: PROMOTING ACTIVE CITIZENSHIP AND HEALTH AWARENESS THROUGH GARDENING IN TOWNS AND CITIES**” project should fill in the evaluation form.

A grade should be given on a scale of 1 to 4, with 4 being the highest and 1 the lowest

If you give 1 or 2, please explain why and if it is possible give an advice, using the remark/comment lines!

### 1. Structure, content and delivery of the event

No.	Performance Indicator	Themes	4	3	2	1
1.1	Organisation of the transnational event	Evidence of clear planning	<b>2</b> 50%	<b>2</b> 50%		
		Realistic time scales	<b>2</b> 50%	<b>2</b> 50%		
		Appropriate selection of delegates	<b>3</b> 75%	<b>1</b> 25%		
1.2	Effectiveness of content and appropriate range and balance of activities	Appropriate content, clearly related to the aims and objectives of the event	<b>1</b> 25%	<b>2</b> 50%	<b>1</b> 25%	
		Relevant mixture of activities e.g. icebreaking activities, didactic sessions, workshops, social activities, free time	<b>1</b> 25%	<b>3</b> 75%		
		Appropriateness of the social programme	<b>2</b> 50%	<b>2</b> 50%		
1.3	Effectiveness of the process of monitoring and evaluation	Quality of the mechanism for evaluation both short term and long term including follow-up activities, if appropriate		<b>4</b> 100%		
		Evidence of on-going assistance to participants, if appropriate	<b>2</b> 50%	<b>2</b> 50%		
1.4	The quality of project management	Clarity of project coordination	<b>3</b> 75%	<b>1</b> 25%		
		Quality of the management of monitoring and evaluation by the project coordinator	<b>1</b> 25%	<b>1</b> 25%	<b>2</b> 50%	
		The project partners are made aware of	<b>3</b>		<b>1</b>	

		the administrative structure of the project	75%		25%	
--	--	---	-----	--	-----	--

PERSONAL RESPONSE TO THE THEMES/ ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

- All the activities and its management were carried out very well, the only minus to the delivery of the event was non-organized departure of participants! Some assistance with it would be appreciated!
- Some of the visits were a bit irrelevant, but many were nice. A lot of time was spent in a mini-van, but that's mainly due to the distances. The signatures were gathered afterwards, as well as this evaluation.
- I would advise to do evaluation every day to develop in project management.
- I found the project management discussions really useful! Good idea!
- It would be good to plan and organize short evaluation sessions of the activities or meeting days.
- Some activities and sessions (session about herbs, trip to the aromatic and medical herb park) could have been organized with a didactic approach.

**2. Quality of the transnational element**

No.	Performance Indicator	Themes	4	3	2	1
2.1	Input to the event by the project partners	The extent to which each partner contributes to the event	<b>1</b> 25%	<b>3</b> 75%		
		The evidence of partners sharing roles and responsibilities during the event	<b>1</b> 25%	<b>2</b> 50%	<b>1</b> 25%	
2.2	Links between the aims of the event and the overall aims of the project	Mutual understanding amongst partners about the project and event rationale and the short term and long term objectives of the event	<b>1</b> 25%	<b>2</b> 50%	<b>1</b> 25%	
		Clear evidence in the event programme of real synergy with the overall objectives of the project	<b>2</b> 50%	<b>1</b> 25%	<b>1</b> 25%	

PERSONAL RESPONSE TO THE THEMES/ ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

- Some minor problems with the deadlines of tasks submission!
- The presentation of activities was the only thing I remember where partners were sharing and contributing to the meeting.
- There were some project elements that did not relate strongly with the overall aims of the project/visit. For example:
  - Trip to the waterfalls and fish restaurant: the aim of the trip was not discussed, there was not enough information given about that location. There could have been many learning opportunities there but we missed it.
  - Trip to the mountains: we did not understand at all what was the purpose of that trip.

- Trip to the Plant Research Centre – it was not relevant to urban gardening.
- Trip to herbs garden: it was nice to observe that place but we could have used some information on that location and the herbs grown there.
- Soapmaking: a healthy, traditional soap making workshop from natural ingredients would have been a deeper learning opportunity.

### 3. Quality of the partnership

No.	Performance Indicator	Themes	4	3	2	1
3.1	Transnational Partnership	Commitment to the project by each partner	<b>2</b> 50%	<b>2</b> 50%		
		Agreement amongst partners	<b>4</b> 100%			
		Effective communication amongst partners	<b>1</b> 25%	<b>3</b> 75%		
		Development of trust and positive attitudes	<b>1</b> 25%	<b>3</b> 75%		

PERSONAL RESPONSE TO THE THEMES/ ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

We were discussing schedules, and that people should keep them. I guess that was the main concern.

### 4. Quality of the domestic arrangements

No.	Performance Indicator	Themes	4	3	2	1
4.1	Quality and appropriateness of the domestic arrangements and the comfort factor	Attention to practical details and catering	<b>2</b> 50%	<b>2</b> 50%		
		Suitability of the working venue	<b>2</b> 50%	<b>1</b> 25%	<b>1</b> 25%	
		Quality of overnight accommodation, if appropriate	<b>3</b> 75%	<b>1</b> 25%		
		Evidence of special requirements (dietary for example) being met	<b>2</b> 50%	<b>2</b> 50%		

PERSONAL RESPONSE TO THE THEMES/ ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

- The hotel was great! Loved the hamam. Breakfast was nice and the other food ok, even if the vegetarian alternative often had much less energy and protein than the other options. It was nice to see the different places where our partner operates.
- In many cases the level of eating and sleeping arrangements was too high. It relates to the level of sustainability in two ways: 1) if being able to save more money on the prices of food and accommodation, the partners could spend more on local programs, 2) plenty of food waste (too much food) and lack of local ingredients made most of the meals environmentally unsustainable. Also we were spending lots of time (and kilometers) travelling from one venue to another. Having venues closer to each other results in less pollution on the roads.