

Evaluation CROSSTALK

The idea is to use participatory strategies as well as external evaluation.

1. Checklists

for use by partners as an aid at different stages of the project, no need to be returned to evaluation team: i.e.

- during the first meetings of the 3 workgroup in year I by the partners involved
- after the 3 pilot courses were delivered in year I by partners who deliver the pilot courses
- during the first conference of partners in year I by all partners
- after the delivery of the adapted courses in year II by partners who deliver the courses
- during the second conference of partners in year II by all partners

2. Brief reports

(every 6 weeks) by every partner

The report after the pilot activity / course will be especially important and should reach the evaluation team by end June, so as to feed into the first project partner meeting in Vienna.

3. participatory observation

Year I

3 meetings of workgroups to design pilot courses

3 pilot courses (Peter Lewis in Sunderland, Traudel Günnel in Freudenstadt and Freiburg)

Year II

Courses in various countries. Division of work between Peter and Traudel, details to be decided)

4. Questionnaires

1. Trainers – at end of activity/course (QT).
2. Participants of courses - at beginning (QP 1) and end (QP2) of activity / course, self-completed by those who can, or administered by the evaluators (or trainers if they have time) to children and the migrants whose English makes self-completion difficult.

(**Diaries:** Additionally participants could be asked to write an individual diary when attending the training)

5. Group discussions / semi structured interviews

5.1 with some participants of courses:

a) at the beginning

-possible input:

- motivation to take part?
- expectation? (skills to learn, (intergenerational) contact, individual increase

of

competence, long term effects, fun, ...)

b) at the end of the activity

- Possible input:

- highlights
- challenging aspects
- individual increase of competence
- suggestions for improvement
- expected long term effects

5.2 with partners (during conference I and II)

- Possible input:

- Highlights of the project
- challenging aspects
- output (courses , teaching and learning materials – how useful, sustainability?
- suggestions for improvement

6. content analysis of “stories” of participants (Beatrice Barbalato)

Selected number of stories to be analysed. Along a method and classification system appropriate for dealing with private autobiographical work (life histories)"

7. Summary of instruments

instrument	trainers	participants	evaluation team
checklist	x		x
6-weekly reports	x		
observation: planning meeting			x
observation: activity			x
questionnaire start		x	
questionnaire end	x	x	
report after activity/course	x		
interviews			x
interim report			x
Final report			x