

**LLP FINAL REPORT ASSESSMENT SHEET**

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

502230-LLP-1-2009-1-BE-LEONARDO-LAM

**Project title:**

EU-MOVE

	Score /10
<p><b>1. Objectives, results and products</b> Are all planned project outcomes / results available and are they in accordance with aims and objectives as declared in the original application, or as officially amended? Please comment (please use also the second box in case your text is not fully displayed in the first box here below)</p> <p>The project achieved its initial objectives and delivered all the products and outcomes as per the original application. Products of high quality have been developed and made available to a wide target audience of students, employers, trainers, VET providers etc. in Europe. The main product, a European Mobility Service Portal, matches students with employers and provides services for finding a work placement abroad. It is, therefore, likely to create a strong impact on the mobility of trainees particularly in the hospitality sector, and to help bridging the gaps between the job market and VET trainees.</p> <p>The project carried out activities not foreseen in the work plan that strengthened further its visibility, dissemination and impact.</p>	10
<p><b>2. Coherence between workplan and activities carried out during the project lifetime</b> 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? (please use also the second box in case your text is not fully displayed in the first box here below)</p> <p>Minor delays are noticed that were well balanced by bringing forward some other activities. Overall, the project implementation followed the original work plan and time schedule. The Implementation Plan for the INTENT results was developed only in English (instead of English and French) but since this was an internal document there was no need for translation. The hosting platform was different from the original plan and a new portal was developed.</p> <p>The partners made a mile further than the original work plan and carried out more activities to develop a high quality platform with better services for the users. The portal integrated more tools than foreseen in</p>	10

foreseen in the original application and databases with work placement companies for two instead of one target sector: hospitality and care sector. Three partner meetings were held instead of two. The final additional meeting had to ensure that all products are integrated in the mobility portal and the project activity plan is successfully completed. Extra bilateral coordination meetings were organised to test the products and review the progress. Several dissemination activities and products were undertaken in addition to the initial work plan also. All deviations are well justified and relevant.

Score /10

**3. Partnership**

Are there clear indications of a real and effective partnership? Are there significant changes in the partnership when compared with the application? If so, are such changes justified and had they any impact on the partnership?

(please use also the second box in case your text is not fully displayed in the first box here below)

10

No changes in the partnership have taken place. The excellent project performance and the quality of the final products indicate a strong partnership. The partner organisations were involved in the project implementation in a balanced way. Contracts between the lead partner and each other partner are not presented to assess the clarity on roles, responsibilities and budget allocations.

Score /10

**4. Management**

How was the project managed on the whole? How efficient were the management and coordination arrangements to support effective implementation and problem resolution? Have any variation from original plans been adequately justified?

(please use also the second box in case your text is not fully displayed in the first box here below)

10

Seven coordination meetings have taken place (2 plenary project meetings and 5 bilateral) whereas only two were foreseen in the work plan. This deviation is well justified. The meetings had a practical focus and were effectively organised with clear agendas, record of agreed actions.

For internal communication purposes a digital platform (workplace) was established that is well structured, effectively used for sharing documentation and for communication outside the meetings.

An appropriate management structure was set up consisting of a Core team (the project partners) responsible for the development of the portal, the tools and the integration of the transvalp and intent tools; centres of expertise representing the target sectors engaged in work placement companies in

Europe; and national agents, i.e. the testing group. This management structure allowed bringing more stakeholders into the project team and delivering numbers of products in relatively short time.

Score /10

<p><b>5. Financial management</b>          Are the expenditures appropriate and in line with the project's activities as described in the Final Report?          (please use also the second box in case your text is not fully displayed in the first box here below)</p>	9
<p>The project delivered more activities than initially planned and at the same time spent slightly less than the approved budget that demonstrates its cost efficiency. Low subsistence rates were used that kept the costs down. The spending against some budget lines was higher than the approved budget but within established limits. The development of a poster and banner was not approved by EACEA but included in the budget.</p>	

<p><b>6. Evaluation and/or quality assurance</b>          How well was the project's strategy for evaluation implemented? Were the evaluation activities done satisfactory? Were there significant changes compared to the original application?          (please use also the second box in case your text is not fully displayed in the first box here below)</p>	10
<p>Each work package implementation was analyzed and evaluated and results presented in separate reports. Evaluation of the project management was carried out by the lead partner who also assumed the role of project manager - this is not a good practice, moreover that it was done not through questionnaires to provide objective record of partners' feedback but on the basis of the discussions during the meetings.          The evaluation mechanism of the main product (the mobility portal) was appropriate and effective with clear quality criteria. It included a quantitative evaluation, i.e. key stakeholders (students, chief editor</p>	
<p>digital media, entrepreneur) assessed the portal structure, tools, aims/objectives, user friendliness, visual aspects, exploitability, as well as a qualitative evaluation.          Further monitoring of the users group for a sustainable mobility portal for VET in Europe was carrying out through testing the portal to follow the progress of mobility activities and to evaluate the use and usefulness of the EUMOVE portal and improve its quality.</p>	

<p><b>7. Dissemination and exploitation</b>          How effectively the project developed communication, visibility, and the dissemination of its activities and results as outlined in the original application? What is the quality of the dissemination activities? 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?          (please use also the second box in case your text is not fully displayed in the first box here below)</p>	10
--	----

Excellent external communication and visibility of the European Mobility Portal have been ensured through numbers of various activities in each participating country and outside the partnership, project promotion through CEDEFOP websites, conferences, workshops etc. Two more dissemination workshops were held in addition to the initial plan.

The business plan for further developing and maintaining the portal in the future includes clear provisions for ensuring sustainability of the portal, its expansion to other target sectors, target groups and countries. To cover the extra investment and costs for staff this development will require, offering the portal service on a fee basis for sector organisations is considered against a set of benefits. Two testing groups with organisations from 8 countries were established (original plan was for one testing group). The groups were carefully selected to represent potential users: training centres, regional authorities, EU platforms/ associations, social partners, sectoral and employment organisations.

## Overall evaluation

<b>Overall comment:</b>
The project was delivered successfully to high standards. Products of good quality were developed. The initial objectives and aims were achieved and the project exceeded the original plan.
<b>Strong points:</b>
Development of a high quality product relevant to end users needs ensured through a rigorous testing and monitoring. Strong management: analysis of each work package progress carried out Effective quality plan and evaluation mechanism established with regard to the main product – the European Mobility Portal. Good plan devised to maintain, sustain and expand the portal to new sectors, countries and target audiences.
<b>Weak points:</b>
n/a

Summary scoring sheet for Final Report	
Criterion	Score
1 Objectives, results and products	10
2 Coherence between work plan and activities carried out during life of the project	10
3 Partnership	10
4 Project Management	10
5 Financial Management	9

6 Evaluation	10
7 Dissemination	10

<b>Your global score is:</b>	<b>10 /10</b>	<b>100%</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 - 2	Very weak	Addresses the criterion but with significant or many weaknesses
3 - 4	Weak	Addresses the criterion but with some weaknesses
5 - 6	Acceptable	Addresses the criterion satisfactorily
7 - 8	Good	Addresses the criterion with some aspects of high quality
9 - 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 time