



## LLP PROGRESS REPORT ASSESSMENT SHEET

**Project number: [number]-[year]-[country]-[LLP Action]**

133888-2007-FI-Grundtvig

**Project title:**

Elect-European Learning Communities for Training of People with Mental Illness

|  | Score /10 |
|--|-----------|
| <p><b>1. Objectives, results and products</b></p> <p>Have the project's activities been in accordance with its aims and objectives as declared in the original application or as officially amended?</p> <p>Have there already been any valuable results/products achieved at Progress Report stage?</p> | 7         |

The project proceeds well towards the goal. The research phase has been completed and the development work initiated. Attractive and clear information material about the project has been produced. Project demonstrates involvement of the target groups.

The website is functioning; it is well-designed and contains all the project information. It is clear that the partnership strives to make all the products available on the website and also make the project process visible electronically.

Several of the links/downloadable files should be checked on the page: <http://www.elect-project.eu/download.html>

"Page cannot be displayed" comes up when e.g. project brochures (SE, NO, IS, DE and EN versions) should be downloaded; or when e.g. the Elect-project in brief from Helsinki meeting should be downloaded.

The number of visits to the website has been chosen as one of the success indicators for disseminating the project results. The consortium could also specify the characteristics of the visit (e.g. 20 minutes and more) otherwise the visits could be equal with hits on the website.

Quite little progress has been made so far towards the CSCL planning (20%) and contacts to educational institutions (10%). Course invitation and draft pilot course layout have been provided.

|   | Score /10 |
|---|-----------|
| <p><b>2. Coherence between workplan and activities carried out to date</b></p> <p>Have the planned activities been implemented in accordance with the project's work plan as declared in the original application, or as officially amended, and have any variations been adequately justified?</p> | 8         |

The project work plan has been respected but the delay with CSCL courses should be noted.

The consortium proposes to substitute study visits during project meetings with presentations by invited guests. The proposed change should save time during the meetings.

This is a managerial decision and is well justified; at the same time the consortium should consider that broader audience can be reached by visiting the institution than having a guest speaker at the meeting.

The study visits were originally part of the dissemination strategy as well.

|  | Score /10 |
|--|-----------|
| <p><b>3. Partnership</b></p> <p>Are there indicators to show that the partnership is working properly? Are there clear indications of a real and effective involvement of the partners? Are there significant changes in the partnership compared to the application? If so, have these changes had any impact on the partnership?</p>   | 9         |
| <p>The partnership seems to be working well together. Communication flow has been established; a partnership log has been created and allows effective exchange of information and project documents. The attempt to prepare the next step for the project, a European network is a good idea but it should be pointed out that the partnership represents the Northern part of Europe and should work hard for involving other regions in order to create a European network as the further step.</p> |           |

|   | Score /10 |
|---|-----------|
| <p><b>4. Management</b></p> <p>Does the project seem to be well managed on the whole? How efficient were the management and coordination arrangements? To what extent were appropriate decisions made to support effective implementation and problem resolution? Have any deviations/changes been satisfactorily justified?</p>  | 9         |
| <p>The project management is appropriate and efficient. Due to the big size of the consortium several levels of management have been introduced. Communication and internal reporting systems have been created. When all partners do not participate in all project/work-group meetings it is very important that the communication is regular and the partnership feels support and follow-up on decisions from the management.</p> |           |

|  | Score /10 |
|--|-----------|
| <p><b>5. Financial management</b></p> <p>Are the expenditures made so far in line with the project activities?</p>   | 6         |
| <p>The project expenditure on the whole is in line with the carried out activities. There are no costs reported for three partners (DK, FI, SE), the budget for these partners has been allotted and PR provides no further explanation.</p> |           |

|  | Score /10 |
|--|-----------|
| <p><b>6. Evaluation and/or quality assurance</b></p> <p>If evaluation activities have already taken place, are they satisfactory? How well has the project's strategy for evaluation been implemented so far? To what extent has the project considered the comments or recommendations following the project selection?</p>   | 8         |
| <p>The evaluation methodology is well planned, sample questionnaires provided. Both internal and external (involving target groups) evaluation should contribute to the quality control of the outputs. Internal evaluation of the partnership and work so far has been carried out during the project meetings but there is little evidence so far about how this affects the work process of the project. Project managers have visited working group sessions and this has served well for the purpose of monitoring.</p> |           |

|  |                                  |
|--|----------------------------------|
| <p><b>7. Dissemination</b></p> <p>How does the project develop communication, visibility, and the dissemination of its activities and results as outlined in the original application? With reference to the original application, to what extent has the consortium addressed the issue of the exploitation of the project activities / results during the project lifetime (and beyond)?</p> | <p><b>Score /10</b></p> <p>9</p> |
| <p>The project demonstrates good dissemination strategy both beyond and inside the consortium. The products necessary for the dissemination have been developed. Concrete activities and events for dissemination have been described. The challenge for the project is reaching beyond the Clubhouse network and creating partnerships with other actors of the LLL field.</p>                |                                  |

**Supplementary information to be submitted**

|  |
|--|
| <p>Supplementary information required from the project to allow for a complete Progress Report analysis:</p> |
|  |

## Overall evaluation

|   |
|---|
| <b>Overall comment:</b>   |
| The project is proceeding well towards the goal. The achievements so far are good and in accordance to the plan. The partnership is cooperating well and clear commitments for the next phase of the project should ensure progressing according to the plan.<br>It is crucial for the project make sure they form the partnership with the educational institutions.<br>The project should also keep up the ambition to lay grounds for a network at a European level. |
| <b>Strong points:</b>   |
| Relevant project approach<br>Involvement of target groups<br>Survey of existing study practices in Clubhouses<br>Very informative website<br>Attractive information material about the project<br>Strong network of partners and good links in Europe as well as globally<br>Planned additional language versions of the project brochure for broad dissemination in Europe.<br><u>Elaborated evaluation and dissemination plans and methodology</u>                    |
| <b>Weak points:</b>   |
| Weak links with education institutions<br>Unclear financial reporting concerning the costs of three partners  |

| Summary scoring sheet for Final Report  |       |
|---|-------|
| Criterion   | Score |
| 1 Objectives, results and products  | 7     |
| 2 Coherence between work plan and activities carried out during life of the project | 8     |
| 3 Partnership   | 9     |
| 4 Project Management  | 9     |
| 5 Financial Management  | 6     |
| 6 Evaluation  | 8     |
| 7 Dissemination   | 9     |

|                              |               |            |
|------------------------------|---------------|------------|
| <b>Your global score is:</b> | <b>8 / 10</b> | <b>80%</b> |
|------------------------------|---------------|------------|

### KEY TO THE SCORING SYSTEM

| Score   | Definition     | Description of score  |
|---------|----------------|---|
| 0       | No evidence    | Fails to include a minimum amount of evidence to enable the criterion to be evaluated |
| 1 or 2  | Very weak      | Addresses the criterion but with significant and/or many weaknesses                   |
| 3 or 4  | Weak           | Addresses the criterion but with weaknesses   |
| 5 or 6  | Acceptable     | Addresses the criterion sufficiently  |
| 7 or 8  | Good           | Addresses the criterion with some aspects of high quality                             |
| 9 or 10 | Very good      | Addresses the criterion with all aspects of high quality                              |
| X       | Not applicable | Activity of the criterion was not planned for the evaluated period of                 |