



LLP FINAL REPORT ASSESSMENT SHEET

Project number: 142471-LLP-1-2008- COMENIUS- CMP

Project title: Kick Racism Out of Sport, Schools and Society – KROSSS

1 .Objectives, results and products

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

The project KROSSS succeeded to produce, test and disseminate during the two years very good results, in accordance with the original objectives and relevant for wide range of audiences and usergroups. The Final Report brings clear information about the activities, achievements and evidence of their impact. The application of the pedagogical model and the implementation or evaluation of the educational outcomes is supported by evidence of results: such as the training course, the Handbook with Course Materials, the Colourful Football Manual, the summer sports tournament and the informative and easy to use website. Very good results are also the 3 films produced on DVD and on Youtube as support for teachers that show the concrete participation of pupils, teachers and volunteers and communities to the events. An outstanding outcome is the more than 100 pages Research Report with review of literature and practice of anti-racism research, policy and practice in Europe with a focus on the challenges in education and sport. The research, activities and outcomes developed, the awareness raising and the good practices to fight racism and xenophobia in schools and sport, the model of integration that considers integration as a lifelong learning process, all these bring very good contribution to the Comenius Programme and to the LLP.

Score 10 / 10

2. Coherence between workplan and activities carried out to date

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?

The report demonstrates clearly the activities that took place during the duration of the project, presents transparently the variations and the impact on the work-plan. As the project was approved to start in December instead of October, the first 2 meetings and the first course were rescheduled and covered with appropriate solutions. The course reschedule in September due to the Icelandic volcano disruption resulted in a positive change as more persons took part. The final Euro – conference planned in Norway, due to the small number of registrations, was transformed in a mini-conference that brought together in the activities project to increase the sustainability at grass-root level.

Score 8 / 10

3. Partnership

Are there clear indications of a real and effective partnership? Are there significant changes in the partnership when compared with the application? If so, are such changes justified?

The activities and the results were delivered by a motivated, representative and effective partnership that demonstrated a very good collaboration during the entire duration of the project. They identified together a good work – model and pedagogical approach to be used during the project. The minutes of the meetings bring lively information of the exchanges between the partners and their reciprocal commitment to provide the partnership with the educational resources they use successfully.

The national and transnational work the partners, their active participation and also the contribution to the development of outcomes is highlighted in the tasks allocated and performed. Each partner led one or several Work –Packages. The effectiveness of the partnership is also supported further by evidence of their research and dissemination activities.

Score 10 / 10

4. Management

How was the project managed? Have any variation from original plans been adequately justified?

The project management was a key strength of the project. It was based on very good work-model presented in the beginning of the project by the coordinator and was approved and used by the partners. It included monitoring and feedback procedures to ensure work-progress, correct the few variations and deliver the outcomes within the deadlines. The implementation of activities under the different WPs was led by the partners in accordance with their competences. The clear information provided in the minutes of the final report and the evaluation reports highlight an efficient shared management that contributed to the project's achievements and development of final results with a high relevance.

Score 10 / 10

5. Financial management

Are the expenditures appropriate and in line with the project's activities as described in the Final Report?

The financial management was also based on clear procedures and financial planning and reporting by the partners, good management of impact on travel costs due to the Icelandic volcano, as it can be seen in the minutes and explanation in the FR p.5 Variations. The decision to reduce the duration of the meeting to 3 days instead of 4, allowed costs reallocation and ensured a larger participation of teachers than originally foreseen.

Overall, expenditures seem in very good relation to the activities undertaken by the partnership. The financial reporting is detailed for each type of expenditure incurred during the duration of the project.

Score 9/ 10

6 .Evaluation and/or quality assurance

How well was the project's strategy for evaluation implemented? Were there significant changes compared to the original application?

The strategy of the project included a Quality Assurance WP to guarantee the relevance of the educational outcomes in each country and an Evaluation WP to monitor the work-processes. Based on a relevant model for on-going evaluation, the activities included procedures and tools such as the three-tier evaluation framework and resulted in various outputs: such as course evaluation, project monitoring and meetings' evaluations. All partners contributed to the evaluation activities and collaborated on timely basis with the external evaluator and monthly with the coordinator. The very good external evaluation reports, with relevant information and feedback on educational content and work-processes,

are the results of the on- going communication and observation of the project by the external evaluator. **Score 10 / 10**

7 .Dissemination

How effectively did the project carry out its plan for dissemination? What is the quality of the dissemination activities?

The dissemination of the activities, the results and especially the exploitation activities were well implemented to different levels and audiences, from schools and local communities, to policy makers and public bodies. Evidence is presented in the FR and the 36 pages of the dissemination report about the activities and the impact on local, national, regional levels, through many channels of communication, from seminars to networking. The only activity that was changed was the Euro-conference planned that received too few registrations and was organized as mini-conference. The website developed ensures a good visibility of the project's results as well as the participant organizations' websites. Among the indicators for short-term impact are 20 schools, 1500 children, 100 teachers, 100 parents and volunteers, etc. The exploitation strategy of results includes future collaboration between UK and DK partners to organize soccer tournaments and developing a training course for education managers.

Score 9 / 10

Supplementary information to be submitted

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

Overall evaluation

Overall comment:

The project achieved a very good coherence between its objectives and the results, with concrete and high quality resources and activities to fight racism and xenophobia in schools and society. The results bring a very good contribution to the Comenius Programme, LLP and the Call priorities as planned in the approved application. The final report presents transparently information about the activities, the achievements and the contribution of partners.

The products were delivered by a highly motivated, representative and effective partnership, key factor of the accomplishments together with shared responsibilities for project management.

The QA and evaluation activities were based on a relevant evaluation model; the internal and external activities took place during the whole duration of the project.

Evidence is presented through the very good dissemination activities organized, their impact and the audiences reached. The exploitation of results is planned and mentioned, with some concrete actions.

Strong points:

Relevant and innovative results, partnership, shared project management, on-going evaluation, dissemination.

Weak points:

**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.)**

Yes.

Very good and interesting presentation of project’s aims, achievements and future plans.

Summary scoring sheet for Final Report

| Criterion | Score |
|---|-----------------|
| 1. Objectives, results and products | 10 |
| 2. Coherence between work plan and activities carried out during life of the project. | 8 |
| 3. Partnership | 10 |
| 4. Project Management | 10 |
| 5. Financial Management | 9 |
| 6. Evaluation | 10 |
| 7. Dissemination | 9 |
| Your global score is: | 9/10 90% |

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 |