



EDU-VET

3rd Internal Evaluation Report

- Project Title:** E-Learning, Digitisation and Units for Learning at
VET schools – Creating online Learning
Environments in Technical Education for European metal industry
- Acronym:** EDU-VET
- Reference number:** **2019-1-DE02-KA202-006068**
- Project partners:**
- P1 University Paderborn (UPB), DE
 - P2 Ingenious Knowledge GmbH (IK), DE
 - P3 Berufskolleg Bocholt-West (BKBW), DE
 - P4 Lancaster and Morecambe College (LMC), UK
 - P5 Centro Integrado de Formación Profesional Someso (CIFP), ES
 - P6 Stichting BE Oost-Gelderland (SBEOG), NL

Agenda

1. Setting of the testing and target group.....	3
2. Quantitative and qualitative data	3
3. Summary.....	11

1. Setting of the testing and target group

This report represents the 3rd Internal Evaluation for the international Erasmus+ - project EDU-VET (E-Learning, Digitisation and Units for Learning at VET schools – Creating online Learning Environments in Technical Education for European metal industry).

The Internal Evaluation was conducted from the 1st to 27th of March 2022 with the online tool Lime Survey. The survey was divided into eight question parts which includes 15 questions in total. The survey persisted of open and closed questions. The eight participants were from Germany, UK, Spain and the Netherlands.

Following you will get detailed insights in the survey results of the project.

2. Quantitative and qualitative data

Question 1:

As you can see in table 1, all participants think that the project will match the needs of the target groups completely.

Evaluated aspect N=6	Yes, completely.	Yes, in most aspects.	No, there are some parts missing.	Σ
In general: Do you think that the project will match/ serve the needs of the target groups?	3 (50.00 %)	3 (50.00 %)	0 (0.00 %)	6

Table 1: Evaluation result – Question 1

Question 2:

According to question 2, most participants rate their answers on the item ,Yes, completely', which means that the project achieve its objectives so far.

Evaluated aspect N=7	Yes, completely.	Yes, in most aspects.	No, there are some parts missing.	Σ
Did the project achieve its objectives (IOs and activities) so far?	6 (85.71 %)	1 (14.28 %)	0 (0.00 %)	7

Table 2: Evaluation result – Question 2

Question 3:

Table 3 illustrates the evaluated aspect regarding any concerns with the projects' quality of the management or collaboration. The majority has indicated ,No' (62.50 %).

Evaluated aspect N=8	Yes	No	No answer	Σ
Do you have any concerns with the quality of the management or collaboration of the project so far?	0 (0.00 %)	5 (62.5 %)	3 (37.5 %)	8
If "No", why? Please explain (N=0)				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No answer 				

Table 3: Evaluation result – Question 3

Question 4:

Table 4 illustrates the evaluated aspect of partners contribution contribute towards the achievements of the project objectives of the EDU-VET topic. All partners agree with this statement.

Evaluated aspect N=7	Yes, completely.	Yes, in most aspects.	No	Σ
Up to now - Did the project partners contribute towards the achievements of the project objectives?	7 (100.00 %)	0 (0.00 %)	0 (0.00 %)	7
If "No", why? Please explain (N=0)				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No answer 				

Table 4: Evaluation result – Question 4

Question 5:

The next question 5 intends to the using of project resources. The remaining partners (75.00 %) have chosen ,Yes, completely', which means that the project resources were used in an appropriate way. The rest of the participants 25.00 %) find that this aspect agrees in most cases.

Evaluated aspect N=8	Yes, completely.	Yes, in most aspects.	No, they weren't.	Σ
Were the project resources used in an appropriate way?	6 (75.00 %)	2 (25.00 %)	0 (0.00 %)	8
If "No", why? Please explain (N=0)				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No answer 				

Table 5: Evaluation result – Question 5

Question 6:

According to the project time-frame the documents were shared in a timely-manner. This will be confirmed completely by 62.50 % of the participants. The results of the internal survey and the second interim report show here a match. This means that the project has no time delays.

Evaluated aspect N=8	Yes, in most aspects.	No, they weren't.	No answer	Σ
Up to now- Were all documents and information shared in a timely manner?	5 (62.50 %)	0 (00.00 %)	3 (37.50 %)	8
If "No", why? Please explain (N=0)				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No answer 				

Table 6: Evaluation result – Question 6

Question 7.1:

The following Question 7 asks about a system for keeping versions of each document. Unfortunately, over 57 % of the participants don't answer this question. Therefore, the results can only be evaluated in a very limited way. Nevertheless, 42.85 % of the partners agree with the statement.

Evaluated aspect N=7	Yes.	No.	No answer	Σ
Is there a system for keeping versions of each document?	3 (42.85 %)	0 (0.00 %)	4 (57.14 %)	7

Table 7: Evaluation result – Question 7.1

Question 7.2:

Concerning to the project time-frame the deliverables were prepared in a timely-manner. This will be confirmed completely by 12.50 % and in most cases by 75.00 % of the participants (see table 8). This means that the Corona pandemic has no significant effect on the preparation of the deliverables of the Intellectual Outputs in this project.

Evaluated aspect N=8	Yes.	Yes, in most cases.	No answer.	Σ
Up to now- Were the deliverables of the IOs prepared according to the projects time-frame despite Corona?	1 (12.50 %)	6 (75.00 %)	1 (12.50 %)	8
If "No", why? Please explain (N=0)				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No answer 				

Table 8: Evaluation result – Question 7.2

Question 8:

Nevertheless, the results of the survey indicate not only that the project has no delays, but also that the project results meet a high standard despite the Covid-19 pandemic. With 66.67 %, majority indicates that they agree with this view in most aspects (see table 9).

Evaluated aspect N=6	Yes, completely.	Yes, in most aspects.	No, they weren't.	Σ
Up to now- Were all deliverables prepared according to high standards despite Corona?	2 (33.33 %)	4 (66.67 %)	0 (0.00 %)	6

Table 9: Evaluation result – Question 9

Question 9:

According to the questions about the standards of assessing the quality of deliverables, the participants point out the exchange and collaboration in the team. The answers show that there are online exchanges in small groups as well as in the whole project team. These take place regularly via Zoom or Skype.

Evaluated aspect N=8	Answers (N=2)	No answer	Σ
Up to now- Which standards were used for assessing the quality of the deliverables?	-Regularly Skype or Zoom Meetings -OER standards, agreements	6 (75.00 %)	8

Table 10: Evaluation result – Question 10

Question 10:

The results in table 11 give a closer look to which IOs have a high standard. These IOs and deliverables are evaluated as (very) good in average. There exists not a single IO that was evaluated badly so far.

Evaluated aspect N=8	excellent-high quality	great-very good quality	good-good quality	OK-adequate quality	weak-weak quality	bad-bad quality	Σ
Up to now- Rate the quality of the results and deliverables of IO1, which existed so far.	2 (25.00%)	4 (50.00%)	2 (25.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	8
Up to now- Rate the quality of the results and deliverables of IO2, which existed so far.	1 (12.50%)	5 (62.50%)	2 (25.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	8

Up to now- Rate the quality of the results and deliverables of IO3, which existed so far.	3 (37.50%)	3 (37.50%)	2 (25.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	8
Up to now- Rate the quality of the results and deliverables of IO4, which existed so far.	1 (12.50%)	3 (37.50%)	4 (50.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	8
Up to now- Rate the quality of the results and deliverables of IO5, which existed so far.	0 (0.00%)	1 (12.50%)	4 (50.00%)	3 (37.50%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	8
Up to now- Rate the quality of the results and deliverables of IO6, which existed so far.	2 (25.00%)	1 (12.50%)	5 (62.50%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	8

Table 11: Evaluation result – Question 10

Question 11.1:

The results of question 11 give a more detailed insight into what the partners are satisfied with, especially in IO3, IO4, IO5 and IO6. It shows that the partners evaluate all IOs in overall terms as being of very good quality, even on average (see following tables).

Evaluated aspect N=6	excellent- high quality	great- very good quality	good- good quality	OK- adequate quality	weak- weak quality	bad- bad quality	Σ
In relation to IO3, what do you think about the...							
module structure	2 (33.33%)	2 (33.33%)	2 (33.33%)	0 (00.00%)	0 (00.00%)	0 (00.00%)	6
module content	1 (16.66%)	3 (50.00%)	1 (16.66%)	1 (16.66%)	0 (00.00%)	0 (00.00%)	6
module design and layout	0 (00.00%)	3 (50.00%)	3 (50.00%)	0 (00.00%)	0 (00.00%)	0 (00.00%)	6
learning outcomes	0 (00.00%)	3 (50.00%)	3 (50.00%)	0 (00.00%)	0 (00.00%)	0 (00.00%)	6
H5P tasks	0 (00.00%)	3 (50.00%)	1 (16.66%)	2 (33.33%)	0 (00.00%)	0 (00.00%)	6

Table 12: Evaluation result – Question 11.1

Question 11.2:

Evaluated aspect N=7	excellent- high quality	great- very good quality	good- good quality	OK- adequate quality	weak- weak quality	bad- bad quality	Σ
In relation to IO4, what do you think about the...							
module structure	1 (14.28%)	5 (71.42%)	1 (14.28%)	0 (00.00%)	0 (00.00%)	0 (00.00%)	7
module content	2 (28.57%)	3 (42.78%)	1 (14.28%)	0 (00.00%)	0 (00.00%)	0 (00.00%)	7
module design and layout	0 (00.00%)	3 (50.00%)	3 (50.00%)	0 (00.00%)	0 (00.00%)	0 (00.00%)	6
learning outcomes	0 (00.00%)	3 (50.00%)	3 (50.00%)	0 (00.00%)	0 (00.00%)	0 (00.00%)	6

Table 13: Evaluation result – Question 11.2

Question 11.3:

Evaluated aspect N=8	excellent- high quality	great- very good quality	good- good quality	OK- adequate quality	weak- weak quality	bad- bad quality	Σ
In relation to IO5, what do you think about the...							
module structure	0 (00.00%)	2 (25.00%)	4 (50.00%)	2 (25.00%)	0 (00.00%)	0 (00.00%)	8
module content	1 (12.50%)	4 (50.00%)	3 (37.50%)	0 (00.00%)	0 (00.00%)	0 (00.00%)	8
module design and layout	0 (00.00%)	2 (28.57%)	3 (42.85%)	2 (28.57%)	0 (00.00%)	0 (00.00%)	7
learning outcomes	1 (16.67%)	2 (33.33%)	3 (50.00%)	0 (00.00%)	0 (00.00%)	0 (00.00%)	6

Table 14: Evaluation result – Question 11.3

Question 11.4:

Evaluated aspect N=6	excellent- high quality	great- very good quality	good- good quality	OK- adequate quality	weak- weak quality	bad- bad quality	Σ
In relation to IO6, what do you think about the...							
module structure	2 (33.33%)	2 (33.33%)	2 (33.33%)	0 (00.00%)	0 (00.00%)	0 (00.00%)	6
module content	3 (50.00%)	3 (50.00%)	0 (00.00%)	0 (00.00%)	0 (00.00%)	0 (00.00%)	6
module design and layout	3 (50.00%)	3 (50.00%)	0 (00.00%)	0 (00.00%)	0 (00.00%)	0 (00.00%)	6

Learning outcomes	3 (50.00%)	3 (50.00%)	0 (00.00%)	0 (00.00%)	0 (00.00%)	0 (00.00%)	6
-------------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---

Table 15: Evaluation result – Question 11.4

Question 12.1:

Question 12.1 focuses on dissemination activities. As you can see in the following table and figure that all dissemination activities completely implemented as planned.

Evaluated aspect N=5	Yes, completely.	No.	No answers.	Σ
Up to now- Were dissemination activities implemented as planned?	5 (62.50 %)	0 (00.00 %)	3 (37.50 %)	5
If "No", why? Please explain (N=0)				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No answers 				

Table 16: Evaluation result – Question 12.1

Question 12.2:

Additionally to the previous question, the partner should give insights into their dissemination activities and dissemination channels in detail. As you can see in the table the main channel is social media like Facebook, Twitter. Additionally the EDU-VET website is also an important dissemination channel. Printed materials like Newsletters, Flyers, Posters are also carry out the project information. In addition, the exchange of information with the ministry and government is an important dissemination pillar.

Evaluated aspect N=8	Answers (N=2)	No answer	Σ
Up to this point- What tools/ channels were used for dissemination and exploitation and how were they used?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Facebook, Twitter, EDU-VET Website, Newsletter, Flyer, Online article -website, internet, social media, poster, H5P-tasks - direct contacts to ministries and government -paper brochures -events at schools 	5 (62.50 %)	8

Table 17: Evaluation result – Question 12.2

Question 13.1:

The partners agreed that the pandemic has an effect on conducting project activities. Especially the field-based research (interviews, questionnaire survey) as well as the organisation of the partner meetings and Multiplier Events were strongly influenced by the Corona pandemic, as personal contacts were cancelled and all research activities had to be conducted online.

Evaluated aspect N=8	Yes.	No.	No answers.	Σ
Does the Corona pandemic has some effect on the project progression?	8 (100.00 %)	0 (00.00 %)	0 (00.00 %)	8
If "Yes", why? Please explain (N=3) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>difficulties with the field-based research</i> • <i>no face to face meetings</i> • <i>difficulties concerning the organisation of partner meetings and multiplier events</i> 				

Table 18: Evaluation result – Question 13.1

Question 13.2

Although the partners expressed concerns regarding the effects of the Corona crisis on the project activities, the majority is confident that the Corona pandemic will not have a negative impact on the success of the project outcomes (see table 19).

Evaluated aspect N=8	I totally disagree	I disagree	None	I agree	I totally agree	No answer	Σ
Do you agree that the project success will not be affected by the Corona pandemic?	0 (0.00%)	1 (12.50%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (37.50%)	1 (12.50%)	3 (37.50%)	8

Table 19: Evaluation result – Question 13.2

Question 14:

The results of the last question show that the partners are quite happy with the project activities, contents and dissemination activities because all partners, because no partner has expressed concerns.

Evaluated aspect N=8	Answers (N=1)	No answer	Σ
Do you have further comments concerning the project activities, contents, dissemination activities etc.?	<i>-Good cooperation and support of all partners</i>	7 (87.50 %)	8

Table 19: Evaluation result – Question 14

3. Summary

The results of the 3rd Internal Evaluation shows clearly that the project process of EDU-VET proceeded successful as positive for all project partners. The partners show a high satisfaction with the collaboration among the EDU-VET project. Nevertheless, all partners express concerns regarding the Corona crisis. It is emphasised that project work has been made more difficult since the pandemic. This is evident, for example, in field-based research or in cooperation with companies or in the project team. At present, these activities can only be carried out online. Despite all the circumstances, the partners are confident and are doing their best, so that the project can be completed successfully.

The majority rates the structure and quality of all IOs as “very high” to “high”.

Particularly, a regular exchange is very important to all partners. The collaboration and exchange take place in small groups and/or in the whole project team. Due to the Corona pandemic and the elimination of face-to-face meetings, regular meetings are more important than ever. The meetings take place online via Skype or Zoom.

Besides, the project partners are satisfied with their dissemination activities. In this context, they prefer following dissemination channels:

- Social Media (Facebook, ...)
- Internet-based activities (Project website,...)
- Paper-based activities (Posters, flyer,...)
- Project performance-based activities (Project website, contact to ministries and governmental institutions...)

In summary, all partners look forward to the last project issues. The team is confident that the project can be successfully completed despite the corona crisis.