

The final evaluation

The questionnaire to the final evaluation was filled in by all the teams of the schools participating in the project. In 6 schools the questions were answered by the project co-ordinator, in 1 school by the teachers involved in the project activities.

1. Evaluation of the division of tasks and activities in the partnership

All partners agreed with the following statements:

- we had a clear division of tasks between the partners available on the Internet on our website
- the work plan specified the objectives of the project
- all activities were listed in the work plan
- the work plan determined the expected product and results of the activity

Almost everybody agreed that:

- the work plan made it clear how the activities should be carried out
- the work plan included the precise time schedule
- the work plan determined the location of the activities

Next three questions about receiving the products and results of their partners, feelings of equality in fulfilling the tasks and expectations as well as shared assignments were difficult to answer for the teachers who were not project coordinators at schools and not aware enough of the activities. Therefore they didn't express their opinion.

Affirmative answers to the questions about tasks and activities showed that the teams of partner schools were satisfied with the work plan and the activities as well as with the accessibility of all the project materials at the project web page.

To the next question : Did the work plan list who is responsible for each activity? we got five affirmative and two negative answers. It was the only question in this group which got negative answers. Hence it may be concluded that appointing somebody personally responsible for a certain activity was not always the strongest side of the project. Usually the person responsible was the project coordinator but it was not always fixed as a fact.

The last question on the block of these questions was: Did you feel that you worked significantly more or less than your partners? The answers were four times affirmative, two times negative and two answers were "cannot say".

Unfortunately such answers showed that not all the partners were equally involved in the project.

In conclusion I can say that the evaluation of the most important part – the work plan and timetable – showed that all partners were satisfied with that in general. The objectives and goals of the project were understandable for everyone and available for reading at the project home page. All partners were aware of the time, location and objectives of the project meetings. The project web page also stated the activities and final products of the project.

The only weak point here was appointing personal responsibility to each specific activity. It should have been done in a more definite way. Usually the person responsible for almost everything was the project director of the coordinating school.

2. Communication

Most of the partnership schools evaluated the possibilities of communication highly, there were no major problems involved. Small misunderstandings were solved via e-mails or at discussions at the project meetings.

All the partner schools had agreed that the main language of communication during the project would be English but French was also used. In general, communication did not cause problems to any of the partners, as everybody was accepted as equal no matter the level of foreign languages. Only one of the partners mentioned having problems in communication because of the low language level of the other partner.

Almost everybody was satisfied with the frequency of communication, although it was mentioned that it could have been more regular and determined.

It was also brought out that communication was not equally frequent with all the partners. For different reasons we could communicate with some partners not so often. Maybe seven partnership schools is too much to organise communication with everybody equally.

The main means of communication was exchanging e-mails. Regularity and frequency of reading and answering them was a problem for some schools, though. The most dense communication took place during the project meetings.

Making conclusions from this two-year project I may say that for carrying out a project successfully, it is essential for the project coordinator to be present at all the project meetings.

It is positive that all the project meetings have been well prepared, starting from introducing the schools and finishing with culture programs, that both teachers and students participated at the project meetings and the administrations of the schools were involved.

3. Evaluation of the co-ordination in the partnership.

Most of the partners agreed that the different language level of the partners has been taken into account. Only one school claimed having language problems.

All the partnership schools agreed that they had had accessibility to the project materials and necessary information.

Most of the partners agrees that the coordinators of the different schools were authorised to take decisions, one partner did not have an opinion.

The question “Is everybody able to contribute to the same extent?” got four affirmative and one negative answer, whereas two partners did not give an answer.

Unfortunately one of he partners said that a time schedule for communication between partners and for exchange of material was not available although the corresponding information was given at the project web page.

Still, most of the teachers were satisfied with the co-operation of the partnership schools.

4. Evaluation of the evaluation-activities in the project.

Most of the teams of the partnership schools were of the opinion that the evaluation took place on a regular basis and the evaluation was a clear item on the agenda for the partners meeting, that there was a clearly agreed feedback procedure. Everybody was satisfied about the materials for evaluation being reached at the project web page.

We planned to carry out the evaluation of the activities on a regular basis, at the project meetings and via e-mails. Intermediate evaluations were planned to carry out at the second and third project meetings in the form of discussions.

We discussed the course of the project, brought out the effective and successful activities and made plans for changing some things for the better.

The final evaluation in the form of a written test was planned to carry out at the final project meeting in Istanbul.

5. Impact to school and to students

All partners agreed that their students and teachers used ICT during all the project.. They used programs PowerPoint, Word, Excel and of course the Internet. They used multimedia. , video recorders, research work in Internet, blog, designing posters, logos, DVD, CD, chatting on the Internet

They made presentations, looked for information, looked at the project web-page.

The most common was using e-mails for communication between the students of different countries. Of course all our teachers involved in the project used a lot of e-mails to communicate .

Only one school mentioned that their students used a little less ICT.

To the question: Was the project diffused out of the School? Almost all the teachers answered that their project was well known at their school and in the community. To let people know about their activities, they have mostly used local newspapers, but also school home pages. Co-operation with local environment protection organizations was also mentioned. The school from Madrid had close connections with the Town Hall, CSIF (Trade Union) magazine, local newspaper, School orientation fair (stand of our School)...

To the question “Is the project known and supported by your colleagues and staff at school?” Most of the schools answered that they had got enough support. Only one school said that they could have needed bigger support from the administration and colleagues. On the other hand, the coordinator of the school from Madrid wrote, “ Yes, all the teachers implied in the Project have one hour free a week, on Thursday at 12:40, for our meetings.!!!”

The answers to the question, “What was the most important impact for your school? For you? And for students?” were the following:

The school is involved in the international collaboration. At school we have other ecological projects. We integrate all projects and involve many students and teachers in this work.

All participating teachers and students improve their language and ICT skills.

Our themes raise the interest of the students in ecological problems.

The students find friends from some European countries.

We make students aware of water problems, not only in order to save water but also not to pollute it. We raise an increasing motivation for this kind of activities.

It is a possibility of meeting new friends, of discovering new cultures, new school systems, new countries. To promote the use of ICT, to speak foreign languages. In short, to learn a lot differently!

I learned to administrate the project.

Raising awareness of using water and cooperation with partners

For the teachers getting aware of the different European school systems.

For the students getting in touch with different European cultures

to see how drinking water collecting systems are used in participating countries

In conclusion:

We are satisfied with the project and we are planning the next project already.