

## EVALUATION OF THE TRAINING ACADEMY

Please scale the following aspects of the event on a 1-5 basis, where 1 signifies – “no, completely not/very dissatisfied” 2 – “no/somewhat dissatisfied”, 3 - “neutral”, 4-“yes/somewhat satisfied”, and 5 “yes, absolutely/very satisfied”.

(Values shall be rounded to one decimal point).

1. General Overview		1	2	3	4	5	Q
Please indicate your overall satisfaction with this training			1		13	5	4,2
Did the event match your needs?			1	2	14	2	3,9
Did you gain relevant knowledge and information?				4	9	6	4,1
Will you be able to apply such knowledge and information in your work?				4	11	4	4,0
2. How do you evaluate the following aspects of this training?							
Relevance of content			1	3	12	3	3,9
Practical application			1	2	15	1	3,8
Learning environment			1	1	7	9	4,1
3. How do you evaluate the topics of this training?							
I found these topics especially relevant:		Social funds, HR, EU-Policy making instruments, volunteering, funding opportunities, employment in social services, promotion strategies / EU policy making and working in the fields of social services, lessens and representatives.					
I missed these topics:		Further development of some inputs because of the time lack, promotion was relevant but too theoretical, practical information on agenda 2010-2020, concrete information on how to get financial support for projects					
4. Were the following objectives accomplished?							
The training was related to the participants' experiences			1	6	7	4	3,8
The training was positively interactive		1		2	6	10	4,3
5. Organization							
Preorganization		1		1	7	10	4,3
Time schedule		1		2	8	8	4,2
Training materials		1	1	2	9	5	3,9
Service within the training		1			9	7	4,2

Training location	1		2	11	5	4 , 0
Food and beverage	2		2	10	5	3 , 8
Accommodation	1	1	1	10	4	3 , 9
<b>6. Additional comments (What did you like the most, what could have been improved...?)</b>						
<p>The inputs could have taken more time including more practical information. The last input created a good link between the input and working group. One participant stressed his appreciation about the ISS/AWO proposals. The presentations could have been more interactive. The EU topics were very difficult to understand (too abstract for many participants). They should have been explained better to make their influence on members work more visible. Topics which are closer related to the members work would have been more interesting. To be honest, it is not very useful to invite a person who is just reading what is on the slides, if the information can also be found in the internet.</p> <p>The interaction during the working groups was appreciated. A very positive, good working atmosphere was prevailed (topics and interaction with the other participants). The active participation (group dynamics) of all present people and the exchange of experiences and ideas was frequently valued. Working in the groups was the most useful. The experience to share opinions and experiences with people from all across Europe was appreciated.</p> <p>It was very disturbing to see some participants not taking part in the working groups (instead being busy with their notebooks or phones) It was sad to see that some people left before the official end. Two days length was ok, just sad, some left earlier (respect to others and their time).</p> <p>A tip for future training academies: Include more energizers to create a better environment among the participants.</p> <p>It could have been useful to determine beforehand a level of knowledge of the participants in relation to the topics, as one could notice that the most participants had minimal knowledge about the EU policy making and procedures.</p> <p>Which project is the best for what project idea? Any advice to raise the chance for an accepted application? Help associations working together on European projects.</p>						

## 1 General Overview

The results of the evaluation forms indicate that the participants were overall satisfied with the event.

Relating to both categories – the evaluation of the content as well as the evaluation of the organizational aspects – the majority of the participants were satisfied or very satisfied with the event.

The aspect, which was evaluated the best, was the interactive nature of the event.

From the individual comments, we could learn that participants would have liked to have more time for inputs.

Another important topic that was raised in several evaluation forms was the sometimes missing practical relevance of the topics for the daily work of the participants. Several participants see room for improvement here and would have liked to adapt contents more to their daily work.

Furthermore some participants noted down that they had difficulties to understand the EU topics and connect them to their daily work.

Some participants suggested determining the level of knowledge of the participants next time before the seminar and adapt the content of the inputs accordingly.

However, very positive feedback was given concerning the interaction during the group works. The working groups were seen as very interactive and helpful. Participants considered the group work as very helpful opportunity to exchange experiences and opinions across Europe.

Participants therefore evaluated the training academy as a good opportunity to meet and connect with potential project partners

## **Final conclusion:**

The SOLIDAR Training Academy was a good opportunity to meet and connect with potential project partners. Differences between North-South Europe were recognised.