



“A European network on cervical cancer surveillance and control in the new Member States - AURORA”



WP 3 Evaluation of the Project

Evaluation of the first 18 months

December 2010 – May 2012



www.aurora-project.eu
aurora.project@ondaosservatorio.it

Evaluation report of the activities in project AURORA for first 18 months

December 1, 2010 – May 31, 2012

1. Introduction

A process of continuous and final evaluation was developed. The continuous consists of a follow-up every six months, with record-filing systems to analyse the execution of the project comparing the plan to the practice.

This operative report is issued using this information including critical issues and suggestions aimed at project optimisation.

External evaluation of AURORA project is done by an advisory board composed of experts from different respected institutions like IARC, EUROPADONNA and European Partnership for Action Against Cancer Joint action.

AURORA monitoring and evaluation particularly focuses on aspects which are critical to expanding the consortium and for the outputs of the WPs. With regard to the core work packages, the main question is: "have the specific WPs delivered their products and achieved their objectives?"

Therefore, the mandate of the evaluation package can be summarized as follows:

1. Active participation of associated countries in the project activities.
2. Respect of scheduled milestones and deliverables according to the project WPs.

The evaluation of AURORA is performed using different types of questionnaires and interviews.

2. Evaluation of meetings

During the first six months there was the kick-off meeting in Luxembourg on 14th January 2011. As this was a kick-off meeting, no specific evaluation was performed.

During the second six months there was a meeting in Timisoara (15-16 September 2011).

The meeting was evaluated by participants and external experts through questionnaires WP3–A, respectively WP3–C.

All participants saw the meeting's goals as clearly stated and understood and the topics in the agenda as appropriate at the current stage of AURORA. The time allowed for the meeting was balanced with the number of topics planned (85%). The discussion was open enough (86%). Most of participants agreed („agree“ and „totally agree“) they knew what other members are working on and how that was related to the collective success (86%). The participants ended discussions with clear and specific resolutions and calls for action (86%).

However, there were some participants who felt there was not enough time to listen to all opinions – admitting that that could have been expected given the large number of partners.

Participants felt more time for questions would be beneficial and some of them had some uncertainty about the details of actions and doubts about their own abilities.

The external experts were very helpful and active in suggestions aimed at project optimization. Their suggestions were gathered through predefined questionnaires and through personal interviews. Then they were discussed and implemented.

At the end of the third six months there was a meeting in Riga (31 May -01 June 2012).

The meeting was evaluated by participants and external experts through questionnaires WP3–A, respectively WP3–C.

All participants saw the meeting's goals as clearly stated and understood and the topics in the agenda as appropriate at the current stage of AURORA (93%). The time allowed for the meeting was balanced with the number of topics planned (100%). The discussion was open enough (93%). Most of participants agreed („agree“ and „totally agree“) they knew what other members are working on and how that was related to the collective success (93%). The participants ended discussions with clear and specific resolutions and calls for action (93%).

However, there was one participant who felt there was too much time dedicated to discussion.

There was one external expert present at the meeting, who was again helpful and active in suggestions aimed at project optimization. His suggestions were gathered through predefined questionnaire and through personal interview.

3. Evaluation of deliverables according to project work packages

According to the plan of the project the following activities were realized during the first 18 months of the project AURORA:

WP1 – Project Coordination

In February 2011, implementation plan was elaborated and Work Program prepared.

In March 2011, first payment to each partner, representing 30% of their grant's budget, was sent.

Through Skype, there was realized a call conference of the AURORA Steering Committee for the first time in March 2011(on March 14 and March 16, 2011), on questions and problems regarding the Local context analysis.

The meeting was evaluated by participants through questionnaire WP3–A.

All participants saw the meeting's goals as clearly stated and understood and most of them saw the topics in the agenda as appropriate at the current stage of AURORA (86%). The time allowed for the meeting was balanced with the number of topics planned (86%). The discussion was open enough (100%). Most of participants agreed („agree“ and „totally agree“) they knew what other members are working on and how that was related to the collective success (72%). The participants ended discussions with clear and specific resolutions and calls for action (100%).

However, some participants lacked an agenda prior to the meeting in order to be better prepared. There were some who felt some topics were too early on the agenda. More time for discussion was demanded.

In July 2011 creation of Advisory Board.

Through Skype, there was realized a call conference of the AURORA Steering Committee in July 2011 (on July 14 and July 19, 2011) on questions and problems regarding the Local context analysis (WP4).

After Skype conference the participants were sent the questionnaire WP3–A.

Most of the participants saw the meeting's goals as clearly stated and understood (77%) and most of them saw the topics in the agenda as appropriate at the current stage of AURORA (92%). The time allowed for the meeting was balanced with the number of topics planned (77%). The discussion was open enough (92%). Most of participants agreed („agree“ and „totally agree“) they knew what other members are working on and how that was related to the collective success (77%). The participants ended discussions with clear and specific resolutions and calls for action (100%).

However, some participants lacked a written agenda prior to the meeting in order to be better prepared. There were some who felt the scope of this teleconference was too broad and the meeting was too long.

Through Skype, there was realized a call conference of the AURORA Steering Committee in November 25, 2011.

After the Skype conference the participants were sent the questionnaire WP3–A.

All participants saw the meeting's goals as clearly stated and understood (100%) and also all saw the topics in the agenda as appropriate at the current stage of AURORA (100%). The time allowed for the meeting was balanced with the number of topics planned (100%). The discussion was open enough (93%). Most of participants agreed („agree“ and „totally agree“) they knew what other members are working on and how that was related to the collective success (93%). The participants ended discussions with clear and specific resolutions and calls for action (100%).

However, some technical problems with Internet connection were experienced by some participants during the teleconference. Otherwise the participants expressed satisfaction with the overall quality of the meeting, explicitly mentioning improvement after the previous meeting.

Through Skype, there was realized a call conference of the AURORA Steering Committee on March 19, 2012.

After the Skype conference the participants were sent the questionnaire WP3–A.

All participants saw the meeting's goals as clearly stated and understood (100%) and also all saw the topics in the agenda as appropriate at the current stage of AURORA (100%). The time allowed for the meeting was

balanced with the number of topics planned (92%). The discussion was open enough (91%). Most of participants agreed („agree“ and „totally agree“) they knew what other members are working on and how that was related to the collective success (91%). The participants ended discussions with clear and specific resolutions and calls for action (100%).

However, more time for discussion and questions was demanded by some participants, as well as more specific agenda for the meetings.

WP2 – Dissemination of the project results

In March 2011, the Dissemination Plan was elaborated.

In April 2011, the flyer and poster of the project were prepared.

In May 2011, the web site of the project was launched (<http://www.aurora-project.eu/>). All partners during following months participated in translations of materials from English language into national languages – information on partner organizations, on cervical cancer, possibilities of prevention and vaccination. They translated the Cervical Cancer Quiz, which is available at the project`s web site.

In May 2011 the AURORA`s Stakeholder analysis started. This is to enlarge the project consortium and to disseminate the project information and material.

On the 9th July the material was finished and distributed to all partners. Project website prepared and a poster with information about the project.

Description of the dissemination activities and creation of a common methodology to report them (2 tables to keep updated).

Facebook website was created. 7463 fans registered.

WP3 – Evaluation of the project

This work package should assess the level of collaboration among partner organisations and check whether the other work packages delivered their products and achieved their objectives. This is mainly done through questionnaires and interviews. Analysis is made and reported every six months.

In February 2011, the plan of evaluation was elaborated and forms prepared (see further - questionnaire WP 3 – A, WP 3 – B, WP 3 – C).

Most of the partners do not have problems with respecting the deadlines fixed by the Project Coordinator (93%). Most of the partners think that project goals and tasks are well defined (93%). Most of the partners feel they receive appropriate support by the Project Coordinator (93%). Half of the partners actively comments the proceeding of project and gives proposals or suggestions about project implementation.

During the first project meeting in Timisoara, the participants and members of the Advisory Board were asked to fill in the evaluation forms for the first six months of the project (WP3-B questionnaire).

We may conclude that the partners respect deadlines fixed by the Project Coordinator – only in one case it was delayed due to missing information from the respective Ministry of Health and in the second case the

volume of translations needed was felt too much for some partner's actual capacity. The project goals and tasks were felt well defined, even though some problems were reported regarding the e-learning course. Regarding the support from Project Coordinator, it is considered appropriate, even though some more clarifications on administrative issues were asked. For the project implementation, there were many suggestions. It was felt that a more close collaboration with the external experts would be beneficial for all the partners. The target group was asked to be reconsidered to focus on general population instead the hard to reach. Some more explanation on administrative issues was suggested. The partners were content with the project implementation.

During the meeting in Timisoara the proceeding of the project was assessed by external experts - representatives from IARC (not present at the meeting), NIPH (Dr. Sandra Rados Krnel) and EuropaDonna (Karen Benn) - European Breast Cancer Coalition.

Questionnaires and personal interview was used. Suggestions were implemented.

During November 2011 partners were sent a questionnaire for evaluation of the second six months of the project.

We may conclude that the partners respect deadlines fixed by the Project Coordinator – only in one case it was delayed due to other commitments. The project goals and tasks were felt well defined. Regarding the support from Project Coordinator, it is considered appropriate. For the better project implementation, there were many suggestions. They were discussed and some implemented.

During the meeting in Riga (May 31 – June 06, 2012) an interview was done with external expert, Dr. Naldoni.

Dr. Naldoni saw that the project goals were respected and fulfilled. The presentations of the meeting were done well according to him. Dr. Naldoni stressed importance of keeping a great attention to respecting the population-based screening as the most important goal of the project.

There were also performed 4 short interviews with selected partners during the Riga meeting, too.

The partners saw the goals of the project as being fulfilled. They judged the presentations of the meeting as clear and covering the needed topics. They also felt that the understanding of administration problems is clear enough and better than before. Shorter presentations and more discussion was demanded for next meetings, however. Otherwise they were satisfied with the meeting. They also considered the evaluation process appropriate.

All the partners were asked to fill in the evaluation questionnaire.

We may conclude that the partners respect deadlines fixed by the Project Coordinator – only in one case it was delayed due to local partners. The project goals and tasks were felt well defined. Regarding the support from Project Coordinator, it is considered appropriate. For the better project implementation, there were many suggestions. They were discussed and some implemented.

During the meeting in Riga (May 31-June 1, 2012) a SWOT analysis was done in collaboration with all present participants.

We conclude that all partners are motivated and content with working together. Their different expertise and experience is considered a strong point. However, they realize their time and work constraints and limited power within their home countries. They feel some lack of resources for specific goals. They see many opportunities in working on the project and await benefit for their countries and their institutions as well. They are aware of some threats, mainly related to their lack of experience with European projects, wide planned impact of the project and possible economic effects of the crisis in EU. Formulated threats should be monitored and periodically evaluated.

WP4 – Analysis of the local context

In February 2011, the guidelines for the analysis were prepared.

Partner organizations following the prepared protocol, started the analysis and preparation of a report in April 2011.

Material for analysis was processed by partners until May 31st, 2011.

In July 2011 Report's draft was prepared.

In September 2011 Report's presentation in Timisoara.

In November 2011 Specific report about the analysis was prepared but not yet finally released to the EC/EAHC, because the EAHC asked for some integration and revisions. Some clarifications were asked from the Project Officer – these came at the end of December 2011.

Specific report about the analysis of the local context released to EC/EAHC in March 2012.

WP5 – Identification of good practices

Methodology was reviewed in details. Partners filled out one questionnaire for each intervention. At least two questionnaires per country were expected. The deadline for completed questionnaires and related documents was the 30th November 2011.

Good practices were identified in November 2011. Then the Final report was prepared and published in January 2012.

The report is disseminated through the project web site and occasional dissemination by partners (articles, press conferences, etc.).

WP6 – Training course for healthcare professionals and advocacy leaders

This work package started during the Timisoara meeting in September 2011. Methodology, indexes validation and modules contents definition were reviewed in details.

In November 2011 the selection of participants started.

Training course speakers and participants were identified in May 2012.

WP7 – AURORA Pilot Action

In May 2011, the criteria for participating health centers were identified. This delayed the analysis and production of the Report on the analysis of the local context. This work package started during the Timisoara meeting in September 2011.

The network established March 2012.

WP8 – E-learning environment

In May 2011, the structure of the e-learning environment was defined.

E-learning environment was made on-line in November 2011.

The training packages were prepared in March 2012.

4. Conclusions and recommendations

1. There is an active participation of associated countries in the project activities. The partners are content with the project implementation.
2. Scheduled milestones and deliverables according to the project WPs are well respected.
3. Specific software for teleconferences could be considered (e.g. Elluminate or other like Koala or some Adobe solutions).
4. Developing working subgroups on specific tasks was suggested by partners.
5. Sending of reminder emails before deadlines was suggested by partners.
6. Minutes from the meetings should be delivered shortly after the meeting automatically. In case of some problems, a notice should be delivered automatically as well.
7. There should be shorter presentations and more discussion during the meetings.



Attachment – evaluation questionnaires

WP 3 – Evaluation tools (questionnaires): A

Evaluation of a meeting

This short questionnaire aims to assess how our meeting functioned and the project implementation. The results will be summarized in the final evaluation report that will be available to participants on the AURORA website.

Organisation:

Name:

Country:

Please answer the following questions by circling the score which best reflects your opinion from the lowest (1 if you totally disagree) to the highest (5 if you totally agree).

Section I: AGENDA

1 The meeting's goals were clearly stated and understood

Totally disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Totally agree

Comments:

2 The topics in the agenda were appropriate at the current stage of AURORA

www.aurora-project.eu
aurora.project@ondaosservatorio.it

Totally disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Totally agree

Comments:

3 The time allowed for the meeting was balanced with the number of topics planned

Totally disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Totally agree

Comments:

Section II: PROCESS

4 The discussion was open enough to consider different opinions and options

Totally disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Totally agree

Section III: PARTICIPANTS

5 The participants knew what among the other members were working on and how they will contribute to the collective success

Totally disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Totally agree

Comments:

6 The participants ended discussions with clear and specific resolutions and calls for action

Totally disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Totally agree

Comments:

WP 3 – Evaluation tools (questionnaires): B

Evaluation of a partners effort

This short questionnaire aims to assess how our meeting functioned and the project implementation. The results will be summarized in the final evaluation report that will be available to participants on the AURORA website.

Organisation:

Name:

Country:

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

1 Did you respect the deadlines fixed by the Project Coordinator?

Yes or No

If NO why?:

2 *Were the project goals and tasks well defined?*

Yes or No

If NO why?:

3 *Did you receive appropriate support by the Project Coordinator?*

Yes or No

If NO why?:

4 *What are your proposals or suggestions about the best project implementation?*

Please describe:

WP 3 – Evaluation tools (questionnaires): C

Feedback from independent experts

Organisation:

Name:

Country:



Please answer the following questions by circling the score which best reflects your opinion from the lowest (1 if you totally disagree) to the highest (5 if you totally agree).

1. How well does the AURORA consult with partners around key decisions?

Totally disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Totally agree

2. How well does the AURORA give support/guidance on project issues?

Totally disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Totally agree

3. How clear are AURORA communication around project issues?

Totally disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Totally agree

4. How responsive is the AURORA to feedback?

Totally disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Totally agree

5. How well has AURORA organized project meeting?

Totally disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Totally agree

6. How well do you think the members of the AURORA consortium share ideas?

Totally disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Totally agree

7. How well do you think the members of the AURORA consortium recognize and respect cultural differences?

Totally disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Totally agree

8. How well do you think the members of the AURORA consortium support each others` work?

www.aurora-project.eu
aurora.project@ondaosservatorio.it



Totally disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Totally agree

9. How well do you think the members of the AURORA consortium add value to each others` work?

Totally disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Totally agree

Do you have further suggestions for improvement?

.....