

**SOCRATES FINAL REPORT ASSESSMENT SHEET**

**Project number: [number]-[year]-[country]-[Socrates Action]**  
 118700-2004-DE-COMENIUS-C21

**Project title:**  
 TIMSIS - Teacher Inservice training Material on Seriously ill Students in hospital and ordinary schools

	<b>Score /5</b>
<b>1. Objectives, results and products (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 on their quality)</b>	<b>4</b>
<p>The project has generally fulfilled it's aims and objectives, the results as they were described in the project application are basically reached. The project presents a high quality informaton and learning package for teachers, parents and children about serious illnesses and how to integrate children with such illnesses in school education and also hospital schools. The language versions of all outputs are presented as planned, minor changes in the structure of the materials (e.g. the common description for all forms of cancer at children and the development of an introduction module) are agreeable and well explained. The quality of all materials presented is really convincing and shows the well substaintiated content approach the partnership has applied to this project.</p>	

	<b>Score /5</b>
<b>2. Coherence between work plan and activities carried out during the life of the project (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?)</b>	<b>4</b>
<p>The final report shows the implementation process mainly according to the plans, some delays have been met but they could be eliminated also together with an extension of the project duration. Activities have been implemented mainly as planned, there have been some more project partnership meetings than planned, which is well explained and documented with meeting agenda and the reason for each meeting can be seen.</p>	

	<b>Score /5</b>
<b>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?)</b>	4
<p>The quality and approach of the partnership is convincing, the output quality and the responsibility of the single partners for one or the other information and module shows a good involvement of all partners in the project process. There are no significant changes in the partnership and the documents received about meetings and the whole project process including the evaluation show that this was a real and effective transnational partnership approach.</p>	

	<b>Score /5</b>
<b>4. Project Management (How was the project managed? Have any variations from original plans been adequately justified?)</b>	4
<p>The results themselves and also the documentation of the whole project process shows the rich experiences of the project management in this subject. The internal evaluation documents do also support the assumption that there was an effective and efficient project management throughout the whole project.</p>	

	<b>Score /5</b>
<b>5. Financial Management (Is the expenditure appropriate and in line with the project's activities as described in the Final Report?)</b>	4
<p>The financial management does also make a sound impression, there is a slight overspending in staff costs (about 18%) , however the project did save some money in the operational costs category. There is obviously travel expenses in the report form for people not being employed for the project. Generally the expenses and costs seem to be in line with the results of the project presented with the final report. The reason for a 100% usage rate for the declared equipment costs cannot be seen in detail.</p>	

	<b>Score /5</b>
<b>6. Evaluation (How well was the project's strategy for evaluation implemented? Were there significant changes compared to the original application?)</b>	<b>4</b>
<p>The evaluation approach mentioned in the application was generally followed in the project, there is a number of process and summative evaluation documents delivered together with the final report. Also the product evaluation through experts from the partner countries has taken place and it is also important that the expert responsible for the content in the learning materials is mentioned there. The final evaluation document draws a quite positive picture of the project, partners are satisfied with the project process, communication and also the outputs. Only the added value of the evaluation approach itself was rates quite badly, however for future projects it should be tried to integrate the evaluation more in the core activities and not leave it aside as a necessary burden for all project partners.</p>	

	<b>Score /5</b>
<b>7. Dissemination (How effectively did the project carry out its plan for dissemination? What is the quality of the dissemination activities?)</b>	<b>5</b>
<p>There is a huge number of dissemination activities mentioned and also shown in the final report from nearly all the project partners. The sustainability concept co-operating with the HOPE federation shows the success of dissemination, there planned activities which are described quite vaguely in the application have been implemented in my opinion, more than that there have been numerous additional activities, presentations, conferences etc. The quality of the materials and approaches for dissemination is absolutely convincing and is authentic for the project and the target audience of dissemination. It is very positive that the project does not only use the classical university dissemination channels but a broad and target group oriented approach.</p>	

**Supplementary information to be submitted**

<p><b>If applicable, supplementary information required from the project to allow for a completion of the Final Report analysis (including, e.g. missing logo / disclaimer on outputs and / or website):</b></p>
--

## Overall evaluation

<p><b>Overall comment:</b></p> <p>The project has basically reached all its aims and objectives and provides an interesting and at the same time important output for teachers in whole Europe. Basically all aspects of project evaluation receive a very positive estimation and grading, the project is really convincing and could be a role model for quality, partnership and dissemination.</p>
<p><b>Strong points:</b></p> <p>The quality of the outputs and also the complexity and size of outputs is really impressive, the partnership has performed a convincing work to achieve these results and all partner organisations seem to be really committed to this project. The project management seems to be very solid and experienced, the project kept always on track although there was an extension of project duration which may be the result of a very ambitious approach and outputs. The dissemination approach, the number and the quality of the dissemination activities are impressive.</p>
<p><b>Weak points:</b></p> <p>The project does not have any big weaknesses, what is a bit missing is an overarching didactical concept which is somehow covering all the materials and modules presented. Apart from this the project and its results are really convincing and could act as a best practice for quality and dissemination.</p>

### 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	Very weak	Addresses the criterion but with significant or many weaknesses
2	Weak	Addresses the criterion but with some weaknesses
3	Acceptable	Addresses the criterion satisfactorily
4	Good	Addresses the criterion with some aspects of high quality
5	Very good	Addresses the criterion with all aspects of high quality