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evaluation of the study session

and the support received from the european youth centre

To be filled in by the organisers of the study session, with the support of the Council of Europe educational advisor

This form covers the following points:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Overall Evaluation of the session**  | **Evaluation of the support received from the Council of Europe / European Youth Centre** |
| * Relevance and needs assessment
* Aims and objectives
* Preparation
* Programme and educational approaches
* Information about participants
* Lecturers and guest speakers
* Evaluation
* Outcomes
* Visibility
* Impact and follow-up
 | * Educational support
* Administrative and financial support
 |

# Please be specific in your comments and respect the maximum length of text. This form should be completed and sent to the educational advisor of the European Youth Centre no later than one week after the end of the study session.

|  |
| --- |
| **General information** |
| Organisation/s: | Title of the study session:  |
| Dates: EYC:  | Evaluation form completed by *(person/s):* |
| Course director: | Educational Advisor: |
| Supervising EYC Educational Advisor (*if applicable*): | EYC secretarial assistant following the session: |

**I. Evaluation of the Study Session**

 **I. Evaluation by the team of the study session**

This part of the form is to be filled in by the course director jointly with the educational advisor of the study session, in cooperation with the team, based on the input from the team evaluation meeting. Please refer to the [***Quality standards in education and training activities of the Youth Department of the Council of Europe***](https://rm.coe.int/1680703013) when filling in this form.

1. **Relevance and needs assessment**
2. Was the initial needs assessment that led to the session adequate and shared with the preparatory team?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Not at alll | Partly | Satisfactory | Mostly | Fully |
| **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |

1. Please explain your rating (max 150 words)

1. How relevant do you consider the session has been to:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Not at alll | Partly | Satisfactory | Mostly | Fully |
| The organisation/s | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| The participants | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| The Council of Europe | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |

1. What could have been done differently? (max 200 words)
2. **Aim and objectives**

 To which extent were the objectives of the study session achieved (1- not at all; 5 - fully):

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Fill in the objectives of the study session, use one row per objective | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
|  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
|  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
|  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
|  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |

Please explain your rating (max 150 words).

1. **Preparation**
	1. Composition of the preparation team: name, age, gender, organisation, country of residence and their relation to the organisation/s holding the study session (max 250 words)

* 1. Was the preparation of the activity adequate and timely?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Not at alll | Partly | Satisfactory | Mostly | Fully |
| **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |

* 1. How do you assess now the team’s competence and motivation to prepare and facilitate the session?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Not at alll | Partly | Satisfactory | Mostly | Fully |
| **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |

Please explain your rating (max. 150 words)

* 1. Did you encounter any particular problems while preparing and running the activity? (max. 200 words)

1. **Programme and educational approaches**
	1. What were the main issues discussed? (max. 200 words)

* 1. How was the work of the Council of Europe incorporated in the study session? (max. 150 words)

* 1. What have been the main finding or conclusions of the session in relation to its themes? (max. 200 words)

* 1. To which extent were the criteria for study sessions applied and present in your study sessions?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Not at all | Partly | Satisfactory | Mostly | Fully |
| A relevant needs assessment | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Concrete, achievable and assessable objectives | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Definition of competences addressed and learning outcomes for the participants | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| The relevance to the Council of Europe programme and priorities of its Youth Department | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| An adequate and timely preparation process | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| A competent team of trainers and facilitators | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| An integrated approach to intercultural learning, participation and human rights education | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Adequate recruitment and selection of participants | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| A consistent practice of non-formal education principles and approaches | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Adequate, accessible and timely documentation | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| A thorough and open process of evaluation | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Optimal working conditions and environment | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Adequate institutional support and an integrated follow-up  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Relevant visibility and communication  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |
| Concern for innovation and research | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |

Please explain your rating (max 300 words):

1. **Evaluation**
	1. Was the evaluation process planned and open?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Not at alll | Partly | Satisfactory | Mostly | Fully |
| **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |

* 1. How was session evaluated by the participants and what were its main results? (max 200 words):

1. **Information about the participants**
2. What was the profile of participants attending the activity? (max. 100 words)

1. Was the information about the study session disseminated in an adequate way to reach the intended participants?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Not at alll | Partly | Satisfactory | Mostly | Fully |
| **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |

Please explain (max. 100 words):

1. Composition of the group (including the preparatory team)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| How many participants did you apply for?  |  |
| How many people applied for the study session? |  |
| How many participants were finally invited? |  |
| How many participants did actually attend? |  |
| What was the gender distribution of the participants: male/female/other |  |
| What was the average age of participants? |  |
| What was the average age of the preparatory team? |  |

1. Number of participants by country of residence

|  |
| --- |
| **Signatories of the European Cultural Convention** |
| Albania |  | Estonia  |  | Liechtenstein  |  | San Marino |  |
| Andorra |  | Finland  |  | Lithuania  |  | Serbia  |  |
| Armenia  |  | France  |  | Luxembourg  |  | Slovak Republic |  |
| Austria  |  | Georgia  |  | Malta |  | Slovenia  |  |
| Azerbaijan  |  | Germany  |  | Republic of Moldova  |  | Spain  |  |
| Belarus |  | Greece  |  | Monaco  |  | Sweden  |  |
| Belgium  |  | Holy See |  | Montenegro |  | Switzerland  |  |
| Bosnia and Herzegovina  |  | Hungary  |  | The Netherlands  |  | “The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia” |  |
| Bulgaria  |  | Iceland  |  | Norway  |  | Turkey  |  |
| Croatia  |  | Ireland  |  | Poland  |  | Ukraine  |  |
| Cyprus  |  | Italy  |  | Portugal  |  | United Kingdom  |  |
| Czech Republic |  | Kazakhstan  |  | Romania  |  |  |  |
| Denmark  |  | Latvia |  | Russian Federation  |  |  |  |
| **Other countries**:       |  |

1. Was the selection process of the participants adequate?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Not at alll | Partly | Satisfactory | Mostly | Fully |
| **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |

Comments (max. 100 words):

1. Were participants’ needs (language, accessibility, etc.) adequately met?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Not at alll | Partly | Satisfactory | Mostly | Fully |
| **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  | **[ ]**  |

Comments about non-met needs (max. 100 words):

1. **Lecturers and guest speakers**

 Please list the names, function and evaluation of the lecturers or guest speakers in the session (150 words):

1. **Outcomes**
2. What were the most important outcomes or results of the study session? (max 250 words)

1. Were there any resolutions or recommendations, educational materials or tools produced as a result of the study session? (max 150 words)

1. How did your study session contribute to the work priorities of the Council of Europe’s Youth Department (maximum 150 words)

1. Please list the main learning points for participants (maximum 150 words)

1. **Visibility**

What measures were taken for the visibility of the study session (please include any relevant links)?

1. **Expected impact and follow-up:**
2. What follow-up is planned or envisaged by the organisers of the study session? (max. 150 words)

1. What is the role of the participants in the follow-up to the study session and what support is foreseen from the organisers? (max. 150 words)

1. Are there any plans to produce some materials or publication on the basis of this activity? (max. 150 words)

1. How has the activity contributed to the long and short term objectives or the organisation/s (max. 150 words)?

1. Is there any expected or recommended follow-up of the activity within or by the Council of Europe? (max. 150 words)

**9. Any other comments or recommendations you wish to make** **concerning any aspect of the study session** (max. 200 words)

     **II. The support received from the European Youth Centre**

This part of the form is to be filled in by the Course Director in cooperation with the team, based on the discussions during the evaluation meeting.

**Educational support**

1. Your evaluation of the educational support you received from the Educational Advisor:
	1. In the preparation of the study session

[ ]  Inadequate [ ]  Below expectations [ ]  According to expectations [ ]  Above expectations [ ]  Excellent

Comments (optional; max 100 words)

* 1. In the running of the study session (max 150 words)

[ ]  Inadequate [ ]  Below expectations [ ]  According to expectations [ ]  Above expectations [ ]  Excellent

Comments (optional; max 100 words)

* 1. In the evaluation of the study session (max 150 words)

[ ]  Inadequate [ ]  Below expectations [ ]  According to expectations [ ]  Above expectations [ ]  Excellent

Comments (optional; max 100 words)

1. Did the work done and the role taken by the advisor correspond to your needs? If not, what else would you have needed? (max 150 words)

3. For which of the following aspects did you receive support from the Educational Advisor?

[ ]  The organisation of the preparatory process with the team

[ ]  Proposing and organising the invitation of a lecturer or expert

[ ]  Proposing and organising a visit to (a) local project(s)

[ ]  Providing input (lecture, workshop, etc.)

[ ]  Developing methodologies and delivering programme elements

[ ]  Proposing links between the study session and the work of the Council of Europe

[ ]  Administration of the session, such as reimbursements and meeting deadlines

[ ]  Helping to deal with conflicts or unexpected situations

[ ]  Support with the evaluation process of study session

[ ]  Other *(please specify)*

1. Which of the following words describes the performance and attitude of the Educational Advisor (tick as many as appropriate):

[ ]  encouraging [ ]  inspiring [ ]  intrusive [ ]  interfering

[ ]  inclusive [ ]  patronising [ ]  supportive [ ]  constructive

 [ ]  helpful [ ]  resourceful [ ]  confusing [ ]  approachable

 [ ]  blocking [ ]  disappointing [ ]  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ [ ]  ­­­­­­­\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Comments on your choices: (max 150 words):

# II. Administrative and financial support

1. How do you evaluate the administrative support by the EYC (tick where appropriate):

 Poor Good Very good

- information about the conditions of the study session [ ]  [ ]  [ ]

- assistance in obtaining visas for participants [ ]  [ ]  [ ]

- documentation and reference materials [ ]  [ ]  [ ]

- creating an inclusive and accessible environment [ ]  [ ]  [ ]

- travel reimbursement [ ]  [ ]  [ ]

- coverage of preparatory expenses [ ]  [ ]  [ ]

2. Your evaluation of the provision of technical and logistics support by the EYC:

 Poor Good Very good

- working facilities [ ]  [ ]  [ ]

- accommodation [ ]  [ ]  [ ]

- catering [ ]  [ ]  [ ]

- interpretation (if applicable) [ ]  [ ]  [ ]

- reception and security [ ]  [ ]  [ ]

- dinner in town (if applicable) [ ]  [ ]  [ ]

Comments and suggestions regarding to the administrative, financial, technical and logistical support