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INTRODUCTION

In December 2013, three questionnaires have been administered to partners on different qualitative aspects of the project progress and outcomes:

1. **Midterm questionnaire for project partners**: aimed at investigating the perceived overall quality of the project after 24 months of work. Each partner was asked to fill in the questionnaire (at least one for each organization).

2. **Project partners self-evaluation questionnaire**: aimed at investigating the perceived value each partners could give in respect to their own contribution to the various work packages. Each partner was asked to fill in the questionnaire (at least one for each organization).

3. **WP leaders self-evaluation questionnaire**: aimed at investigating the contribution of the partners from the perspective of the WP leaders, indentifying difficulties and problems and propose possible solutions. Only WP leaders were asked to fill it in, one questionnaire for each work package.

The questionnaires were prepared by using the Google form facilities and, as for the content item, they were reviewed by the Project Manager, who gave suggestions to improve them.

The deadline for filling in the questionnaires was mid January, so that a report analyzing the answers could be released at the end of January (at month 24 as foreseen by the DoW).

---

1 The questionnaire is available at the following address: https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/viewform?usp=drive_web&formkey=dDhyRWpVcllDOE5xTFJTRTJJSVljZHc6MA#gid=0

2 The questionnaire is available at the following address: https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/viewform?usp=drive_web&formkey=dE5qLUuSVNkTFNpajJEV3BHSTA4T3c6MA#gid=0

3 The questionnaire is available at the following address: https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/viewform?usp=drive_web&formkey=dEVRMkxhRU5yb0lQUUS1y3JTWpIWGc6MA#gid=0

4 In the Description of Work, the Deliverable 5.2 “Evaluation Report” is due in month 24. As clarified by the Project Coordinator, this release date is not in line with the lifespan of the project since generally an Evaluation report is due at the end of the project. The project coordinator explained in the Confidential Report that this was due to the fact that initially the project lifespan was to be 24 months and only later it was extended to 36 months. Thus the release date for D.5.2 was to be postponed to Month 36. Given this mismatch, we decided to produce an Interim Evaluation Report at Month 24 and to release the final “Evaluation Report” in Month 36, as it is more sensitive.
The first question was about the respect of the project timetable, as foreseen in the DoW. As shown below, the majority (67%) expresses their worries about the fact that some project outcomes have not been accomplished in the due time. The partners were also asked to identify the reasons for the delay.

**The project outcomes have been fully accomplished and in the due time**

![Bar Graph](image)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11,00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56,00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22,00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11,00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Delay in workflow (answers from 1 to 3: specify)*

Partners have reported delays in several WPs, such as WP3, WP4, WP5 and WP7, as specified below.

WP3. We have been late with some deliverables, e.g. ourselves UNI-C. And we have not been able to e.g. try/evaluate the training materials nationally because UNI-C no longer has the role as a provider (of e.g. training); now we are an authority.

As for WP5, there have been some deviations from the original description of the work because the planned activities were not in line with the project schedule. As for some outputs, such as the community of practice, there have been problems in involving teachers in a kind of top-down approach. Even though some social networks groups have been created to stimulate the discussion, a real community of practice has never started.
WP7. As the assessment of our progress report showed, we are reaching some but not all objectives. The main failing is not building the network and involving end users in schools.

The questions 2, 3 and 4 were about the communication and cooperation among partners and on the tools adopted to support those aspects.

*The communication and work tools have been adequate for the management of the project*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td>11,00%</td>
<td>33,00%</td>
<td>56,00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Problems identified and their solutions (answers from 1 to 3: specify)*

- File management is sometimes difficult.
- Probably, monthly online meetings would have helped.
- We've not had many online meetings in real time. Partners seem to prefer face to face and email rather than live conference calls.
The communication among the partners has been very good

![Bar chart showing communication among partners](chart1.png)

Problems identified and their solutions (answers from 1 to 3: specify)

- Turkish partners are problematic to work with.
- Sometimes it has been difficult to get feedback from some of the partners.
- [Communication is good] between [some partners] but not [among] all

The cooperation among partners has been very good

![Bar chart showing cooperation among partners](chart2.png)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>56.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Problems identified and their solutions (answers from 1 to 3: specify)

- Turkish partners are problematic to work with.
- Sometimes, even though some targets had been agreed in face-to-face meetings, they have not been accomplished or not in the right way/time.
- We, incl. UNI-C, could do better in supporting the work of other partners. The support for WP3 has been good though.
- [Cooperation is good] between [some partners] but not [among] all

Questions 5 and 7 were about the learning value of meetings. The majority (78%) is satisfied with the learning visits and considered them as a way of getting to know better the SEN ecosystem in the visit country.

During the project, I've learnt something I did not expect

What partners learnt (answers from 3 to 5: specify)

- I've learned more about the organizations of the partners and the inclusion process in respective countries.
- I did not have too much experience on SEN, I had experiences about SEN education both nationally and internationally.
- As for me the topic as such - children with special needs - was new then I have learnt a lot and I am truly happy that I joined the project. I especially like the school visits we have done - it gives a close view of what is really going on in that area in different countries and what are
the things that could be improved in my country. I also enjoy doing the case studies: both case studies we have done so far have been interesting to do as we have gone to the lessons, talked to the teachers, students and headmasters - we have really gone to the "field" and not only read the documents that are written above and don't say so much about the real situation.

- [I've learnt about] 1: Assistive technology support systems in Project partners. 2: - Modular teacher training implementation in different country.
- It was interesting to "touch" the SENNET situation in different countries and even though one might have theoretical knowledge, it is different to see it in person.
- High quality of the training materials (I assume from the looks of it). Accessibility issues, and the whole vocabulary of MLR about SEN has been an inspiration for national context.
- Even in countries were inclusion is the standard, UDL as a principle is rather unknown.
- I am not an expert in special needs, and have learnt a lot from partners.

**Within peer learning workshop, the quality of the learning visits have been very good**

![Quality of the learning visits graph]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quality of the learning visits (answers from 3 to 5: specify)**

- Some interventions by the SEN national authorities have given an overview of latest developments in the countries and some special projects have been good examples of SEN inclusion.
- It was great to see the different approaches in the countries!
- We have seen different applications related to SEN and usage of ICT in Sen education. We have also experienced different approaches of the other countries in this education.
- As I mentioned before the learning visits have been a very good value of that project. We have seen what is really going on in that field in different schools of Europe, got some ideas...
of how to improve our activities in special needs education and last but not least - we have seen and heard that the situation is not ideal anywhere, maybe it consoles a bit.

- 1: Visits were very good organized (time and programme etc.)
- 2: Partners shared their implementations in country.
- the setting, tools, methodologies, opportunities as for SEN students in different countries.
- I got connected and grounded to real life situations. Some national approaches are the same, yet there are differences in background and cultures.
- The possibilities of a mixture of funding of a school: partially government and partially local offers a lot of possibilities.
- We got a very good image about the inclusion or non-inclusion in the different countries.
- First hand experience in different countries. Well organized by hosts.

Question 6 was about the problems encountered so far and the time it took to tackle them. 78% of partners think problems were solved in the due time. The remaining 22% expressed some perplexity about the timing, as reported below.

**The problems we have encountered were solved in a short time**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22,00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33,50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44,50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dissatisfaction about the time in solving problems (answers from 1 to 3: specify)**

As for WP2 deliverables, in one of the Report of First Year, one of the contribution was handed out with some months’ delay and in this year report we miss the contribution from one of the partners.

Question 8 was about the quality of the partners’ face-to-face meetings. The majority (78%) is satisfied with it, even though some reported that the time for discussion was too short.
Within peer learning workshop, the quality of the partners meetings have been very good

![Quality of the partners meetings within peer learning workshop](image)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22,00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67,00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11,00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The last two questions were open questions asking partners to give their suggestions and comments on the quality of the project progress and suggestions to improve.

Please report your comments on the quality of the project process and outcomes

- The project has been developed better in some WPs than others, but on the whole has tried to deliver products, as reports, studies, digital resources, teacher training.
- Interesting case studies which can be very helpful for teachers, content-wise some work still needs to be done, online courses are very interesting.
- The Project process generally works well but there are some problematic issues on the explanations of the tasks. The tasks which the partners should make are not always well described and given in details. The quality of the outcomes also depend the processing.
- The quality of project’s process and outcomes is generally good.
- 1: Project planning, activities reports were very good organized. 2: Projects outcomes were shared with all partners.
- According to us the average quality of the project is around 7. Some aspects may be improved such as the fact of having online monthly meetings and to have a stronger management policy towards the problematic situations.
- My level of insight in SEN is not sufficient to evaluate the quality of the project’s reports. The is a value in reading what is happening in other countries, and from a ministry point of view their policies and strategies. I believe the course is of high quality (my own feeling as we have not managed to test it in a Danish context).
Please provide suggestions for improving the quality of the project outcomes and process management

- Some partners might contribute more evenly to all WPs.
- Maybe the tasks need to be laid out more clearly so that every partner knows what they are expected to do by when. This is not the case in every WPs.
- The tasks should be defined in detail and in steps in a more detailed way. Moreover format for every study should be prepared to make the studies clear. Nobody should need to have a copy of other country’s worksheet to work over, especially if you are not so much experienced on the subject of the project.
- What could be improved is that in WP4 there would be funding for conducting the web based course. The outcome of how many teachers will get knowledge of how to involve students with special needs and how ICT can help there would be much bigger then. Right now it depends only on each organization’s budget.
- Having online monthly meetings could help. Using more structured evaluation tools such as these ones (so far we have been using informal discussions with partners and emails to assess the project outcomes and process management.
- Networking and getting input from other Networks/’knowledge’ persons. The connection and relations to the European Agency is valuable, also in the perspective that our ministry is also represented in that Network. The project management has been solid and helpful. Clear, simple deadlines (what is the project to deliver when) might support process management.
- Note that this is a network not a project, so the networking and communication side is as if not more important than the production of outputs and reports.
In this questionnaire, partners were asked to evaluate their contribution to each single WP and to specify how they could improve it in case they would consider it to be insufficient or too poor.

**Contribution to WP1 outputs has been fully satisfactory**

![Contribution to WP1 outputs chart]

| 1  | 0  | 0 |
| 2  | 0  | 0 |
| 3  | 1  | 14,00% |
| 4  | 3  | 43,00% |
| 5  | 3  | 43,00% |

*Problems identified and possible solutions (answers from 1 to 3 - low satisfaction)*

- Find more time

**Contribution to WP2 outputs has been fully satisfactory**

![Contribution to WP2 outputs chart]

| 1  | 0  | 0 |
| 2  | 1  | 14,00% |
| 3  | 0  | 0 |
| 4  | 2  | 29,00% |
| 5  | 4  | 57,00% |
Problems identified and possible solutions (answers from 1 to 3 - low satisfaction)

- The poor excuse is change in personnel, because key persons left UNI-C as a consequence of our restructuring. The same person (me ;-) will be the person working in SENNET for the rest of the project, and I will ask the relevant experts around me for contributions.

Contribution to WP3 outputs has been fully satisfactory

![Contribution to WP3 outputs chart]

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14,00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29,00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43,00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14,00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Problems identified and possible solutions (answers from 1 to 3 - low satisfaction)

- We still need to add resources. Sometimes it is difficult for us because we only can add free resources. Certainly in these days of apps there are a lot of good apps which are not expensive. It is a pity we cannot add them to the list.
- For me the concrete tasks for WP3 have been unclear and not well described. The tasks have become more clear in recent months but it's still difficult to see what is the broader outcome, what will be the use for all the teachers in Europe.
- The first versions of deliverables were of too poor quality and delivered with a delay. The present, updated versions I feel are fully satisfactory - however some have been late.
Contribution to WP4 outputs has been fully satisfactory

Problems identified and possible solutions (answers from 1 to 3 - low satisfaction)

- We're experiencing problems with the development of our new website which means that we cannot start our learning environment.
- We have not been able to contribute, evaluate and test the training materials yet. However, I am still trying to find Danish organizations or schools that are interested (not only because of the project, but because I think teachers might benefit from using the materials)

Contribution to WP5 outputs has been fully satisfactory

Problems identified and possible solutions (answers from 1 to 3 - low satisfaction)

- It was not clear what was actually expected to be done.
- As stated by the Commission Reviewer, we should have done more and better to evaluate the quality of the products and the process of the project.
- I am not really sure what we have done... I probably missed a coordinated action? I believe that the partners have carefully considered the quality of their own contributions, UNI-C has.
- Need to provide more feedback and evaluation

**Contribution to WP6 outputs has been fully satisfactory**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14,00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57,00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29,00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Problems identified and possible solutions (answers from 1 to 3 - low satisfaction)**

- We still have to do our conference. We started too late our communication about our involvement in the project. It was our first European project and we’ve learned a lot about it. We’ll be communicating more through our e-newsletter, facebook, ... about the results of the project.
- Most important and successful internationally is the collaboration with the EdReNe Network. Its members have contributed to the survey and SENNet results have been presented to this Network.
Contribution to WP7 outputs has been fully satisfactory

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14,00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57,00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29,00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Problems identified and possible solutions (answers from 1 to 3 - low satisfaction)

- Some work still needs to be done in both dissemination and exploitation.
- Except for the EMINENT seminars we have to make a valid sustainability plan.
- We have done what has been asked from us as for this WP but probably there is not a clear strategy/communication on how to exploit the outputs of the project.
- SENNET’s survey has been forwarded to the members of the EdReNe Network. However, we are still looking for an interested body in Denmark to take up the course. UNI-C will register the materials on the national educational repository, Materialeplatformen, though, thereby making the resources available to the Danish teacher community.
- Need to reach out and promote SENnet more.

Conclusions

In conclusion, we can say that on the whole, partners consider their contribution to be satisfactory or fully satisfactory in WP no. 1 (86%), 2 (86%), 3 (57%), 4 (72%), 6 (86%), whilst dissatisfaction is reported as for WP no. 5 (57%) and 7 (71%).
The first question was about the perceived satisfaction as for partners’ contributions. As shown below, half of the partners (57%) expressed their satisfaction to the work done by the partners, whilst the remaining half expressed some dissatisfaction and explained the reasons, the actions done to overcome the problems and the support they received and the possible solutions to face the situation in the forthcoming months.

**Positions showing low satisfaction (answers from 1 to 3) and corresponding WPs**

*Problems identified*

- WP1: Problems with communication and engagement of one or two partners at times. Some misunderstandings about the financial and reporting work owing to inexperience or being too busy.
- WP4: Some partners have not adapted the English version to national ones. The validation of the online course/modules national versions have not been totally satisfactory, with few participants involved in some cases.
- WP5: The problem is that at the beginning no formal tools for the quality assessment of the project have been used so the gathering of feedback from partners has been made informally.
Actions done to overcome the difficulties

- WP1: One to one contact, explanation and encouragement.
- WP 4: A common basis was prepared in English and discussed. Alternatives and a certain openness were given for adaptation into national versions and validation. Each partner is committed to a contract with EC, so it is up to each one to do the job within their national frontiers.
- WP5: We have now created a series of formal tools to monitor the quality of the project progress and products.

Support given/received

- WP1: support from experts in EUN office, and peer pressure.
- WP4: Some partners have tried to follow the guidelines, so those have been supportive.
- WP5: No support was given.

Possible solutions

- WP1: Formal letter to weak partners; more regular monitoring of activity and resource usage.
- WP4: As each partner has a different context both as organization and relationship with the educational community, each partner knows best how to put into practice the tasks required.
- WP5: to have a formal strategy for evaluating the project progress and products.

Positions showing high satisfaction (answers from 4 and 5) and corresponding WPs

- WP2: According to us, the key factors have been:
  1. the fact of having set a common format for the outputs, in a collaborative way;
  2. the fact of having sent a series of reminder for the handing out of the partners' contributions;
  3. the fact of having experience in the field of educational documentation of innovative practices.
- WP3: The delay in producing the WP3 deliverables is caused by delay from the WP3 leader ourselves. Quality input to the SEN resources survey from Austria, Italy, Portugal, Estonia and the EUN, and strong support from the EUN in designing the SEN application profile and in setting up the database and its registration template. Additionally the contact to the members of the EdReNe network has proven very beneficial.
- WP6: Regular workshops and peer learning visits following a similar format
- WP7: Opening of Facebook group for SENnet. Efforts to increase EU visibility through conference input, newsletters, improving web site. In 2014 I hope we can organise some online learning events and webinars open to eTwinning, iTEC and all EU teachers. These are not in the work plan and so there are issues related to workload.

Then they were asked to express their expectations as for the tasks to be accomplished by the end of the project and the majority (71%) showed a positive feeling about them, as represented in the graph below.

![Graph showing expectations as for 2014 outcomes]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Positions showing low expectations (answers from 1 to 3) and corresponding WPs**

Only in WP1 and 7 WP leaders were doubtful about the tasks to be accomplished by the end of the project. However, they offered possible solutions to tackle those problems.

**Possible solutions**

- WP1: More effort from some partners.
- WP7: More focus by all on impacting and reaching out.

**Monitoring actions by WP leaders on external impact**

Finally, partners were asked if and by what means they were monitoring the progress and the impact of their outputs. The answers provided by WP leaders are given below.

- WP1: Yes - EUN sites are monitored - see WP6 and 7.
- WP2: As for the quantitative figures, we know the number of the intended audiences as for the INDIRE newsletter and the partners' newsletter, and the number of people attending the SENNET workshops where the WP2 products were presented.
- WP3: I am assuming the EUN will be monitoring the statistics of use on the LRE.
- **WP4:** An evaluation questionnaire was developed to include in the validation of the online course/modules, which was translated/adapted by each partner. A descriptive part is provided by each partner regarding the organization and validation of the course/modules. A general report gathers all these contributions of the partners. Expansion of target-public is desirable in next stages.

- **WP5:** No since this is an internal process.

- **WP6:** Yes, reports published online, attendance recorded.

- **WP7:** Yes, statistics, social media.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the analysis of the answers of the three questionnaires, the recommendations that can be drawn are the following ones.

As on the project work organization in general:

- Organize online monthly meeting in order to share and communicate tasks, deadlines and efforts to be dedicated from all the partners.
- Plan in a written form tasks and deadline so that all partners have a clear overview of what it is expected from them (the document could be referenced during online monthly meetings).
- Manage the partners’ area uploading all the documents there (need to clarify who is responsible for updating the area).
- Push the “lazy” partners with direct and strict communications on what is required and by when.

As on specific project priorities to be carried out:

- Dissemination, in particular face-to-face events, in conjunction with other projects meetings where many teachers are likely to attend.
- Exploitation, in particular the community of practice need to be prioritized since so far only a Facebook group has been created but not many teachers are participating there. One measure could be networking with existing national and international communities (such as eTwinning, or other international projects communities such as the Living Schools Lab community, or the ITEC community etc.) since it is difficult that we can build an online community in such a short period of time (only a few project months are left) and with a top-down approach.
ANNEXES

Questionnaire #1

Please, rate from 1 (not agree) to 5 (totally agree) the following statements:

*Compulsory answers

1) The project outcomes have been fully accomplished and in the due time *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1a) If your answer is from 1 to 3, please specify

2) The communication and work tools have been adequate for the management of the project *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2a) If your answer is from 1 to 3, please specify

3) The communication among the partners has been very good *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
3a) If your answer is from 1 to 3, please specify

4) The cooperation among partners has been very good *
   1 2 3 4 5
   0 0 0 0 0
4a) If your answer is from 1 to 3, please specify

5) During the project, I've learnt something I did not expect *
   1 2 3 4 5
   0 0 0 0 0
5a) If your answer is from 3 to 5, please specify what you learnt

6) The problems we have encountered were solved in a short time
   IF APPLICABLE
   1 2 3 4 5
   0 0 0 0 0
6a) If your answer is from 1 to 3, please specify what happened

7) Within peer learning workshop, the quality of the learning visits have been very good *
   1 2 3 4 5
   0 0 0 0 0
7a) If your answer is from 3 to 5, please specify what you learnt

7b) If your answer is from 1 or 2, please give reasons for your score

8) Within peer learning workshop, the quality of the partners meetings have been very good *
   1 2 3 4 5
   0 0 0 0 0
8a) If your answer is from 3 to 5, please specify what you learnt
8a) If your answer is from 1 or 2, please give reasons for your score.

9) Please report your comments on the quality of the project process and outcomes *

10) Please provide suggestions for improving the quality of the project outcomes and process management *
Questionnaire #2

SENNET - Project partners self-evaluation questionnaire

Please, rate from 1 (not agree) to 5 (totally agree) the following statements:

1) Your contribution to WP1 outputs has been fully satisfactory *
   1 2 3 4 5

1a) If your answer is from 1 to 3, please specify and provide possible improvements

2) Your contribution to WP2 outputs has been fully satisfactory *
   1 2 3 4 5

2a) If your answer is from 1 to 3, please specify and provide possible improvements

3) Your contribution to WP3 outputs has been fully satisfactory *
   1 2 3 4 5

3a) If your answer is from 1 to 3, please specify and provide possible improvements

4) Your contribution to WP4 outputs has been fully satisfactory *
   1 2 3 4 5

4a) If your answer is from 1 to 3, please specify and provide possible improvements

5) Your contribution to WP5 outputs has been fully satisfactory *
   1 2 3 4 5

5a) If your answer is from 1 to 3, please specify and provide possible improvements

6) Your contribution to WP6 outputs has been fully satisfactory *
   1 2 3 4 5

   1a) If your answer is from 1 to 3, please specify and provide possible improvements
6a) If your answer is from 1 to 3, please specify and provide possible improvements

7) Your contribution to WP7 outputs has been fully satisfactory *
   1 2 3 4 5
   0 0 0 0 0

7a) If your answer is from 1 to 3, please specify and provide possible improvements
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Questionnaire #3

SENNET - WP leaders self-evaluation questionnaire

Please, rate from 1 (not agree) to 5 (totally agree) the following statements:

*Comp. obligations

Preliminary questions on the status *

Of which WP are you leader? (please make one questionnaire for each WP you are leading)

1) The partners contribution to your WP has been fully satisfactory *

1 2 3 4 5

1a) If your answer is from 1 to 3, please specify the problems you have encountered

1b) If your answer is from 1 to 3, please provide a description of what you have done to solve the problems

1c) If your answer is from 1 to 3, please mention what kind of support you have received and from whom

1d) If your answer is from 1 to 3, please outline what could be the possible solutions

1e) If your answer is 4 or 5, please specify what are the key factors for the success of the WP outputs

2) The work is on target to produce the expected results (as defined in the proposal) by 2014 *

1 2 3 4 5
2a) If your answer is from 1 to 3, please specify what needs to be done and by whom in 2014.

2b) Are you monitoring the WP work external impact and with what tools (i.e. statistics for visitors to websites, events, newsletters)?

Please explain.

[Blank space for additional remarks]

Note: Please note the password for the Modul Google.