



Annex1

**LLP FINAL REPORT ASSESSMENT SHEET**

**Project number: [number]-[year]-[country]-[LLP Action]**  
 142767-LLP-1-2008-1-NO-ERASMUS-EVC

**Project title:**  
 Social Work-Virtual Campus (SW-VirCamp)

	Score /10
<p><b>1. Objectives, results and products</b>                      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.</p> <p>The project outcomes, results and products have met the objectives as stated in the application. In particular, the project consortium achieved to establish an international framework in social work specialisation by means of complying with Bologna standards, developing online modules and learning materials on community work and development, continuing training programmes in ICT, media skills and competences and piloting a Virtual Campus module with 55 students. All project results were developed and delivered in compliance with allocated tasks, partners and expected outcomes in the work packages. In addition to print-outs, the products are available on the project website, which imparts a professional application-, concept- and layout design.</p>	9

	Score /10
<p><b>2. Coherence between workplan and activities carried out to date</b>                      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?</p> <p>There are some minor variations from the initial plans, which mainly occurred due to amendments in the resource and meeting plans that affected the yearly budget planning stages. Other variations came from a slightly delay in signing the consortium framework agreement; the finalisation of the curriculum plan was behind schedule due to serious illness of the work package leader; the working plan and project budget were postponed due to delayed incoming grant agreements. Altogether, the consortium managed to tackle unforeseen circumstances in a straight-forward and solution-based manner.</p>	8

<b>3. Partnership</b>	<b>Score /10</b>
Are there clear indications of a real and effective involvement of partners and their concrete contribution to the project results? Are there significant changes in the partnership when compared with the application? If so, are such changes justified?	8
The work package design already proposed a well-balanced distribution of tasks among the project partners. Thereby the work package leaders played a significant role in identifying and gathering supplementary expertise, competencies and resources from the project partners. The list of deliverables and assigned tasks and partners involved suggests a coherent and sound engagement of all actors involved, which is aptly reflected in the solid project outcomes.	

<b>4. Management</b>	<b>Score /10</b>
How was the project managed? To what extent did the consortium use any mechanisms for effective monitoring to ensure that all project objectives will be reached within the project lifetime? Were the decision making and problem solving adequate? Have any variation from original plans been satisfactorily justified?	8
The well designed management structure and organisation laid the foundation for successful project completion. In detail, the management structure splits into partner meetings, a virtual campus steering committee, a project leader, a project administration group, and the work package leaders. An important role played the management tools, which are the grant agreement, the consortium agreement, the LLP project handbook and the virtual conference room. Another important managerial component accrues to arrangements of information and communication media and channels that were effectively deployed for organisational, collaborative, communicative and disseminative purposes. Means and methods of internal quality assurance and monitoring included three surveys, interviews and a quality guide which covered guidelines for evaluations of the meetings and the student evaluations.	

<b>5. Financial management</b>	<b>Score /10</b>
Are the expenditures appropriate and in line with the project's activities and results as described in the Final Report?	8
The actual project costs are a bit lower than the agreed budget. Staff costs are correctly calculated in line with the international regulations on cost ceilings. Most of the money was spent in staff category 2, which can be interpreted as a clear indicator on project priorities. Travel costs do partly exceed Apex tariffs, what is owed to higher flight fares on remote flight destinations. The costs for the external evaluator are reasonable and other cost items are justifiably spent.	

	Score /10
<p><b>6. Evaluation and/or quality assurance</b>            How well was the project's strategy for evaluation implemented? To what extent has the project considered the comments or recommendations addressed following the Progress Report assessment?</p>	8
<p>The project consortium implemented several evaluation tools, mechanism and criteria that accompanied the project from the start to the end. Detailed plans were developed for tasks verification, time management, milestones, deliverables, budget and progress monitoring. An important tool for sustainability and quality assurance measures in virtual campuses became the Quality Guide, which is informed and inspired by the Free Technology Academy. In addition, a student survey was undertaken three times during the pilot course and teachers were also interviewed about their experiences during the pilot phase. The course teachers blog brought another dimension of discussion, information and knowledge exchange into the project. An external evaluator from Lund University followed the process from the start of the new curriculum to the piloting phase, which eventually led to the compiled evaluation report "Over the borders - Building and launching the Virtual Campus SW-VirCamp."</p>	

	Score /10
<p><b>7. Dissemination</b>            How effectively did the project carry out its plan for dissemination? What is the quality of the dissemination activities? To what extent has the consortium addressed the issue of the exploitation of the project results during and beyond the project lifetime?</p>	9
<p>The consortium members actively contributed to various conferences by means of papers, posters, workshops and presentations. Several papers found its way into subject-specific journals, e-learning initiatives and open universities. In addition a text book called "Participation in Community Work. International Perspectives" has been produced as part of the cooperation with an associated partner from South Africa. The video clips as part of the Virtual Book are conceived as learning resources for the e-learning course in community work from an international perspective. The short introductory lectures presented by professors from different higher educational institutions in Europe and South Africa are inspiring triggers for discussions and reflections to broaden the issue. Concerning further exploitation of results, the main benefits were identified in the following areas: a) gaining of knowledge about community work; b) improvement of English language skills; c) self-directed and autonomous learning enhanced by online course material and resources; d) intercultural knowledge; e) information and knowledge exchange in a larger community.</p>	

## Supplementary information to be submitted

Supplementary information required from the project to allow for a complete Final Report analysis:

## Overall evaluation

<b>Overall comment:</b> The project has established an international platform of people who share the passion, competences, skills and expertise to work together in the applied and academic field of social work. Given the high number of project partners and their diverse cultural and academic backgrounds, the project coordinator achieved to establish a well-functioning project management deploying a variety of meaningful and useful tools and mechanism that assured consistency in the workflow, transparent and traceable communication and effective implementation of envisaged outcomes. The online platform consists of state-of-the-art features that are compliant with web 2.0 standards. Moreover, it is the convincing relationship of form and content the whole project presentation, both on- and offline, imparts as a comprehensive and motivational approach among the consortium members, giving leeway to a future-oriented and harmonised curriculum.	
<b>Strong points:</b> Quality assurance, management and dissemination activities as well as the online platform utilising web 2.0 features constitute the strongest part in this project.	
<b>Weak points:</b>          	
<b>Is the public part, in your opinion, ready for publication on the Executive Agency's website? Please comment on aspects such as language and quality of content of the report</b>	YES

Summary scoring sheet for Final Report	
Criterion	Score
1 Objectives, results and products	9
2 Coherence between work plan and activities carried out during life of the project	8
3 Partnership	8
4 Project Management	8
5 Financial Management	8
6 Evaluation	8
7 Dissemination	9

<b>Your global score is:</b>	<b>8 /10</b>	<b>80%</b>
------------------------------	--------------	------------

#### 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 or 2	Very weak	Addresses the criterion but with significant and/or many weaknesses
3 or 4	Weak	Addresses the criterion but with weaknesses
5 or 6	Acceptable	Addresses the criterion sufficiently
7 or 8	Good	Addresses the criterion with some aspects of high quality
9 or 10	Very good	Addresses the criterion with all aspects of high quality