



# COMAPP Final Evaluation Report and Appendix

November 2013

**COMAPP:** Community Media Application and Participation. Training for trainers that implements intergenerational and intercultural communication in different settings of adult education by using mobile learning and community radio based on low budget technology  
[www.comapp-online.de](http://www.comapp-online.de)

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission (Lifelong Learning Programme). This publication on the project reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.  
PROJECT NUMBER: 517958-LLP-1-2011-1-DE-GRUNDTVIG-GMP  
AGREEMENT NUMBER: 2011 – 3978 / 001 - 001

## **COMAPP Final evaluation report**

### **Table of Content:**

1. Introduction	2
- short description of the overall project and its main activities	2
- about this report	2
- short overview over the project's evaluation strategy	3
2. COMAPP courses	3
3. teaching and learning materials, tools	5
4. dissemination and exploitation: target groups that were reached	7
5. the partnership: cooperation and collaboration	8
6. sustainability	9
7. evaluation strategy	9
8. conclusions	11
9. references	13

### **Appendices**

Appendix 1: Evaluation plans and tools, COMAPP work plan

Appendix 2: Evaluation reports of activities in Year 2 of the project:

- train the trainers' course in Sunderland (UK)
- train the trainers' course in Freiburg (DE)
- train the trainers' course in Algodonales (SP)
- international conference in Budapest (HU)

Appendix 3: Progress evaluation report (covering year 1 of the project)

## 1. Introduction

### Short description of the overall project and its main activities

COMAPP (communication maps and apps) provides a five day ‘train the trainers’ course for adult educators, trainers, social workers etc., as well as teaching and learning materials and tools. The COMAPP course was developed, and delivered and evaluated several times during the project’s lifetime. The course explores and provides training in uses of mobile phone technology (apps for audio recording, photos, music, geo-caching and web interactivity) to create multimedia guides; it is adaptable for use both in adult education and in non-formal civil society. The approach, learner-centred and action-oriented, is innovative and economical –since the adult educators / trainers themselves promote these new competencies which they have learnt in the shared tasks of media production, using an intergenerational and intercultural approach.

The 5 day course’s main emphasis is realized in three course units covering interviewing, recording and editing; digital mapping, website construction and geo-caching ; and teaching and learning methods which promote dialogue and participation between generations and cultures using an action-oriented approach.

In the first year of the project the three units were developed, tested and evaluated in seven pilot courses in six countries. In the second year these units were integrated into the five-day ‘train the trainers’ course delivered at national level in the UK and in Germany and as an international course in Spain.

The website [www.comapp-online.de](http://www.comapp-online.de) carries free for download outcomes in six languages (DE, EN, ES, FI, PL, HU) which include the courses, handbooks, three readers, teaching and learning materials, evaluation tools, the OpenStreetMap (OSM) generator, a tool developed by COMAPP to assist production of multimedia internet maps and multimedia internet maps. Dissemination activities included posters, postcards, articles, contribution to seminars and conferences and the three international meetings within the project. The educational and academic networks of partners have been used to disseminate and exploit the outcomes and integrate some elements of the course into university curricula in Germany, the UK and Poland.

The project was continuously monitored and evaluated with the aid of an action research strategy by an evaluation team (partners of the consortium) in cooperation with an external evaluator from London Metropolitan University.

### About this report:

This report describes the most important findings of the project’s evaluation under the following headings

- the COMAPP courses developed and delivered
- teaching and learning materials, tools
- dissemination and exploitation: target groups that were reached
- the partnership: cooperation and collaboration
- the evaluation strategy

and ends with final conclusions.

An appendix includes: the evaluation plan and tools, the evaluation reports of activities in year 2 of the project, i.e. evaluation reports of the courses in Sunderland, in Freiburg, and in Algodonales as well as of the project partnership meeting and conference in Budapest. It also carries the Progress evaluation report (covering year 1 of the project).

### **Short overview over the project's evaluation strategy**

The evaluation of the project was based on action research methodology which involved frequent exchange between the evaluation team and those in the field – the teams developing modules and running courses. These teams also function as researchers (self-monitoring and self-assessment) during different phases of the project. The trainees/participants of the pilot courses evaluate the courses they took part in. The action research team prepared an evaluation plan and suitable instruments to be used in the different actions for assessment and evaluation purposes (questionnaires, interviews, observation. reports). Researchers were invited via existing academic networks to take part in the evaluation of the project and its outcomes. The evaluation encompassed the products of the course, materials, management / collaboration, meetings, instruments, external experts, website changes. For details see chapter 6 of this report.

## **2. COMAPP courses: development and delivery**

The overall work plan for the COMAPP project scheduled different phases and milestones to make sure that the outcomes to be developed match different backgrounds and needs of adult educators in different European countries. All partners were involved and played an active role from the beginning.

### **Year1**

The first six months of the project were occupied with consultation with adult education institutions of the different partner's countries and with the development of the training course and appropriate teaching and learning materials. This was carried out in three work groups, respectively responsible for

- communication, interviewing, audio editing, production of mp3 guided audio tour
- multimedia and the public sphere. Creation of web-based tour
- holistic intergenerational and intercultural teaching and learning and evaluation techniques

To ensure mutual exchange several partners participated in more than one workgroup. There was continuous contact among the workgroups and the coordinator. After the sharing of experience in the Lodz conference (May 2012), there followed a careful examination of the test schedules of the three courses as well as the teaching and training materials with a view to creating the in Year 2 planned five day training course, taking into account the outcomes of the Year 1 experience. Workgroup 1 ran pilot courses in Lodz (October 2012) and Turku (October 2012); Workgroup 2 in Freiburg (February and July 2012) and Sunderland (May 2012); Workgroup 3 in Budapest (September 2012) and Algodonales (March 2012). Far from being “a rather loose collection of activities lacking a clear framework and guiding methodology” (External Expert's Progress Report Assessment), this was a

systematic development of the components intended to be combined in the final courses to be held in Freiburg and Sunderland. As previously reported (see appendix: Progress evaluation report), course participants in the pilot stage found the activities relevant to their training work and took pleasure in learning new skills. The findings of evaluation of the pilot courses were shared among all partners and, in particular, critical feedback was communicated to the teams planning the complete course which was to incorporate the separate pilot curricula. An example was the suggestion made at the Sunderland pilot of May 2012 of an improvement to the OSM generator to make it more user-friendly which was successfully adopted by its inventors in Freiburg a few months later.

In the **Freiburg** test course of July 2012, as summarised in the Progress Evaluation Report (see appendix), the feedback testified to a very positive experience: “The course allowed [participants] to experience in theory and practice how technically easy it can be to produce an interactive map for the internet. The discussion and exchange of ideas during the course about how to use Smart phones, the production of interactive maps and geo caching in educational contexts was very much valued by the participants” (Evaluation Report, Freiburg, 23 July 2012). An improvement in the COMAPP generator simplified pin-setting in the interactive maps and saved time; on the other hand, the trainers noted that more time should have been allowed for understanding the ‘dual role’ approach trainers needed to be aware of.

## **Year2**

The **Sunderland** course (February 2013) was the first pilot of the final five-day train the trainers’ course which broadly followed that of the May 2012 pilot with alterations resulting from that experience, from those of the other pilots and from the discussions between COMAPP partners that followed. Course participants included students on an adult education digital inclusion project, trainers and volunteers in community radio, music producers active in local music production and promotion and a student on the University’s MA in Radio course. Feedback showed that positive elements of the course included the sound walk and creating content during the walk, finding out about local history, understanding and implementing the technical steps to create a map and seeing how individual contributions came together in a group. Observation by the external evaluator noted that a good rapport existed between trainers and participants; trainers showed a readiness to attend to individual problems and at the same time to foster a group spirit. A feedback session during Day 4 illustrated the participants’ satisfaction and some excellent ideas presented in Day 5’s course design session were proof that the course had led to a good understanding of the application of what was learned in a community context.

Critical feedback expressed the wish for more time at certain points, e.g. for exploring to find content and for finding people to interview, but overall, “there is no doubt ....that a highly promising tool has been developed which, drawing on earlier Freiburg experience, brings together local history and natural history, and the memories of local individuals, communities and institutions with contemporary cultural creativity and consumption to provide the content usable with smartphone, app and mapping technology” (Evaluation Report, Sunderland, 23 March 2013, see appendix).

The question of how much time should be devoted to ICT - the technical aspects of App creation, Open source mapping, geocaching etc - was one that was discussed in the Sunderland feedback sessions and questionnaire responses, and it was useful that the Freiburg experience was able to be represented by the Freiburg partner KoMMedia e.V.. The **Freiburg course** (April 2013) completed the schedule with some time to spare, whereas in Sunderland ICT issues took up more time than, in retrospect, was appropriate. The conclusion was that ICT issues should not dominate the entire course. COMAPP’s objective to contribute to ‘e-inclusion’ should not mean neglecting content - the important cultural, historical or social topics to be addressed within the various settings: audio walking tour,

internet mapping or sessions on intercultural and intergenerational teaching and learning issues ( for details see evaluation report Freiburg course in the appendix).

For the final international course in **Algodonales** (June 2013) a number of changes were made according to the exchange and discussion within the consortium based on the findings of the evaluation: some of the sessions of the three units, were put into a different order; some parts originally developed in section 3 (teaching and learning) were integrated into the first day, for example the philosophy of teaching and learning and the “the dual role approach”. This still leaves it possible to run separate units which can be combined according to the focus and the time chosen, or to run the whole 5 day course. Flexibility is an important aspect of the project: since conditions for training within different organisations of adult education vary considerably, adult educators should be offered a variety of ways to apply the course content that suit their own situation.

The course schedule followed at Algodonales (5-11 June, 2013) is attached (see evaluation report Algodonales in the appendix). In summary, **Day 1** began with introductions of participants and programme and an explanation of the ‘dual role’ concept which required participants throughout the course to keep in mind their role as learners both of the course content and of the methods and general approach they would themselves use as trainers adapting the content for their target groups. On this first day, internet maps were introduced and the idea of ‘hotspots’; recording with smartphones, interviewing and the collection of sounds and images (photos); finally a ‘sound walk’ which included encounters with places, events and interviewees pre-arranged by the resident organisers. In **Day 2**, participants were shown how to save, organise and edit the material gathered, and to write brief explanatory or creative (poems) texts to accompany hotspot material. **Day 3** involved further editing, and introductions to FTP servers, uploading to servers, google maps and OSM, and the OSM generator developed in Freiburg. In **Day 4**, simple websites were created, geocaching as an activity was introduced, and illustrated in a search exercise in the vicinity. **Day 5** was devoted to discussion of teaching and learning methods and styles, an exercise in which groups designed a course which adapted what they had learned for use with chosen target groups, and a session on evaluation methods. **Day 6** was dedicated to exchange of experiences and collaboration with local institutions working in the field of adult education.

Each day included a session in which one of the participants did a presentation about their own work, warm up exercises to illustrate ways that target groups could be made to feel at ease and sessions where individual and small group comment was invited and discussed in plenary session.

Following the Algodonales course participants, trainers and project partner all fed back that the course schedule and curriculum is very well structured. Only some minor revisions were suggested and made to details in the schedule such as for example to hand out the readers referring to the respective session directly after having introduced the digital editing, the OSM generator and the geocaching topic to allow advanced learners to get into more detail, or to number the handouts and indicate them in the course schedule. The final version of the course schedule can be found on the COMAPP website < <http://www.comapp-online.de/>>

### **3. Teaching and learning materials**

These were developed in successive stages over the two years of the project. The majority of the COMAPP team had been involved as partners in previous Grundtvig-funded training projects and the first step was to involve new colleagues in reflection on that experience and identification of methods

and materials relevant to the new project. At the same time, consultation with adult education institutions ensured an updating of the versions prepared and circulated between all three workgroups for discussion at the first conference in Lodz in May 2012. There, each workgroup presented its proposed schedule and materials for the respective unit and some changes were made in response to the comments of colleagues.

Next came the testing and evaluation of the pilot courses in six locations. The findings of evaluation and the reports of partners led to revised curricula and materials (including the first revision of the OSM Generator) and to the next version of the train the trainers' course whose curriculum and teaching and learning materials were translated into English and German for use in Freiburg and Sunderland at national level. Experts not involved into the COMAPP project in the UK and in Germany were asked to comment on the materials. Their feed back and the findings of the evaluation of these two courses led to the curriculum for the international training course delivered in June 2013. The handbook and the teaching and learning materials (handouts and readers) were tested, evaluated, and improved: partners suggested adding two chapters in the handbook, a quick guide providing a short overview, and frequently asked questions tackling issues which often came up when a course or a section of the course was taught. Finally, evaluation of the international course at the Budapest conference assisted in the finalisation of handbook and website which include the OSM generator, handbooks and readers and all the teaching and training materials translated into six languages: English, German, Polish, Magyar, Suomi and Spanish.

At the separate delivery of the courses at each stage, handouts were distributed to participants and these have been revised and brought together as appendices to the handbook now available for download on the website. Besides the schedule for participants (the detailed course curriculum for trainers is found in chapter 3.3 of the handbook), the handouts include a list of android apps that need to be downloaded onto participants' phones before arrival at the course; advice on interviewing, recording and creating hotspots; some exercises in acoustic ecology; instructions use of the software 'Audacity' for audio-editing, on mapping, the use of the OSM-generator, on geocaching; a summary of learning styles and a 'tool-box' of teaching methods; a case study of using the hot spot and mapping idea in a particular context (Family Health and Well-Being); a course outline plan form and a summary of evaluation techniques. All the handouts were based on input by different partners and were created so as to directly support individual or group work during the course. Three readers (on digital editing of sound, on creation of interactive maps with the open street map generator, and on geocaching) with more detailed explanation were created for participants to take home and to help in applying the content to their regular work.

The quality of these materials is best assessed by understanding that they are built on a **pedagogical approach** which has been used in the community media field over several decades, one which has introduced technical, communication and creative skills to disadvantaged groups in informal settings. COMAPP's coordinator has published extensively on a theorisation of the method (action-oriented media pedagogy and the 'dual role' approach) and several of the COMAPP partners have been using, and continue to use, the methods in their current work. Consequently, the addition of the use of open source mapping and the use of apps, creation of websites etc does not represent a major departure from their pedagogical 'repertoire', but rather an extension. Some parts of the COMAPP course (interviewing, recording, editing for example) were and are being continually and successfully used, refined and revised in work outside the COMAPP project. And as for the potential relevance and application of the COMAPP curriculum in a university and adult education context, it is clear from the feedback from participants and COMAPP partners that they are excited by the possibilities of using it in their work. This is a measure of the success of the teaching and learning materials.

A passage from the evaluation report on the Algodonales course (see appendix) is worth quoting to amplify the point.

“The underlying training philosophy / methodology implies that the role of the trainers was more that of a facilitator than teacher. The sessions included a mix between trainer input, individual work, work in small groups, and plenary reflection and discussion. Input and information were provided whenever necessary but the focus was on encouraging the participants to try out ideas and to produce material (in small groups and individually) and, in the whole group, to reflect upon and discuss their own productions and issues that came up. Examples were: the ethics of journalistic interviews, protection of a person’s personal rights when recording sound and pictures, copyright questions, intercultural and intergenerational differences.

Participants were treated as subjects with their own history of how to learn and work. The consequence of following the underlying methodology ...was that the trainers activated and included participants, their strength, their training needs and their contributions at every stage.

For example: the course includes several exercises to find out about skills, strengths and learning needs of participants and about the different learning styles of people and how these differences can positively contribute to the whole training. Also participants were invited to run their own session and share their experience with the whole group.”

#### **4. Target groups, exploitation, dissemination**

COMAPP’ course is intended in the first instance for use by trainers, adult educators, social workers, media pedagogues and teachers working with different generations and with socially disadvantaged target groups who want to bring into their regular work ways of using media to improve communication skills, expectations and self-confidence. These “multipliers” are the first target group. Beyond them, the ‘second target groups’ are the groups they work with - senior citizens, migrants, vulnerable social groups or groups in marginal social contexts. Given that skills and experience in the use of smartphones and apps is to be found to a great extent in the younger generation, COMAPP has always borne in mind the potential for intergenerational learning as senior citizens ‘trade’ their experience with young people by learning new skills and insights from them.

Different parts of the course can be and have been used and sustainably integrated in more formal settings such as university undergraduate courses or in the work of NGOs and community radio stations. Examples for the latter are maps created with the OSM Generator developed in the COMAPP project:

- the multimedia historical city guide “In Ekkehard’s footsteps“ – an intergenerational project of a fifth form at a school in the city of Singen/Germany: [www.ekkehard-guide.de](http://www.ekkehard-guide.de)

- “Telling Stories” – Family memories of the participants from different European countries attending the training course. Each story is connected to an item of remembrance:

<http://rdl.de/images/2012/audioguide/stories5.html>

- A guide produced with the COMAPP OSM Generator by inhabitants of a quarter in Freiburg with the help of a local Community Radio Station: Audioguide Weingarten: [www.weingarten.rdl.de](http://www.weingarten.rdl.de)

To summarise, the dissemination and exploitation plan was and is aimed at four target groups:

1. adult educators, teachers and trainers
2. organisations, institutions, key actors in the area of adult education: universities, institutions for senior citizens, migrants and people living in rural areas, media centres and community radios in

European countries

3. Educational and academic networks and institutions in six European countries where each COMAPP partner is already involved in different networks. Beyond the six countries, other interested European institutions can access the project website

4. General audience, reached through media coverage, and access to the project website.

Institutions and individuals who are part of these target groups have been in continuous contact with the project, already exploited parts of the COMAPP teaching and training materials and intend to sustainably make use of the outcomes.

The **website** [www.comapp-online.de](http://www.comapp-online.de), revised since the Progress Report which referred to feedback from the target groups, was discussed in detail at the final conference in Budapest and has been much improved. Indeed, one criticism made in Budapest was that it would have helped if the website had been set up earlier to further improve communications. The website is the key source for information about the project, carrying as it does course designs, the curriculum, teaching & learning materials, handbooks and readers in six languages free for download. The site also carries the OSM generator, a tool to produce interactive multimedia maps and links to a range of maps already produced in different countries by using the generator. **Postcards** have been spread by partners in their communities (shops, community centres, libraries), at conferences and to networks to which they belong. Information about COMAPP has been publicised at a number of events and at different **national and international conferences** in Germany, Italy, Poland, UK and Canada. **Articles** about COMAPP have been written and interviews given in the countries of the partnership. In four of the universities associated with COMAPP project materials have been **integrated into curricula** and the outcomes have been used in community media organisations, schools and adult education centres use in partner countries.

## **5. Collaboration of partners**

As noted in the Evaluation Progress Report, there were some initial difficulties of communication between partners in the first few months of the project, and in two cases this was due to the threat of removal of funding from the partner organization (Civil Radio, Budapest) or a change of personnel (Radio Robin Hood, Turku), both of which temporarily distracted attention from COMAPP business. But from the Lodz conference (May 2012) onwards the lines and methods of communication were clearly understood and used (email, Skype, texting), and, as the delivery of outcomes proved, were effective. It is difficult to comprehend the external expert's comment that "no other means are put into place to facilitate interaction and collaboration" (External Expert's Progress Report Assessment), the implication being that only face to face meetings can ensure collaboration. In fact, the overlapping membership of the three workgroups led to more continuous contact than only the partnership meetings. In year 2 alongside the international course in Spain (June 2013) an additional meeting –not foreseen in the original work plan - was scheduled, to discuss the final form of the course curriculum, the teaching and learning materials and improvements needed before the final conference in Budapest (September 2013). This additional meeting proved very useful in considering suggestions by all partners of the consortium and integrating appropriate changes into the teaching and learning materials before the translation started.

At any particular moment it was apparent to partners what stage in the work plan had been reached and the reports and outcomes were shared by the coordinator and the evaluation team with all partners to provide transparency.

The final Budapest conference (September 2013) included a session intended to revise the website and the handbook. The informed and constructive discussion that resulted was extremely helpful: the feedback from institutions and organisations with whom partners in their respective countries collaborated indicated that the first version of the project's website was not clearly enough structured. The decision was made to structure the website completely differently so as to make it more user-friendly and to ensure that the materials on it would be used sustainably after the funded period of the project.

The conference also provided the opportunity to ask partners to reflect on the project as a whole (see appendix: Budapest evaluation report). Apart from some criticisms - referring to time pressure, workload connected with reports and financial proofs and some weaknesses in communication in the first year of the project – partners felt enriched by the project. The main positive points mentioned were:

- International collaboration, cooperation between academics and NGOs, interdisciplinarity and the mix of skills among COMAPP partners
- the professionalism and team spirit of the group
- the participatory approach applied both in the courses and in the organization of COMAPP
- the thorough testing and development of an innovative course and its flexible application to different target groups
- the involvement of new NGOs eg Algdosol and KoMMedia e.V.
- the fact that the project is more than a training curriculum: it is also a tool that helps to build and develop communities.

## **6. Sustainability**

The partners will be able to use the COMAPP materials in their own regular teaching and training, and use their contacts with networks, organisations and institutions involved in adult and media education to further exploit the project's outcomes.

But the main opportunity for sustainability is to establish the COMAPP course within the future **Grundtvig inservice programme (IST) under Erasmus +**. Partners of the consortium can draw on their experience with a prior project “META Europe” which was developed through a multilateral project under Grundtvig and after the funded period was successfully established as an IST course. The COMAPP course will be offered under the Erasmus + framework as soon as it becomes possible.

Other opportunities are consultancies to exploit the outcomes offered to community radio stations and media centres, to institutions of adult education, social workers in community centres, youth clubs and schools, and the inclusion of the COMAPP experience in conference presentations and journal articles.

## **7. The evaluation process**

### **7.1. Methodology**

It is necessary to begin this section by answering the charge made in the External Expert's Progress Report Assessment that there was “no underpinning framework or methodology” apparent in the evaluation of COMAPP. Yet the Progress Report stated, “evaluation is based on action research methodology”.

Under the title 'ethnographic action research' (EAR), this methodology was first developed with the UK Department for International Development funding and UNESCO support in early 2002. COMAPP'S external evaluator worked with colleagues to apply the methodology for a community radio and internet project in Sri Lanka (Slater, Tacchi & Lewis 2002). The approach was implemented and further developed with UNESCO (<http://eprints.gut.edu.au/4399/>) and has been adapted for the evaluation of subsequent Grundtvig-funded projects led by Dr. Traudel Günnel (Lewis 2006).

The approach uses observation, interviews, diaries, questionnaires and scrutiny of documents. As *ethnography*, EAR seeks to understand a practice (in this case, training) in the social setting and circumstances of the social actors concerned. As *action research*, it seeks to bring the research findings back into the setting being studied in order to develop and plan new activities and new ways of working. In both aspects, the approach is *participatory*, and the key aim is to assist the 'subjects' of research, rather than thinking about evaluation as an activity that happens *to* them, and only at specified points in time, to develop, as an integral part of their continuous cycle of planning and doing, a *research culture* through which knowledge and reflection contribute to the ongoing development of their work. The aim is to help them acquire the capacity to *self-evaluate* their work and arrive at a commitment to reflect on actions undertaken, identify successes and failures and make adjustments to subsequent actions accordingly. A considerable element of self-evaluation is involved, using instruments evaluation (check-lists, questionnaires, reports) and methods agreed in advance with the evaluation team and reliant on continuous monitoring and exchange of information by face-to-face meetings and by email with other partners and the evaluators. The findings arrived at by self-evaluation are cross-checked by the overlapping membership of the work groups, and by the evaluation team. This allows observation and interviews to confirm or correct the data derived from self-evaluation. (Evaluation plan and instruments used in COMAPP see appendix)

In COMAPP, as in the earlier projects led by Günnel, a detailed workplan (see appendix) was developed in consultation with partners and was the framework within which reports from partners recorded the completion of the stages of work.

The division of roles between the coordinator, KoMMedia and the external evaluator was also a point on which the External Expert needed clarification. The evaluators systematically observed the course activities, the trainers and the participants and also the use of the teaching and training materials (how they were used, what seemed to work well, what did not). Partner 7 (lead partner for evaluation) supported by partner 1 did this by having in parts a "participant's" perspective, while the external evaluator at any time had the perspective from outside. During the meetings of the evaluation team these different perspectives were discussed and tasks (focuses for observation) were shared and determined. The external evaluator also interviewed course participants. Documents (course publicity, teaching materials) were studied and the completed questionnaires of participants and trainers analysed. The coordinators of each course produced their own reports (self-evaluation) and an overall report was produced by the evaluation team and distributed to all partners (see appendix: evaluation reports on the courses in Sunderland, Freiburg, Algodonales and report on the Budapest conference).

## **7.2.Evaluation in Algodonales and Budapest**

The last two meetings brought together all the partners and, in Algodonales, some other experienced trainers and media pedagogues. Both meetings allowed time, in formal sessions and in the informal socialising, for reflection and evaluation of the two-year project.

Throughout the duration of the Algodonales course (05.-11.June 2013), the training team demonstrated evaluation methods that could be introduced in training. Aside from initial and

concluding questionnaires (QP1, QP2) and the questionnaire for trainers (QT), these included short oral evaluations (“flash light”), post-its: individuals, small groups, reports in plenary, individual notes posted on walls, a reporting of positive and negative experience as a learner and as a teacher, mid course evaluation - cards pinned on the wall, the Head, Heart, Carrier Bag and Dustbin evaluation (see Appendix 19 of the handbook for trainers), discussion summary charts (the trainer writes points on a chart visible to all participants), and observation and interviews by evaluators. This ‘in-course’ evaluation created a constructive dialogue about the course as a whole - the approach and the administrative arrangements which helped to shape the final, sustainable form of the teaching and learning materials and the website. Suggestions included the timing of the sending out of initial questionnaires, the organisation of the handouts, changes to the OSM, the timing of the introduction of the readers (maps with the OSM generator, editing with Audacity, geo caching).

The evaluation session at the Budapest conference (September 2013) ended with partners completing a final questionnaire (QP4) whose most important points can be summarised as follows

*What were the **most important things** for you at this meeting?*

- seeing two years’ work come together; “I see now the global sense of the programme”; sharing reflections about the project; the discussion about outcomes-handbook-website; checking and re-working outcomes together; feedback and corrections; “brilliant outcomes” shown by presentations; “I was amazed by the quantity and quality of outcomes. We have done a really good job”; finalisation of project eg website, now simple and clear - making sure it’s accessible and sustainable; the success of project- the Algodonales presentation was inspiring
- stronger reconnection with European partners; meeting again; pleasure expressed by Civil Radio at being able to host the conference; all partners emphasised their appreciation of this and the arrangements for meeting with local organisations and seeing Budapest
- the importance of a mixture of skills within the group
- Discussion of future collaboration
- Advice on financial aspects available to individuals

*What was **good overall**?*

- the collaboration and cross-cultural exchange of working practices, problem solving; the creativeness and knowledge of the group
- inspiring participants; wonderful atmosphere
- local organisation; “perfectly organised conference”; hospitality of our hosts
- realising what an excellent project we have

*What was **not so good overall**?*

- lot of work in every session; conference too short; important elements felt rushed
- bad news – the uncertainty re future funding; sad that there was to be no future project

## Conclusions

- The COMAPP course, its materials, and the variety of input, both academic and practical, resulted in a commendable match to the needs of European adult education in respect of e-inclusion and intergenerational, intercultural teaching and learning.
- The partnership brought together by the Coordinator covered six European countries providing a wide range of different experiences: teaching refugees and collaborating with organisations that work with refugees in Turku (Finland), conditions for training adults in the rural area of southern Spain (Algodonales) or the challenges of teaching senior citizens in Budapest to jointly create a multimedia map. Some of these challenges were quite similar between countries, others, such as media law regulations, were different. The input from partners with such different experience led to intense exchange, enriched the creation of project outcomes, deepened mutual understanding and fostered the will to sustain collaboration across Europe. The management succeeded in creating a collaboration of partners based on mutual trust and friendship. The minor difficulties which arose (flow of communication in the first 3 months, workloads at certain stages) were quickly solved and did not have a negative influence on the project on its whole. The consortium had detailed and very fruitful discussions via email and skype and especially at the partnership meetings and conferences and – by considering the results of the evaluation at each stage - suggested improvements where necessary.
- Dissemination and exploitation will largely occur in the future, but in its website, where all the outcomes can be found and downloaded, COMAPP has left a legacy for sustainable use which has already begun to be exploited (see the final report and chapter 4 above).

## Comments by the External Evaluator

- A limited budget did not allow for the presence of evaluators at certain key moments in the development of the COMAPP project, for example the pilot courses in Turku, Finland, and Lodz, Poland. All three members of the evaluation team were present at the opening and closing conferences and at the final international course in Algodonales, Spain, but the evaluation scheme as a whole depended to a large extent on self-evaluation whose importance was emphasised and explained from the start as being an essential element in training and the planning of training courses. The efficient testing and development of the pilots and the bringing together of the separate experiences and materials and tools to create the final national and international versions of the course is evidence that the self-evaluation worked well.
- The same budget limitation applied to the extent of face-to-face meetings that could be realised, a limitation that has been experienced in all the previous projects (Creating Community Voices, Digital Dialogues, META-Europe and Crosstalk mark a sequence of development over a 15 year period). There has always been a difficult decision to make about when to hold the first meeting – at the very start of the project or some months into it? Skyping or video-conferencing can to some extent overcome this dilemma, but were not at first used in COMAPP, leading to criticism about communications in the first year of the project by some partners and by the Grundtvig assessors' comments on the Interim Report. In the second year serious attempts were made to improve the communication via skype, email and extended reports by partners. The work plan and timing of the separate contributions to the project, as well as the checking of deadlines and distribution of information was very effectively handled by the Co-ordinator and her supporting staff. There is no doubt for this evaluator that the 'team spirit' and strong connections between Co-ordinator and partners was the best yet compared to all the previous projects and this is supported by the feedback

summarised above. It is greatly to the credit of the Co-ordinator that this should be so, especially taking into account the following point.

- What was very evident in this latest project was the increase in administrative demands made by the funding agency compared to the experience of previous projects in the ‘family’ sequence. This placed a very marked strain on the Co-ordinator and her assistants which in turn had an effect on the administrative returns required of partners, none of whom were contractually involved in a full-time capacity with COMAPP and all of whom had demanding work in their main occupations. It is not coincidental that this will be the last project the Co-ordinator will undertake. COMAPP brought together a team which has worked well, is justifiably proud of its achievements and is disappointed that there is not an opportunity to continue the partnership. The final evaluation in which every partner criticised the excessive bureaucratic demands imposed on COMAPP underlines the need for the programme administrators to re-examine the effect on potential applicants of the heavy administrative burden that a project imposes.
- The importance of the social side of the project cannot be over-emphasised. At each venue, the opportunity to be shown a city and to be introduced to local organisations of adult education by people who live and work there is a very special experience. The personal cross cultural exchanges (also during shared meals) as well as group experiences the participants enjoyed and enabled provided space for further reflection and exchange and cemented the commitment of the group to continue their European wide collaboration.
- 

## **9. References**

Lewis, P.M.(2006) ‘Monitoring and Evaluation’ in Lewis, P.M. & Jones S. *From the Margins to the Cutting Edge – Community Media and Empowerment*. Catskill, NJ : Hampton Press.

Slater, D., Tacchi, J. & Lewis, P.M. (2002) *Ethnographic Monitoring and Evaluation of Community Multimedia Centres: A Study of Kothmale Community Radio Internet Project, Sri Lanka*. Available at <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/8701/1/8701.pdf>

## **Appendix 1**

Evaluation plan and tools,

- Evaluation plan
  - checklist objectives
  - participants' questionnaire 1 and 2
  - trainers' questionnaire
  - partners' questionnaire
- COMAPP overall work plan



## Evaluation- plan and design COMAPP

### A PARTNERSHIP

<b>Focus of evaluation</b>	<b>Partnership/collaboration in working groups/sections</b>
<b>Key questions</b>	What are your expectations? What was your experience?
<b>Timing</b>	beginning of project; in Lodz (5/12) and in Budapest (9/13)
<b>Method</b>	QT1 questionnaire (02/12); interviews (individual & group), written comments
<b>Evaluation by</b>	Partners and Evaluation team

### B DISSEMINATION ETC

<b>Focus of evaluation</b>	<b>dissemination, publicity, recruitment, external comment</b>
<b>Key questions</b>	details/examples of above
<b>Timing</b>	continuously throughout the project
<b>Method</b>	completion and updating of QT1/B
<b>Evaluation by</b>	Partners

### C PRODUCTS AND COURSES - PARTNERS

<b>Focus of evaluation</b>	<b>Development of products</b>
<b>Key questions</b>	(1) Are objectives promised in application (a) relevant to Section? (b) being applied in our planning? (2) What are our section's specific objectives? (3) What are our target groups? (4) How did it go? Description, highlights and weak points
<b>Timing</b>	(1) at start of collaboration; (2) & (3) by 4/12 (4) reports at successive stages, ie: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• development of course curriculum and materials stage 1 (4/12) (Lodz)</li> <li>• development (materials and course) and delivery of course stage 2 (6-9/12)</li> <li>• development (materials and course) and delivery of course stage 3 (Sunderland and Freiburg) (3-4/13)</li> <li>• development (materials and course) and delivery of course stage 4 (international course)( 6-7/13)</li> </ul>
<b>Method</b>	(1)completion of checklist; (2), (3) & (4) reports at successive stages Interviews and observation
<b>Evaluation by</b>	Partners and Evaluation team

### D PRODUCTS AND COURSES - PARTICIPANTS

<b>Focus of evaluation</b>	<b>evaluation of courses and materials</b>
<b>Key questions</b>	(1)What do you know already? What are you expecting? (2) What have you learnt?
<b>Timing</b>	(1)in advance of course (2) at end of course – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• pilot courses section units (all partner countries) (6-9/12)</li> <li>• pilot courses national level in Sunderland and Germany (3-4/13)</li> <li>• international Course in Algodonales (6-7/13)</li> </ul>
<b>Method</b>	Completion of questionnaires; observation, interviews / group discussion
<b>Evaluation by</b>	course participants / evaluation team

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication [communication] reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

## COMAPP “Community Media Applications and Participation”

Evaluation – Checklist Objectives (to be filled in by all project partners at project start)

Traudel Guennel, Peter Lewis, Eberhard Boess



In our application to the European Commission we were required to tick boxes about COMAPP’s objectives. The Commission will judge our work by the extent to which we have met our claims.

Now we are asking *you* to tick boxes!

Not all the objectives apply to each working group/section. Please read through and see what is applicable to you.

We suggest you keep the list by you in your COMAPP work so as to keep the project on target.

### Specific objectives (COMAPP- application): ... (partner)

Objective	Applicable to our Section?	Are we meeting this objective?
The participants: gain new <b>media competencies</b> and understandings which they can implement in their work with target groups. They too may be motivated to engage in <b>further (lifelong) learning</b> , taking their interest in media further to gain formal educational qualifications		
increase contact, communication and <b>mutual understanding between different generations and/or cultures</b> by breaking down traditional roles and stereotypes		
stimulate media competences that <b>enable effective expression, build self-confidence and have transferable value</b> in employment and social interaction		
create incentives and access to <b>basic skills</b> , and to <b>social, civic, cultural and intercultural competences, creativity and entrepreneurship</b>		
explore ways to tap the <b>potential of senior citizens</b> to share their experience as well as validate that of young people by learning new skills and insights from them and/or...		
...enable <b>migrants</b> to express their needs and find ways to meet them		
support knowledge acquisition through <b>self-conducted media productions</b>		
encourage <b>vulnerable social groups</b> or groups in <b>marginal social contexts</b> to bring their stories into the public domain, giving a voice to the „voiceless“		
help marginalised social groups develop a <b>critique of mainstream media</b> and <b>understand</b> the consequent rationale for, and record of, <b>community media</b> in remedying the defects of the mainstream		
open <b>new vocational perspectives</b> for members of marginalised target groups		
<b>use professional, national and European</b>		

## COMAPP “Community Media Applications and Participation”

Evaluation – Checklist Objectives (to be filled in by all project partners at project start)

Traudel Guennel, Peter Lewis, Eberhard Boess

<b>networks</b> (educational and community media), with which the consortium has connection, <b>to publicise and transfer the courses</b> , materials and methods developed in the project		
<b>adapt results and outcomes of previous projects</b> and thus to contribute to broader dissemination and to support sustainability		
use <b>evaluation methods</b> which involve the whole consortium in identifying the effectiveness of the course and its materials		

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication [communication] reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

**PROJECT NUMBER: 517958-LLP-1-2011-1-DE-GRUNDTVIG-GMP**

**AGREEMENT NUMBER: 2011 – 3978 / 001 - 001**

# Initial Questionnaire for participants

(please fill in before the course starts)

---

## Annotation:

We would like to ask you to fill in this short questionnaire. The questionnaire is used only for evaluation purpose. It can help to improve the quality of future project activities. Anonymity is guaranteed: your personal data will not be published. Thank you very much for your support!

---

## A Personal data

**Gender:**  male  female    **Age:**                      **Languages spoken:**

### How did you learn about the course?

- personal contact                       newspaper                       flyer                       Internet  
 other, namely: ...

### What is your current occupation or voluntary work?

- adult educator /  school teacher /  professor / lecturer /  social worker /  
 member / staff in community radio /  student /  volunteer at NGO  
 other...

## B Expectation

What do you want to gain from the course?

What new knowledge and new skills would you like to acquire?

## C Teaching experience

What target groups do you usually work with or intend to work with?

What training methods do you normally use? (for example: lecturing, group work, one to one training, learner centred, teacher centred, etc.)

## D Media experience

What experience have you had personally using the following media and communications applications?...

### (1) Smartphone – use / application

none  a little  quite a bit  a lot

If you use smartphones: what for?

telephone  SMS  internet  taking pictures  videos  apps (please give examples)

others...

### (2) Apps

none  a little  quite a bit  a lot

### (3) Use of **digital / virtual** (geographic) **maps** (e.g.. Google, Open Street Map...)

none  a little  quite a bit  a lot

Did you ever create / edit such a map?

yes, with (Google, OSM...):  no

### (4) Geocaching

none  a little  quite a bit  a lot

Did you ever create an own cache?

yes  no

### (5) Computer

none  a little  quite a bit  a lot

### (6) E-mail

none  a little  quite a bit  a lot

### (7) Web surfing / web research

none  a little  quite a bit  a lot



# Final Questionnaire for course participants

(please fill in at end of course)

---

## Annotation:

We would like to ask you to fill in this short questionnaire. The questionnaire is used only for evaluation purpose. It can help to improve the quality of future project activities. Anonymity is guaranteed: your personal data will not be published. Thank you very much for your support!

---

## Personal data

**Gender:**  male  female

**Age:**

**Languages spoken:**

1. Please indicate how useful you found the different parts of the activity / course

- **Researching and developing content for interactive maps including the sound walk**

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not interesting	<input type="checkbox"/>	very interesting				

- **Learning about, practising and doing journalistic interviews**

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not interesting	<input type="checkbox"/>	very interesting				

- **Creating hot spots using photographs, text, narration, sounds**

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not interesting	<input type="checkbox"/>	very interesting				

- **Digital audio editing**

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not interesting	<input type="checkbox"/>	very interesting				

- **Working with interactive digital maps**

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not interesting	<input type="checkbox"/>	very interesting				

- **Using the COMAPP OSM - generator to create a map**

Not interesting      1      2      3      4      5      very interesting  
                       

- **Creating a website and transferring the OSM map on to the web**

Not interesting      1      2      3      4      5      very interesting  
                       

- **Introduction of geo caching & search of a cache**

Not interesting      1      2      3      4      5      very interesting  
                       

- **Applying what you have learnt about smart phones, creation of interactive maps, geo caching to your own teaching and learning setting**

Not interesting      1      2      3      4      5      very interesting  
                       

- **Teaching and learning techniques for work with different target groups in different settings (e.g. adult education centres, community media, schools, youth clubs...)**

Not interesting      1      2      3      4      5      very interesting  
                       

- **Evaluation strategies and instruments**

Not interesting      1      2      3      4      5      very interesting  
                       

**2. Which part / activity / unit of the course did you like best? Why?**

3. What was your greatest success in learning? Why?

4. Was the level of technical information:

- too high                       too low                       about right

5. Were your expectations for the activity /course disappointed in any way?

- yes    no

Please give some details:

6. Do you have any feedback for the trainers? (About the course / about the methods / about teaching and learning materials / about course organisation.....)

7. What use will you make of what you have learnt during the course? (individually / as part of your work / your voluntary activities.... Please give some details!)

**8. suggestions** for what could be improved:

a) Handouts , readers and teaching and learning materials

b) The tools (for instance the OSM – generator....)

c) the course in general

**9.** Any comments about rooms, facilities and food?

**10.** Any other comments

Name (optional).....

Thanks!

# Questionnaire for Trainers

(use at end of activity / course)

## 1. Place, date:

**Name:**

**Did you teach:**

Training Tandem ? (for instance: media tutor/s, working alongside partner organisation...)

Training alone?

Other variations? (for instance: if you only taught

parts / a part of the course).

Which parts...

## 2. If you taught **in a team**: What was **your role**?

Which parts / units of the course did you teach? What was your main focus?

## 3. Please comment (where applicable) on the **effectiveness of the teaching** and on the **course units** relating to what is listed below. Please refer to the content, the methods, the timing, technical issues, interaction with participants and between participants. Please also mention reasons and suggestions for possible changes.

**(a) Approach of teaching and learning, the dual role approach, dynamic of the group, collaboration between participants during group work**

	1	2	3	4	5	
Very good	<input type="checkbox"/>	not good				

Reasons:

**(b) Audio editing**

	1	2	3	4	5	
Very good	<input type="checkbox"/>	not good				

Reasons:

**(c) Taking and editing pictures**

	1	2	3	4	5	
Very good	<input type="checkbox"/>	not good				

Reasons:

**(d) Doing and recording interviews**

	1	2	3	4	5	
Very good	<input type="checkbox"/>	not good				

Reasons:

**(e) Sound walk, sound perception (supported by the handouts)**

	1	2	3	4	5	
Very good	<input type="checkbox"/>	not good				

Reasons:

**(f) Creative writing for hotspots**

	1	2	3	4	5	
Very good	<input type="checkbox"/>	not good				

Reasons:

**(g) Creation of maps with the Open Street Map Generator (OSM)**

	1	2	3	4	5	
Very good	<input type="checkbox"/>	not good				

Reasons:

**(h) Introduction / creation of website with b-placed**

	1	2	3	4	5	
Very good	<input type="checkbox"/>	not good				

Reasons:

**(i) Geo caching / search for a cache**

	1	2	3	4	5	
Very good	<input type="checkbox"/>	not good				

Reasons:

**(j) Teaching / learning methods for different target groups**

	1	2	3	4	5	
Very good	<input type="checkbox"/>	not good				

Reasons:

**(k) Applying course content to teaching contexts**

	1	2	3	4	5	
Very good	<input type="checkbox"/>	not good				

Reasons:

**(l) Evaluation (introduction and exercise)**

	1	2	3	4	5	
Very good	<input type="checkbox"/>	not good				

Reasons:

4. (a) Please comment on the **effectiveness of other aspects** of the interaction between yourselves as trainers and the course participants (besides those listed above). Please mention reasons and make suggestions what to improve.
- (b) What would you say worked well in the **interaction between course participants**? What worked not so well? (Please give reasons).
5. What do you think of the **success / achievement of the participants** in general? How did you observe / register the achievements in learning? (Please give examples).
6. **Course materials and equipment**: What was missing? Problems?
7. **Administrative aspekts**? (including travel, accommodation, participants' comment on arrangements at venue, childcare etc...)
8. Did the moments of **evaluation** for participants work? Please "tick"
- Initial questionnaire participants
  - Final questionnaire participants
  - Group discussion
  - Others (which)...
9. Space for **additional comments** (please also use reverse side)

COMAPP – “Community Media Applications and Participation”, supported by the EU-programme “Lifelong Learning” project evaluation – questionnaire for partners (COMAPP QT 1 A, B & C, see evaluation plan & design), to be filled in by all partners at project start/ early month  
Traudel Guennel, Peter Lewis, Eberhard Boess 29..02.2012



## Questionnaire for project partners

*Before you begin work on COMAPP please take a few minutes to answer these few questions. Your answers to **A** will help us all by providing a baseline when we come to evaluate the process at the end of the project.*

***B** on page 2 is where you can record what you may have done so far and your plans for the coming months till we meet at the 1<sup>st</sup> project conference where each working group will present a report of their progress*

*Thank you.*

### **A**

1. **What do you think about the basic idea of COMAPP?**
2. **How about the working group to which you are assigned?**
3. **Do you anticipate any particular difficulties in fulfilling your role/completing your task? e.g. available time? Communications within the group?**
4. **What positive outcomes do you expect for**
  - (a) yourself?
  - (b) the project?
  - (c) the participants (trainees)?

### **B Dissemination, publicity, recruitment, external comment**

*Please note here any results under this heading and/or your plans for the coming months. We add **external comment** because you might find it useful to involve a local university, college or adult education institution, or a community radio in commenting on the website, curriculum and materials.*

**C** Groups will present their reports at the 1<sup>st</sup> project conference. Each working group is expected to deliver to project coordinator a short report by ... in order that it can be circulated before the meeting.

Reports should include:

- definition arrived at of the specific objectives for the section (training unit)
- definition arrived at of target groups
- updated report on dissemination, publicity, recruitment, external comment
- How did it go? description, highlights and difficulties so far
- Report on development of course curriculum and materials stage 1

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication [communication] reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

## “Community Media Applications and Participation” (COMAPP)

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication [communication] reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

PROJECT NUMBER: 517958-LLP-1-2011-1-DE-GRUNDTVIG-GMP

AGREEMENT NUMBER: 2011 – 3978 / 001 - 001



Traudel Guannel, COMAPP Project Co-ordinator, work plan COMAPP

Freiburg, 05.12.2011

### **COMAPP Partners:**

P1: University of Education Freiburg, Germany

P2: University of Sunderland, UK

P3: Radio Robin Hood, Turku, Finland

P4: Civil Radio, Budapest, Hungary

P5: University of Lodz, Poland

P6: association AlgoSol, Algodonales, Spain

P7: association KoMMedia, Freiburg, Germany

Evaluation team: P1 and P7 with external evaluators

Coordinator: P1 Traudel Günnel

### **Overall Work plan COMAPP 12/2011 – 11/2013**

<b>Outcomes / Outputs: By the end of this stage we will have achieved / produced</b>	<b>What to do? How? Activities leading to the outcomes</b>	<b>Starting and completion date of the activity</b>	<b>Partners / persons involved</b>	<b>Stage of project</b>
Overall work plan	Establishing work plan prepared by coordinator	12/2011	P1 in cooperation with partners	<b>Stage I</b>
Financial evidence, dissemination and exploitation plans, report forms, for project monitoring	Setting up management structures	12/2011	P1	
Evaluation: plan / design, instruments, tools	prepared by coordinator in cooperation with external evaluators	1/2012	P1, P7, in cooperation with external evaluators	
Brussels EU coordinators meeting	Coordinator – LLP Grundtvig Project compulsory meeting	19.- 20.01.2012	P 1	

Internal reports	<p>Financial reports and evidence :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 15.06.2012 (period of proof/ all financial evidence: 01-12-2011 – 31-05-2012)</li> <li>2. 15.11.2012 (period of proof/ all financial evidence: 01-06-2012 – 31-10-2012)</li> <li>3. 15.06.2013 (period of proof/ all financial evidence: 01-11-2012 – 31-05-2013)</li> <li>4. 10.12.2013 (period of proof/ all financial evidence: 01-06-2013 – 30-11-2013)</li> </ol> <p>Reports on activities along the activities undertaken by the workgroups S 1-3 (process of developing teaching and learning materials and activities, running courses, dissemination and exploitation)</p>	From 12/2011 continuously	All partners	<b>Stage I – III</b>
integration of results of the team's previous projects and consultation with adult education institutions	Research, suggestions from all partners	12/2011 – 4/2012	All partners	
Creation of website	Designed by coordinator, cooperation of partners	From 12/2011 continuously	P1 with cooperation of all partners	
<p>Establishing 3 work groups to develop sections (S) of overall training course and teaching and training materials:</p> <p><b>Workgroup S 1</b> (Partners; P2, P3, P5) Communication, interviewing, audio editing, production of mp3 guided audio tour.</p> <p><b>Workgroup S 2</b> (Partners: P1, P2, P7) Multimedia and the public sphere. Creation of web-based tour</p> <p><b>Workgroup S 3</b> (partners P1, P4, P6) Holistic intergenerational and intercultural teaching and learning; evaluation</p>	Partners of workgroups organize their work, work contacts via email, creating first drafts of training courses and of work package for the training courses.	12/2011 – 04/2012	All partners (involved in one of the 3 work groups, compare first column), evaluation team	<b>Stage I</b>
Evaluation findings referring to work process and draft outcomes	Participatory evaluation from the beginning	12/2011 – 05/2012	P1, P7, external evaluators	

Draft versions of Sections of training courses (S1, S2, S3) Draft of training packages (teaching and learning materials)	Dissemination via website dissemination and exploitation via networking, press release (ongoing through the project) Reports of workgroups S 1-3	12/2011 - 04/2012	S 1 : P2, P3, P5 S 2: P1, P2, P7 S 3: P1, P4, P6	
First international conference in Lodz  Improved curricula and teaching and learning materials	Coordinator prepares schedule: Exchange of experience among and between work groups Feedback from research and consultation Findings of Evaluation Planning of next steps to run a train the trainers - course Planning of exploitation and dissemination	05/2012	All partners External evaluator	
Testing and evaluation of pilot sections: S 1: Lodz, Turku, S 2, Sunderland, Freiburg S 3 Budapest, Algodonales  Tested sessions and materials.	Preparation for the 3 sections along first drafts of work groups Advertising for “courses” (sessions), organizing sessions Delivery of sessions Reports by partners  Evaluation: evaluation visits, reports	06/2012 – 09/2012	All partners along their workgroups section 1-3 evaluation team	<b>Stage II</b>
1. Evaluation Research Meeting in Germany, Outcomes: Findings / adapted evaluation instruments	Analysis of data, conclusions / implications for upcoming project activities	10/2012	P1, P7, external evaluator	
Improved curricula and materials	improving sessions and materials using the findings of evaluation and the reports of partners,	10/2012 – 11/2012	All partners	
Progress (Interim) Report	Coordinator in cooperation with all partners and evaluation team	Input by all partners due: 15/11/2012	P1 input by all partners, evaluators	
Final design of train the trainers course. Curriculum of pilot course, teaching and training materials English, German	Input of all partners, work contacts via email, creating final draft of training course and of work packages by P1 and P2, feedback of all partners	12/2012	Coordinator/ P1, P2 input by all partners, Cooperation with translators	
Arrangements and advertisement for courses in 2 countries (Germany, UK)	Partners P1, P2 work locally and exchange via email	01/2013 – 02/2013	P1, P2	<b>Stage III Year 2</b>

5 day training courses in Germany and the UK findings of evaluation	Delivering courses, evaluation Feedback to Coordinator and all other partners  advertising for international train the trainers course	03/2013 – 04/2013  (continuing in 05/2013)	P1, P2, Evaluation team  All partners	
2. Evaluation Research Meeting in the UK, Outcomes: Findings / adapted evaluation instruments	Analysis of data, conclusions / implications for upcoming international	05/2013	P1, P2, P7, external evaluator	
Improved curriculum of international training course and materials	Implementing findings of evaluation into the international course design P1, P2 exchange via email via E-mail, P1 puts all together in a final draft  continuing with advertising and organizing the international course every partner advertises and sends participants	05/2013	P1, P2  All partners	<b>Stage IV</b>
International course (Algodonales, Spain), evaluation	P1, P2 , P6 organize and deliver the course	06/2013 – 07/2013	P1, P2, P6, P7 evaluation team	
Final version of course, final version of teaching and training materials audio and multi media productions, handbooks	P1, P2 put final course and materials together, based on findings of evaluation  Start of translation	08/2013 – 09/2013	P1,P2 external translators (or -where possible- Partners for translation)	<b>Stage V</b>
Second international conference in Budapest	(planned, organized by P1+P4) Exchange with experts and networks: Final corrections of curriculum and materials dissemination, exploitation, sustainability: planning future courses.  Overall evaluation  (ongoing translation)	09/2013	All Partners, evaluation team	

Final version of courses and materials in 6 languages	Delivering final translation <b>Every partner is responsible</b> to deliver his translated version to the coordinator as well as to send all materials and outcomes of their work (including dissemination-/exploitation – lists) to the coordinator	10/2013 – 11/2013	All partners, P1	
Final Report, final budget report, final evaluation report	Final Report, final budget report, final evaluation report	30.11.2013 Input , reports and evidence by partners due 15/11/2013	P1 , based on reports of partners and evaluation team	
Publication, dissemination and exploitation of outcomes: Course curriculum Training packages Handbooks Audios / multimedia productions Findings of evaluation  Networking, papers on conferences etc.	Coordinator and partners	30.11.2013	P1 and all partners Evaluation team	
Final Crosstalk – website, outcomes for free download	Coordinator in cooperation with all partners and evaluation team	30.11.2013	P1 and all partners	

## **Appendix 2**

Evaluation reports of activities in Year 2 of the project:

- train the trainers' course in Sunderland (UK)
- train the trainers' course in Freiburg (DE)
- train the trainers' course in Algodonales (SP)
- international conference in Budapest (HU)

**Sunderland Feb 2013 test course evaluation** (report by Peter Lewis, 23/03/113)

1. **Duration** The course ran for five days from Friday 20 February to Tuesday 20 February, from 10.00 to 15.00 hrs. . Various permutations for course days and times had been surveyed with potential participants: the option of running the course over a Monday to Friday working week had been rejected because several community radio participants had part-time work commitments. The final course ran 10-3 and included a weekend which also meant that the radio station and university facilities were free to use over that period.
2. **Training team** The course was planned and led by Caroline Mitchell (CM), assisted by a Sunderland University colleague, Mike Pinchin (MP), responsible for technical aspects of the course, and by Anne Curtis (AC), manager of a local software company, who was responsible for content. Both had assisted as trainers in Caroline's pilot course in May 2012.
3. **Course participants** included
  - a group of students currently on a NIACE digital inclusion project (James Murphey, Stephen Wooton, Steven Carroll, Rachel Kenny) and their peer tutor, Chris Smith, editor of the University Student magazine, Spark. Chris had several years' experience as a freelance software designer before university.
  - Ameen Al Douseri, studying for Sunderland's MA in Radio
  - Rachel Connolly, a trainer at Spark FM
  - Mel Wills and Gemma Davison, Sunderland graduates in media production/animation and currently interns giving technical support in university courses
  - Alistair Goodier, for 3 years a volunteer at the community radio station, Radio Tyneside
  - Seb Otigbah and Paul Welford, music producers active in local music production and promotion
  - Davis Smith –student volunteer in community radio in Middlesborough. Active in anti bullying campaigns with youth groups.

Traudel Günnel joined in the role of observer from the Sunday, and Peter Lewis, evaluator, from the Monday.

4. **The course programme** (full version attached 'Sunderland Spark test course template) broadly followed that of the May 2012 pilot with alterations resulting from that experience, those of the other pilots and the discussions between

COMAPP partners that followed. Some repetition in each day was necessary to allow trainees who had missed sessions to catch up.

Day 1: introduction to course and participants, working in groups; introduction to apps and kinds of content possible; introduction to mapping technologies

Day 2: acquaintance and practice with types of 'hotspot' content – narration, interviews, photos, video, poems; walk to collect material;

Day 3: editing and organisation of material; introduction to uploading content to web space, use of Word Press and OSM

Day 4: introduction to and use of COMAPP map generator, using FTP software.

Day 5: teaching methods, shaping courses for target groups, course design in a community context

## 5. Evaluation

(a) **Instruments** Nine QP1s completed at the start of the course, seven QP2s at the end. The 3 trainers completed QT2. Observation, examination of documents (course handouts etc), recording of group feedback on Day 4, and of course design summaries on Day 5, interviews.

(b) **Summary of QP1 and QP2** Although most were in some way involved in training adults (NIACE peer tutor, interns giving technical support in university courses, training Spark FM volunteers) and felt the course relevant to their needs, there were only two participants (Seb and Paul) representative of the 'trainer target group' that COMAPP aims at – e.g. social workers, youth workers, trainers working with the elderly or minority ethnic groups. CM wanted more from community radio stations but they didn't respond or dropped out at the last minute.

QP1s show that the group possessed, perhaps untypically, advanced skills in use of the media listed.

Of the 12 enrolled, around 8 were present at any one time, illustrating the problem CM referred to in the context of training methods, that continuous attendance is difficult to obtain in adult education.

Despite the coming and going there was good group feeling and satisfaction in course; '**highlights**' and **successes** mentioned included the walk and creating content, finding out about local history, understanding and implementing the technical steps to create a map, seeing how individual contributions came together in a group, realising what might be the application of what was taught in a future community or training context. **Shortcomings** mentioned included the wish for more time at certain points, e.g. exploring to find content, finding people to interview.

- (c) **Summary of QT** the three QT2 responses make many useful points. Undoubtedly, the variable presence of participants required the trainers to adapt, repeat and at points shorten the programme with the result that, e.g. there was insufficient time for teaching interviewing (AC suggested the pre-arranged presence of someone with lived experience of local history – ship-building – would have allowed a role play session). In turn, this meant, in their view, a lack of ‘authentic voices’ in the content and generally a lack of audio content. The creative writing was inspirational, the explanation of Word Press a little hurried. Hand outs worked well, saving research time. AC was pleasantly surprised by the interest in local history.
- (d) **Other notes of evaluator based on observation** The sessions I attended were examples of really successful training: a good rapport existed between trainers and participants, a readiness to attend to individual problems and at the same time to foster a group spirit. A feedback session during Day 4 illustrated the participants’ satisfaction and some excellent ideas presented in Day 5’s course design session were proof that the course had led to a good understanding of the application of what was learned in a community context.

### **Some quotations**

“it’s quite like a little taster – you might try a bit of this and a bit of that and you know now if you want to do a community project you can go from there and it’s definitely given you a skill and the mind set as well to go away and see what you can get out of it.”

“when you look at that map and you look at the area we’ve covered ....you see how much more there is of Sunderland, and how many more stories there are behind that..”

“I would love to get a local voice in it. Obviously we only had so much time. If I was to do it again I would want to make it more local sounding.”

“It does give you the skills. You could go home now and probably do it ourselves.”

## **6. Recommendations**

### **6.1 *Evaluation instruments***

QP2 section 1: instead of asking for a tick to be put in to one of ‘No opinion/not at all interesting/quite interesting/very interesting’, insert numbers 1 to 5 flanked by ‘not at all interesting’ on the left and ‘very interesting’ on the right and ask for one number to be ringed. This is not to provide statistical data (number of respondents are too small for that) but to pose a more compelling question.

QT2 more space should be provided on page 1 with some of question 7 being moved to page 2.

## 6.2 *The course*

There is no doubt, after the pilot of May 2012 and this course, that a highly promising tool has been developed which, drawing on earlier Freiburg experience, brings together local history and natural history, and the memories of local individuals, communities and institutions with contemporary cultural creativity and consumption to provide the content usable with smartphone, app and mapping technology.

The question of how much time should be devoted to ICT - the technical aspects of App creation, Open source mapping, geocaching etc - is one that was discussed in the feedback sessions and questionnaire responses.. ICT issues should not dominate the entire course. COMAPP's objective to contribute to 'e-inclusion' should not mean neglecting content - the important cultural, historical or social topics to be addressed within the various settings: audio walking tour, internet mapping or sessions on intercultural and intergenerational teaching and learning issues. The schedule of the entire course has to give enough time for these topics which, together with evaluation, should be integrated into the entire course right from its beginning and referred to continuously throughout.

What was not tested in the Sunderland course was the perceived relevance of the course to COMAPP's 'trainer target group' since various difficulties prevented recruitment from these potential users. The 5 day course in a block can be a large time commitment for people with a variety of work, volunteer and family commitments and running the course with a weekend block to start and then follow up sessions might be worth considering at local level. Other ways of marketing the course to reach these groups need to be developed.

---

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission (Lifelong Learning Programme). This publication on the project reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

PROJECT NUMBER: 517958-LLP-1-2011-1-DE-GRUNDTVIG-GMP  
AGREEMENT NUMBER: 2011 – 3978 / 001 - 001



## **Evaluation report: COMAPP pilot course in Freiburg, 12.- 13.04. / 19.- 20.04.2013**

### **1. Overview:**

The pilot course took place at the University of Education in Freiburg.

**The course programme** (see appendix 1: course curriculum) broadly followed the one of the February 2013 pilot course in Sunderland with some alterations resulting from experience and the discussions between COMAPP partners.

Day 1: introduction to course and participants, working in groups; introduction to apps and kinds of content possible; introduction to mapping technologies and interviewing, sound walk, planning of hotspots,

Day 2: acquaintance and practice with types of 'hotspot' content – narration, interviews, photos, poems; editing, introduction to the COMAPP OpenStreetMap (OSM) generator

Day 3: organisation of material; creating the map: using FTP software, website creation, uploading content to web space,

Day 4: geo caching, teaching methods, shaping courses for target groups, course design in a community context, evaluation

### **Preparation / alterations based on findings of the previous pilot course in Sunderland**

While preparing the course findings and recommendations resulting from the previous COMAPP pilot course in Sunderland in February 2013 were taken into account:

“COMAPP’s objective to contribute to ‘e-inclusion’ should not mean neglecting content - the important cultural, historical or social topics to be addressed within the various settings: audio walking tour, internet mapping or sessions on intercultural and intergenerational teaching and learning issues. The schedule of the entire course has to give enough time for these topics which, together with evaluation, should be integrated into the entire course right from its beginning and referred to continuously throughout” (quotation: evaluation report COMAPP course in Sunderland).

So – for example –in Freiburg the amount of technical content was reduced where possible. For example it was decided among the partnership that it is not necessary for the COMAPP course to teach how to work with programmes like “word press” in detail.

In the Freiburg course the underlying course philosophy (the dual role approach) worked very well and was valued very much. From the beginning trainers continuously referred to the role switch between being a learner and a trainer. Participants took over the role of a trainer and anticipated their future teaching in intergenerational and intercultural contexts. This seemed to have been very useful for participants. In the teaching and learning unit they picked up and developed ideas further and planned their own courses / teaching activities they said they would like to try out as part of their teaching in the next future.

The questionnaires for participants, too, were slightly changed according to what was suggested after the COMAPP course in Sunderland.

The detailed schedule (see appendix 1: course curriculum) was very helpful for the trainers and also for the participants as the whole course structure as well as the objectives and activities of every session were transparent.

As planned the course in Freiburg only used smart phones (and 1 iphone) for all the recordings: pictures and sound (using the virtual recorder, a free app). Wind shields were used during sound recording and were very important when recording outside of rooms.



## **Trainers**

The course was run by 3 professionals: Dr. Traudel Günnel, Andreas Klug, Monika Löffler who had been involved in developing the course from the beginning and who cooperated very well (see comments of participants).

## **General impression**

The COMAPP course in Freiburg went very well. The topic of the map produced was "village life of Littenweiler" and introduces small shops and institutions and their activities which are important for the respective quarter (see: [http://www.comapp-online.de/COMAPP\\_website\\_neu/OSMFILES/dorfleben/karte.html](http://www.comapp-online.de/COMAPP_website_neu/OSMFILES/dorfleben/karte.html)) .

All participants participated from the beginning to the end and appreciated the course very much (see below). So it was all in all a great success. The findings of the evaluation show that there are only minor issues which have to be changed and improved in order to further develop the COMAPP course (see below: conclusions and suggestions).

## **2. Evaluation details and findings**

**a) Instruments:** 18 initial questionnaires were completed before the course started, 18 final questionnaires at the end of the course. The 3 trainers completed the trainers' questionnaire (the questionnaires: see appendixes 2, 3, 4.) Observation, examination of documents (course handouts etc), notes of group feedback at the end of the first 2 days and at the end of the course, interviews with participants were other parts of the evaluation I carried out. The findings along with the results of the questionnaires let to suggestions what to change and improve (see below "conclusions and suggestions").

**b) Participants:** People with different backgrounds and age and from various professional fields such as adult education, community media, schools, youth clubs, universities (see appendix 5, summary of findings initial questionnaires) took part. Participants knew about the course through the internet, through flyers and through personal contacts. The number of participants, however, was only 18, envisaged had been 25. Among the 18 participants there were 16 male, and only 2 female a fact which did not correspond at all to the aim to attract as much women as men and to have a gender balanced course.

### **Pre knowledge and professional experience of participants**

The group as a whole did not possess advanced skills in use of the media. For example only 6 out of 18 said they had many or very many experience in using smart phones, while 13 said they had no experience at all or very little experience. Very little pre knowledge the participants also had in digital editing of sound and in geo caching. Participants had quite some experience in teaching and delivering training. For more details see appendix 5.

### **Expectations of participants**

The expectations of participants included:

- To learn about young people is talking
- To develop skills in using new media
- To learn about how to use smart phones, tablets, Apps
- To acquire skills and teaching and training methods how to use new technology in adult education, in social work and in school.

After the course participants answered to the final questionnaire (detailed findings see appendix 6)

### **What participants appreciated most was**

- to create and to work with interactive multimedia maps
- to learn to do digital editing
- to learn how to use web space
- to get detailed ideas how to use smart phones and the OSM Generator in their own teaching and learning
- how much can be learned in a limited time about how to actively use new technologies.

The trainer team got very good feedback, they were regarded as very competent, very learner centred, very open, very patient, creating a very positive learning atmosphere.

In general participants appreciated the handouts, the readers and the OSM generator. Some suggestions were made what to improve (see appendix 6: findings final questionnaires).

**Handouts** should be numbered according to a table of content which should additionally be provided.

**The OSM Generator:** to put a pin should be made easier, the compatibility with different browsers and different system software should be checked again, GPS coordinates should be created automatically for hotspots on the map.

**c) Trainers:** All 3 were very happy with the “dual role” approach of teaching and learning which stimulated participants from the beginning to think of how to integrate what they learnt during the course into their own teaching and training with different target groups. The trainers also appreciated very much the “supportive” team teaching based on a well structured course schedule which was “very well balanced between more theoretical and more ‘hands on’ parts”. They valued the success in learning of participants high – which corresponds to what participants themselves said in their final questionnaires. Handouts worked also well and were regarded helpful for participants especially during sessions in which participants worked on their productions.

What trainers thought was difficult was not to have scheduled enough time for the introduction and practice of how to do a journalistic interview. Also the geo caching session was a bit too much under time pressure especially as it took quite long to get the coordinates for the different hotspots ready and uploaded. Solving problems which arose because of a variety of different smart phones / iphones used by participants took some time: to make sure that all data and files recorded on the different phones are correctly transferred to the computers for further editing ... The trainers recommended to prepare different technical options before the course, among those providing different leads. Apps, blue tooth etc.

### **3. Conclusion and Suggestions:**

There were some observations and recommendations, which should be taken into account for the preparation of the upcoming international COMAPP course in Algodonales / Spain in June 2013:

- **Gender balance:** The COMAPP course in Freiburg was attended by 16 male participants and only 2 female participants. As important course content is about the use of smart phones and mapping it could be that women thought the course could be too “technical driven” for them and therefore did not join. Although there are quite some sessions concentrating on technical issues the whole approach of the COMAPP course including those sessions focuses

on teaching and learning: how to empower people to gather media competency. The two women participating in the COMAPP course in Freiburg were very happy with the course and underlined how comfortable they felt also when learning and trying out new technology. For upcoming courses it should be taken into account to address the issue explicitly when advertising for the course trying to directly attract women to join in.

- **Ground rules:** in Freiburg they were not established from the beginning. After participants were late after breaks the topic was mentioned and it was agreed that from a trainer's perspective it is useful to talk about and establish ground rules together with the course right in the beginning.

So ground rules should be established at the beginning of the upcoming Algodonales course.

- **Handouts, Readers:** the handouts offered during the course (see separate list at the end of this report) were appreciated very much. Participants even would have liked to have some more (how to handle the virtual recorder) and an extended version of the handout "creation of interactive maps with the OSM generator". This version should include short hints how to text for online publication, how to edit pictures and audio (size and length) and some legal issues. Also it would have been very helpful to offer copies of the handbooks (audacity, OSM, geo caching) for everybody, because that would have allowed to be able to address different levels of pre knowledge as some participants were more experienced than others.

- **Explanation and time scheduled for different topics and exercises:**

**Interview:** How to do a good journalistic interview seemed to be more difficult for the participants as foreseen by the trainers. After the introduction and explanation there was no time for an exercise to practise between participants. Instead they directly went on the audio tour to do the interviews.

It would have been much better (necessary!) to schedule more time, to do an exercise, to give short feed back and only afterwards go to do the recording during the audio walk. Also technically it needs an exercise to handle the recording with the smart phone and the virtual recorder. A handout for the virtual recorder was missing.

- **Creation of online text, editing pictures and sound**

The order in the schedule to explain what and how to do should be like this: 1. text, 2. picture, 3. audio

Text production and picture editing is quite easily explained compared to audio editing and thus needs not too much time.

It was very helpful to point out the importance of **writing for online publications**.

Participants said that they had not reflected upon this issue before.

**Audacity:** There is the danger to demonstrate and to explain too much at one time without making participants to try out. For audio editing more time must be scheduled as participants do not have experience with creative editing. For absolute beginners the task what to do could be reduced: for example only to edit the interview and to take only 3 takes. Others could use sound, too, and do a more creative piece. In Freiburg participants helped each other – which was very positive.

During demonstration by the teacher it should be shown how to import raw datas and how to convert a pcm file to an mp3 file.

- **Creation of own website, to be able to have an ftp to upload files:**

What was very good was that every participant was taught to create her / his own website where the files for creating the OSM with the generator could be put onto and later downloaded from this website. The advantage compared to only have one central website



operated by the teacher is, that everyone can use her / his website after the course when she / he wants to create more maps – independently from the website of an institution. Participants mentioned that very positively in the feed back questionnaires.

In Freiburg free web space offered by bplaced.net was used. The teaching included how to link from the windows explorer to bplaced.net by ftp – and at a later stage how to create a start page for the website using word, which is really simple.

In the overall COMAPP course schedule the unit how to create the own website has to come first before the OSM Generator is explained – as participants then can do the following exercises using their own website.

#### **- OSM Generator**

The explanation has to be done step by step allowing participants to practice. It also should be explain in detail and demonstrated on the screen how to create an html file with a text editor- If possible there should be integrated an additional feature which allows to automatically create the coordinates of the “hotspots” on the map which are composed by participants.

#### **- Geo caching**

It was fine to reduce the schedule for this topic to 2-3 hours and to concentrate on how to get the coordinates the OSM Generator automatically creates on the phones and how to search for a cache instead of also including how to create a cache. Thus the technical aspects were not overwhelming. When searching for a cache it would have been better to at least have on “real” cache deposited instead of only looking for a virtual cache.

#### **- Technical Problems:**

There were some difficulties in Freiburg to **transfer data from various smart phones and especially from the iphone to the computers**. So better prepare for different leads and maybe also for blue tooth transfer of data.

It is recommendable **to check computers** before the course starts very extensively, whether there is a firewall or some other systems installed which might not allow data transfer as foreseen.

In Freiburg there were some problems with the university’s firewall which did not occur when previously testing but occurred during the course when many participants at the same time wanted to do some operations.

#### **- Handouts**

All handouts used should have the same layout (see example attached) and carry the EU reference and the logo of the EU and COMAPP. They should be numbered.

#### **- Preparation**

Requirement to pre install apps to be sent to participants – this went very well in Freiburg, all participants who had an own smart phone / iphone came to the course with installed apps.

In the Freiburg course it was very helpful that the locations which were visited for recordings during the sound walk by participants were prepared in advance by the trainers. I.e. to prepare information and research material for background information for each location in advance; to talk in advance to people like in Freiburg a shop owner etc. who participants can interview....It is also very useful to prepare a map of the area where the sound walk takes place in which the locations are marked. See example of the map used in Freiburg. Please click on the hot spots: [http://www.comapp-online.de/COMAPP\\_website\\_neu/OSMFILES/dorfleben/karte.html](http://www.comapp-online.de/COMAPP_website_neu/OSMFILES/dorfleben/karte.html)



If the coordinates of the locations in Algodonales for the sound walk in Algodonales can be provided before the course starts, Andreas Klug (one of the Freiburg trainers) offers to create a similar map for the Algodonales course.

Detailed coordinates can easily be found by the following open street map:

<http://www.openlinkmap.org/>

If the mouse is moved down on the right side the respective coordinates are indicated very detailed.

For the course's corporate identity it was helpful to have **one** topic / headline for the audio walk and map to be produced by participants which was introduced by the trainers at the beginning of the course. In Freiburg this was "village life in Freiburg Littenweiler" (Littenweiler is a quarter of Freiburg).

#### **List of handouts:**

- Short overview over course for participants
- App pre install list (to be sent to participants in advance)
- Initial questionnaire participants
- Map for sound walk
- What do you want to include within your hotspot What shall appear if you click on your hotspot?
- Materials for research/ information on hotspots
- Basics introduction to the interview as a journalistic genre
- Developing a Hotspot Site Poem
- Virtual recorder and FreeMP3Droid
- Audacity handout
- Webspaced
- Design with the OSM generator
- Maps in the internet (osm, google)
- Geo coordinates
- Short introduction to the OSM generator
- Geo caching with Columbus
- Integration of OSM maps
- Toolbox Exercise one Design an introductory community media course
- Course outline, plan form
- Head, heart, bag, trash
- Final questionnaire participants
- Questionnaire trainers

## Comapp: Südlich der Gleise – Dorfleben in Littenweiler

Zeit	Thema	Kurzbeschreibung	Wer?	Methode, Infos, Links
<b>1. Tag</b>	<b>Freitag 12.4.</b>			
14:00-14:30	Kurs Ziele, Vorhaben	Hörspots Littenweiler, Comapp projekt Website vorstellen Handlungsorientierte Medienpädagogik, Intergenerationslernen, interkulturelles Lernen, Rollenwechsel (Pictures dual heads), T	T, A, M	
14:30-15:00	Vorstellung	2erGruppen, jede® wechselseitig vorstellen, warum sie den Kurs machen wollen Parallel: Vorkenntnisse / Stärken, die TeilnehmerInnen einbringen, auf Karten sammeln.	T	
15:00-15:30	Einführung	Zeigen von Beispielen. Internetkarten zeigen (Weingarten, singen), bzw. selbst ausprobieren (an Computern oder auf Smartphones)? Zielgruppenaspekte, Text, Bild, Tonaspekte...	A	Linkliste: <a href="http://mediensyndikat.de/dorfleben">http://mediensyndikat.de/dorfleben</a>
15:30-16:00	Aufnahmen	Ton und Bild, Einführung in die Geräte	A	
16:00-16:30	Interview	ganz einfache Einführung (Frageplan (Recherche), Fragetechnik, Aufnahmequalität: Abstand Mikrofon), handouts	T	
16:30-17:00	Hörspaziergang	Einführung: Weg, Hotspots. Aufgaben: Ton (Interview und sound) und Bilder aufnehmen, Ideensammlung für Lyriks (handouts: Stadtteilkarte, was erscheint bei Klick, Kurzlyrik)	T, A, M	
17:00-17:15	--- Pause ---			
17:15-18:45	Hörspaziergang	Vorbereitete Interviews: Gleisnost, Vogel, Fahrradladen, Pizzabox, Umfrage: Heizmann, handout Orte		
18:45-19:20	Datensicherung	Daten auf Computer übertragen – Ausschnittweise anhören		
19:20-20:00	Gruppenbildung	Gruppenbildung für Hotspots (anhand Karte) erste Überlegungen zum jeweiligen Hotspot.		
<b>2. Tag</b>	<b>Samstag 13.4.</b>			
9:00-9:15	Begrüßung	Begrüßung, offene Fragen, Plan für den Tag,		
9:15-9:45	Gruppenpräsentation	Gruppen stellen ihre Planung für den jeweiligen Hotspot vor: Welches Material, was muss gemacht werden, welches Material wird noch benötigt? „Texten“		
9:45-10:00	Einführung	Warum Bilder kleinmachen, Töne Bearbeiten, Text speziell für Internetkarten verfassen?	T	
10:00-10:15	Einführung	Einführung in Schreiben für den Hotspot (handout) A	A	
10:15-11:00	Einführung	Einführung in Audacity (mit Übung anhand der Aufnahmen der TeilnehmerInnen jeweils in der Hotspotgruppe), (handout)	A, M	

Zeit	Thema	Kurzbeschreibung	Wer?	Methode, Infos, Links
11:00–11:20	Bilder	Verkleinerung von Bildern, Ausschnitt von Bildern	T	
11:20–12:30	Gruppenarbeit			
12:30–13:15	--- Pause ---			
13:15-14:15	Gruppenarbeit			
14:15-14:45	Karten	Hintergrund zu OSM und Google maps (handout)	A	
14:45-15:45	Generator	Einführung OSM Generator mit Übung an hand von Beispielen – individuell oder in Gruppen (siehe Kursplanung Andreas)	A	
15:45-16:00	Zwischenfeedback			
<b>3. Tag</b>	<b>Freitag 19.4.</b>			
	Begrüßung	Offene Fragen Tagesplanung, Ziele	T	
	Veröffentlichung	Upload der gemeinsamen Karte (jede Gruppe lädt ihr ding hoch)		
		Angucken, Anhören, Reflektion, Feedback		
		Einführung Webspaces, homepage kreieren (handout)	A, M	
18:00-18:15	--- Pause ---			
18:15-20:00		FTP, Website creation. Alle legen eine ganz einfache individuelle Website auf bplaced.net and an.	A	
<b>4. Tag</b>	<b>Samstag 20.4.</b>			
9:00-9:15	Begrüßung	Offene Fragen, Tagesplanung, Ziele		
9:15–11:30	Geocaching	Einschließlich Suche und Reflexion. (handout)	A	
11:30-11:45	Handlungsorientierte Medienpädagogik	Ziele der Einheit	T	
11:45-12:15	Lehren/Lernen	Handlungsorientierte Medienpädagogik (ppt)	T	
12:15-12:45	Eigene Erfahrungen	Eigene Erfahrungen als Lernende und Lehrende, danach handout: toolbox, ev. Lernstile		
12:45-13:00	Kursplanung	Planung für einen Kurs, Gruppeneinteilung, Aufgabenbeschreibung, handout: Kursplanung	T	
13:00-13:45	--- Pause ---			
13:45-14:15	Gruppenarbeit			

COMAPP: Südlich der Gleise – Dorfleben in Littenweiler. Diese Projekt wurde mit Unterstützung der Europäischen Kommission finanziert.

Zeit	Thema	Kurzbeschreibung	Wer?	Methode, Infos, Links
14:15-15:00	Auswertung			
15:00-15:30	Evaluation	Einführung ppt ev. Mit Brainstorming Evaluationsstrategien, Instrumente	M	
15:30-15:40	Evaluation	head and heart Übung (erklären oder machen lassen)	M	
15:40-15:50	Evaluation	offene Fragen, feed back		
15:50-16:00	Evaluation	Evaluationsbogen		

COMAPP – Community Media Applications and Participation  
[www.comapp-online.de](http://www.comapp-online.de)

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission (Lifelong Learning Programme).  
This publication on the project reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

PROJECT NUMBER: 517958-LLP-1-2011-1-DE-GRUNDTVIG-GMP  
AGREEMENT NUMBER: 2011 – 3978 / 001 - 001





## Anfangsfragebogen für Kursteilnehmer innen (bitte vor dem Kurs ausfüllen)

---

### Erläuterung:

Wir möchten Sie bitten, diesen kurzen Fragebogen auszufüllen. Er dient ausschließlich der Evaluation und soll dazu beitragen, die Qualität weiterer Projektangebote verbessern zu können. Anonymität ist garantiert: Ihre persönlichen Daten werden nicht veröffentlicht. Vielen Dank für Ihre Mitarbeit!

---

### A Persönliche Daten

**Geschlecht:**  männlich  weiblich      **Alter:**      **Muttersprache:**

### Wie haben Sie von diesem Kursangebot erfahren?

- persönlicher Kontakt       Zeitung       Flyer       Internet  
 sonstiges, und zwar: ...

### Was machen Sie derzeit beruflich oder ehrenamtlich?

- Erwachsenenbildner\_in     Lehrer\_in     Dozent\_in     Sozialarbeiter\_in  
 Medienpädagoge/Medienpädagogin     Mitglied/Tutor\_in/Angestellte\_r im kommunalen Radio  
 Student\_in     ehrenamtliche Tätigkeit in einer NGO  
 sonstiges: ...

### B Erwartungen Kursteilnahme

Welche Erwartungen haben Sie an den Kurs?

Welche Kenntnisse / welches Wissen erhoffen Sie sich von der Kursteilnahme?

### **C      Lehrerfahrung**

Mit welchen Zielgruppen arbeiten Sie selbst / haben Sie selbst zu tun, wenn Sie unterrichten?  
Oder welche (weiteren) Zielgruppen wollen Sie in Zukunft erreichen?

Welche Unterrichtsmethoden setzen Sie ein? (z.B. Lehrkraft-zentriertes Unterrichten,  
Gruppenarbeit, Einzeltraining...)

### **D      Medienerfahrung**

Welche Erfahrungen haben Sie mit folgenden Geräten und Anwendungen:

#### **(1) Smartphone – Nutzung/ Anwendungen**

keine    ein wenig    viel    sehr viel

für was nutzen Sie das Smartphone:

telefonieren    SMS    Internet    fotografieren, filmen    Apps, z.B. ...

sonstiges:

**(2) Apps**

keine  ein wenig  viel  sehr viel

**(3) Nutzung digitaler (geografische) Karten** (z.B. Google, Open Street Map...)

keine  ein wenig  viel  sehr viel

Haben Sie solch eine Karte schon mal selbst erstellt/bearbeitet?

ja und zwar in (Google, OSM...):  nein

**(4) Geocaching**

keine  ein wenig  viel  sehr viel

Haben Sie schon mal einen eigenen Cache erstellt?

ja  nein

**(5) Computer**

keine  ein wenig  viel  sehr viel

**(6) E-mail**

keine  ein wenig  viel  sehr viel

**(7) Surfen im Internet / Internetrecherche**

keine  ein wenig  viel  sehr viel

**(8) Soziale Netzwerke** (Facebook, Twitter...)

keine  ein wenig  viel  sehr viel

**(9) Blogs**

keine  ein wenig  viel  sehr viel

Haben Sie einen eigenen Blog?

ja  nein

**(10) Fotografieren**

keine  ein wenig  viel  sehr viel

Mit welchem Medium (Smartphone, Handy, Fotokamera...)?

**(11) Filmen**

keine  ein wenig  viel  sehr viel

Mit welchem Medium (Smartphone, Handy, Videokamera...)?

**(12) Digitaler Audioschnitt**

keine  ein wenig  viel  sehr viel

Mit welchem Programm (Audacity, Adobe...)?

**(13) Tonaufnahme**

keine  ein wenig  viel  sehr viel

Mit welcher Art von Aufnahmegerät? ...

**(14) Einstellen von Dateien in das Internet**

keine  ein wenig  viel  sehr viel

**(15) Sonstige Erfahrungen:**



## Schlussfragebogen für Kursteilnehmer innen (bitte nach dem Kurs ausfüllen)

---

### Erläuterung:

Wir möchten Sie bitten, diesen kurzen Fragebogen auszufüllen. Er dient ausschließlich der Evaluation und soll dazu beitragen, die Qualität weiterer Projektangebote verbessern zu können. Anonymität ist garantiert: Ihre persönlichen Daten werden nicht veröffentlicht. Vielen Dank für Ihre Mitarbeit!

---

#### 1. Wie würden Sie für sich die folgenden **Kursaktivitäten** bewerten?

- **Arbeit mit interaktiven und multimedialen Karte**

	1	2	3	4	5	
nicht interessant	<input type="checkbox"/>	sehr interessant				

- **Produktion von interaktiven Karten**

	1	2	3	4	5	
nicht interessant	<input type="checkbox"/>	sehr interessant				

- **Einführung Geocaching & Cache-Suche**

	1	2	3	4	5	
nicht interessant	<input type="checkbox"/>	sehr interessant				

- **Einsatzmöglichkeiten von Smartphone und Kartengenerator in der pädagogischen Praxis**

	1	2	3	4	5	
nicht interessant	<input type="checkbox"/>	sehr interessant				

- **Interviewtechniken einüben, Interviews führen**

	1	2	3	4	5	
nicht interessant	<input type="checkbox"/>	sehr interessant				

- **Audioschnitt**

	1	2	3	4	5	
nicht interessant	<input type="checkbox"/>	sehr interessant				

- **Lehr- und Lernmethoden bezogen auf unterschiedliche Zielgruppen und in unterschiedlichen Lehr- und Lern - Settings**

	1	2	3	4	5	
nicht interessant	<input type="checkbox"/>	sehr interessant				

- **Kenntnisse zum Einsatz des Erlernten im Kontext von Bürgermedien, Schule, Jugendarbeit...**

	1	2	3	4	5	
nicht interessant	<input type="checkbox"/>	sehr interessant				

- **Evaluationsmethoden**

	1	2	3	4	5	
nicht interessant	<input type="checkbox"/>	sehr interessant				

2. Welche Kursaktivität oder was im Kurs hat Ihnen am besten gefallen? Warum?

3. Was würden Sie als Ihren größten **Lernerfolg im Kurs** bezeichnen?  
(Bitte beschreiben Sie kurz, ob/warum dieser Erfolg für Sie wichtig ist.)

4. War **der technische Anteil im Kurs** für Sie:  
 zu hoch                       zu niedrig                       genau richtig?
5. Wurden Ihre **Erwartungen an den Kurs** und die Inhalte erfüllt?  
 ja     nein  
Bitte machen Sie einige Angaben dazu:
6. Möchten Sie den KursleiterInnen eine **Rückmeldung** geben (Methoden, Kursmaterialien, organisatorische Dinge...)
7. Wie möchten Sie die Dinge, die Sie im Kurs gelernt haben, weiterhin nutzen? (z.B. privat, in ihrem Berufsalltag, für Aktivitäten im ehrenamtlichen Bereich... Bitte beschreiben Sie etwas genauer.)
8. Haben Sie **Verbesserungsvorschläge** für:
- a) Handouts und Lehr-/Lernmaterialien
- b) OSM – Generator
9. Was Sie uns sonst noch mitteilen möchten (bitte ggf. Rückseite nutzen)...



## Fragebogen für Kursleiter innen (bitte nach Durchführung ausfüllen)

### 1. Ort, Datum:

Name:

### 2. Wie haben Sie unterrichtet:

im Tandem (z.B. gemeinsam mit einem/einer Tutor\_in Ihrer  
Einrichtung/Organisation)

alleine

andere Varianten? (z.B. wenn sie selbst nur einen Teil  
des Kurses unterrichtet haben) Und zwar...

### 3. Wenn Sie **im Team** unterrichtet haben: Welche Funktion haben Sie übernommen und welche inhaltlichen Schwerpunkte des Kurses haben Sie übernommen?

### 4. Was hat beim **Unterrichten und** bei den **Kursaktivitäten zu** den unten aufgezählten (in Ihrem Kurs thematisierten) Inhalten/Anwendungen gut funktioniert? Was nicht so gut? (Inhalt, Methode, Tempo, Technik, Interaktion mit den Teilnehmern, die Interaktion zwischen den Teilnehmern... ) Bitte führen Sie auch mögliche Gründe bzw. Änderungsvorschläge auf.

**(a) Pädagogisch – didaktischer Ansatz** des *dual role approach*, Gruppendynamik und Zusammenarbeit in Kleingruppen

	1	2	3	4	5	
sehr gut	<input type="checkbox"/>	nicht gut				

Gründe:

**(b) Audioschnitt**

	1	2	3	4	5	
sehr gut	<input type="checkbox"/>	nicht gut				

Gründe:

**(c) Fotos machen und bearbeiten**

	1	2	3	4	5	
sehr gut	<input type="checkbox"/>	nicht gut				

Gründe:

**(d) Interviews führen, aufnehmen**

	1	2	3	4	5	
sehr gut	<input type="checkbox"/>	nicht gut				

Gründe:

**(e) Hörspaziergang/ Hörwahrnehmung (mit Unterstützung des Handouts)**

	1	2	3	4	5	
sehr gut	<input type="checkbox"/>	nicht gut				

Gründe:

**(f) Kreatives Schreiben**

	1	2	3	4	5	
sehr gut	<input type="checkbox"/>	nicht gut				

Gründe:

**(g) Karten erstellen im Open Street Map Generator (OSM)**

	1	2	3	4	5	
sehr gut	<input type="checkbox"/>	nicht gut				

Gründe:

**(h) Einführung b-placed und Website-Erstellung**

	1	2	3	4	5	
sehr gut	<input type="checkbox"/>	nicht gut				

Gründe:

**(i) Geocaching / Cache - Suche**

	1	2	3	4	5	
sehr gut	<input type="checkbox"/>	nicht gut				

Gründe:

**(j) Lehr-/Lernmethoden bezogen auf unterschiedliche Zielgruppen**

	1	2	3	4	5	
sehr gut	<input type="checkbox"/>	nicht gut				

Gründe:

**(k) Ideensammlung Einsatz des Erlernten in der eigenen pädagogischen Praxis**

	1	2	3	4	5	
sehr gut	<input type="checkbox"/>	nicht gut				

Gründe:

**(l) Einführung Evaluationsmethoden**

	1	2	3	4	5	
sehr gut	<input type="checkbox"/>	nicht gut				

Gründe:

5. (a) Was hat sonst noch (neben den Angaben unter 6.) in der **Interaktion zwischen Ihnen als Trainer\_in und den Kursteilnehmer\_innen** gut funktioniert? Was nicht so gut? Bitte nennen Sie mögliche Gründe und Änderungsvorschläge.

(b) Was hat Ihrer Meinung nach in der **Interaktion der Kursteilnehmer\_innen untereinander** gut funktioniert? Was nicht so gut? (Bitte auch hier wieder mögliche Gründe aufführen.)

6. **Wie schätzen Sie den Lernerfolg der Teilnehmer\_innen insgesamt ein? Woran erkennen Sie den Lernerfolg? (bitte Beispiele nennen)**

7. **Kursmaterialien und Technik:** Hat etwas gefehlt? Gab es Probleme?

8. **Administrative Aspekte?** (inkl. An-/Abreise, Unterkunft, Zufriedenheit der Teilnehmer\_innen mit dem Veranstaltungsort, Kinderbetreuungsmöglichkeiten... etc.)

9. Sind die Kursteilnehmer\_innen mit den von Ihnen eingesetzten **Evaluationsinstrumenten** gut zurecht gekommen (bitte mit  bestätigen, falls zutreffend):

- Anfangsfragebogen (QP1)
- Schlussfragebogen (QP2)
- Gruppengespräch/Feedback
- Sonstige von Ihnen eingesetzte Methoden und zwar...

10. **sonstige Anmerkungen/Hinweise/Vorschläge Ihrerseits** (ggf. Rückseite nutzen):



Eberhard Böß

## **Auswertung / Antworten, COMAPP Pilot Kurs in Freiburg, April 2013**

### **Anfangsfragabogen für Kursteilnehmer\_innen (bitte vor dem Kurs ausfüllen)**

---

#### **Erläuterung:**

Wir möchten Sie bitten, diesen kurzen Fragebogen auszufüllen. Er dient ausschließlich der Evaluation und soll dazu beitragen, die Qualität weiterer Projektangebote verbessern zu können. Anonymität ist garantiert: Ihre persönlichen Daten werden nicht veröffentlicht. Vielen Dank für Ihre Mitarbeit!

---

#### **A Persönliche Daten**

**Geschlecht:** 16 männlich; 2 weiblich    **Alter:** 25 – 48    **Muttersprache:** 17 deutsch, 1 englisch

#### **Wie haben Sie von diesem Kursangebot erfahren?**

10 persönlicher Kontakt       Zeitung      18 Flyer      12 Internet

sonstiges, und zwar: ...

#### **Was machen Sie derzeit beruflich oder ehrenamtlich?**

5 Erwachsenenbildner\_in

3 Lehrer\_in

4 Medienpädagoge/Medienpädagogin

3 Student\_in

3 ehrenamtliche Tätigkeit in einer NGO      ...

## **B Erwartungen Kursteilnahme**

Welche Erwartungen haben Sie an den Kurs?

Verstehen, wovon die Jugend spricht

Kompetenz entwickeln im Umgang mit neuen Medien.

Verschiedene Methoden kennenlernen, welche eventuell in der Praxis anwendbar sein könnten.

Kennenlernen von nützlichen Apps , speziell im Zusammenhang mit Schule

Möglichkeiten, wie Smartphones und Tablets in den Unterricht integriert werden können

Neue Kenntnisse im Umgang mit Smartphones

Welche Gefahren und Risiken Smartphones und Tablets mit sich bringen

Gute Schulung und praktische Umsetzung

Wie man es im pädagogischen Kontext mit Erwachsenen und Jugendlichen umsetzen kann

Erweiterung journalistischer Fähigkeiten

## **Welche Kenntnisse / welches Wissen erhoffen Sie sich von der Kursteilnahme?**

Was ein App ist???

Medieneinsatz teilnehmerzentriert einsetzen: welche Stolpersteine könnten dabei eintreten und wie sind sie eventuell zu vermeiden?

Wie kann ich Apps im Schulunterricht anwenden (eventuell auch ohne vorhandene Ressourcen)?

Ideen für Projekte erhalten.

Geocaching ausprobieren.

Ideen für den Unterricht mitnehmen.

Das nötige „Know How“

Verständnis erlangen für mögliche Schwierigkeiten und wie man denen begegnet

Einsatzmöglichkeiten im schulischen und außerschulischen Kontext

## **C Lehrerfahrung**

**Mit welchen Zielgruppen arbeiten Sie selbst / haben Sie selbst zu tun, wenn Sie unterrichten? Oder welche (weiteren) Zielgruppen wollen Sie in Zukunft erreichen?**

Jugendliche zwischen 10 und 17 Jahren

Erwachsene

Senior\_innen

Migranten

Grund- und Hauptschüler

**Welche Unterrichtsmethoden setzen Sie ein? (z.B. Lehrkraft-zentriertes Unterrichten, Gruppenarbeit, Einzeltraining...)**

Ich packe die ganze Methodenkiste aus

Unterschiedlich, vorwiegend Gruppenarbeit

Gerne Gruppenarbeit zum Erarbeiten von Erlerntem , zu Beginn eher Frontalunterricht

Eine gute Mischung aus vielen Methoden, z.Teil lehrkraftzentriert, z.T. Gruppen- und Paararbeit

**D Medienerfahrung**

Welche Erfahrungen haben Sie mit folgenden Geräten und Anwendungen:

**(1) Smartphone – Nutzung/ Anwendungen**

5 keine 7 ein wenig 2 viel 4 sehr viel

für was nutzen Sie das Smartphone:

13 telefonieren 13 SMS 12 Internet 11 fotografieren, filmen 12 Apps, z.B. ...

1 TV schauen

1 Navigieren

1 Google Maps

1 Kalender

1 WhatsApp

1 Spiegel online

1 Dropbox

1 Chat

**(2) Apps**

6 keine 3 ein wenig 5 viel 4 sehr viel

**(3) Nutzung digitaler (geografische) Karten** (z.B. Google, Open Street Map...)

3 keine 7 ein wenig 8 viel sehr viel

Haben Sie solch eine Karte schon mal selbst erstellt/bearbeitet?

2 ja und zwar in (Google, OSM...): 16 nein

1 GPS track aufgezeichnet und eingezeichnet

**(4) Geocaching**

11 keine 4 ein wenig 2 viel 1 sehr viel

Haben Sie schon mal einen eigenen Cache erstellt?

1 ja 17 nein

**(5) Computer**

keine 6 ein wenig 7 viel 5 sehr viel

**(6) E-mail**

keine ein wenig 14 viel 4 sehr viel

**(7) Surfen im Internet / Internetrecherche**

keine ein wenig 8 viel 10 sehr viel

**(8) Soziale Netzwerke** (Facebook, Twitter...)

8 keine 2 ein wenig 4 viel 4 sehr viel

**(9) Blogs**

9 keine 9 ein wenig viel sehr viel

Haben Sie einen eigenen Blog?

ja 18 nein

**(10) Fotografieren**

keine 9 ein wenig 7 viel 2 sehr viel

Mit welchem Medium (Smartphone, Handy, Fotokamera...)?

Fotokamera

Handy, Digicam

Smartphone

Kompaktkamera

### **(11) Filmen**

5 keine 8 ein wenig 5 viel sehr viel

Mit welchem Medium (Smartphone, Handy, Videokamera...)?

Videokamera

Smartphone

### **(12) Digitaler Audioschnitt**

10 keine 8 ein wenig viel sehr viel

Mit welchem Programm (Audacity, Adobe...)?

2 Audacity

### **(13) Tonaufnahme**

10 keine 6 ein wenig 2 viel sehr viel

Mit welcher Art von Aufnahmegerät? ...

USB Mikrofon

Portables Aufnahmegerät

MP3 Rekorder

Audacity Mikrofon und PC

### **(14) Einstellen von Dateien in das Internet**

8 keine 6 ein wenig 4 viel sehr viel

### **(15) Sonstige Erfahrungen:**

COMAPP – Community Media Applications and Participation  
www.comapp-online.de

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission (Lifelong Learning Programme).  
This publication on the project reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use  
which may be made of the information contained therein.

PROJECT NUMBER: 517958-LLP-1-2011-1-DE-GRUNDTVIG-GMP  
AGREEMENT NUMBER: 2011 – 3978 / 001 - 001



## Schlussfragebogen für Kursteilnehmer innen (bitte nach dem Kurs ausfüllen)

---

### Auswertung

1. Wie würden Sie für sich die folgenden **Kursaktivitäten** bewerten?

- **Arbeit mit interaktiven und multimedialen Karte**

	1	2	3	4	5	
nicht interessant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	7	11	sehr interessant

- **Produktion von interaktiven Karten**

	1	2	3	4	5	
nicht interessant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	7	11	sehr interessant

- **Einführung Geocaching & Cache-Suche**

	1	2	3	4	5	
nicht interessant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	7	6	5	sehr interessant

- **Einsatzmöglichkeiten von Smartphone und Kartengenerator in der pädagogischen Praxis**

	1	2	3	4	5	
nicht interessant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	3	13	sehr interessant

- **Interviewtechniken einüben, Interviews führen**

	1	2	3	4	5	
nicht interessant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	6	9	3	sehr interessant

- **Audioschnitt**

	1	2	3	4	5	
nicht interessant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	8	10	sehr interessant

- **Lehr- und Lernmethoden bezogen auf unterschiedliche Zielgruppen und in unterschiedlichen Lehr- und Lern - Settings**

	1	2	3	4	5	
nicht interessant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3	10	5	sehr interessant

- **Kenntnisse zum Einsatz des Erlernten im Kontext von Bürgermedien, Schule, Jugendarbeit...**

	1	2	3	4	5	
nicht interessant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	9	9	sehr interessant

- **Evaluationsmethoden**

	1	2	3	4	5	
nicht interessant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	8	8	2	sehr interessant

2. Welche Kursaktivität oder was im Kurs hat Ihnen am besten gefallen? Warum?

Teamarbeit und die individuelle Betreuung durch die Dozenten empfand ich sehr positiv. Hier wurden viele Probleme individuell besprochen und eine angenehme, kooperative Atmosphäre geschaffen

Das Erstellen einer eigenen Karte

Weil wir (ohne große Vorkenntnisse) ein tolles Projekt zusammen erarbeitet haben.

Audioschnitt

Das Erstellen der eigenen OSM – erfreut, wie einfach das geht! Kannte OSM davor nicht.

Schwer zu sagen, denn jeder Bereich war neu für mich, sodass in jedem ein Wissenszuwachs stattfand und damit auch sehr gut gefallen

Interaktive Karten erstellen. Weil individuell und Spaßig. Umgang mit Medien (verschiedene)

Der Audioschnitt, weil man da seine Aufnahme selbst hört und verändern kann.

Die Einführung in bplaced.

3. Was würden Sie als Ihren größten **Lernerfolg im Kurs** bezeichnen?

(Bitte beschreiben Sie kurz, ob/warum dieser Erfolg für Sie wichtig ist.)

Das Erstellen eigener COMAPPS und die Handhabung von bplaced, da ich denke, (ähnliche) Anwendungen privat nutzen zu werden.

Sinnvoller Umgang mit dem smartphone

Das Potenzial von Smartphones, das mir zuvor nicht benannt war, wurde mir übergebracht

Das Arbeiten mit dem OSM Generator und die vielen Anwendungsgebiete in und um die Schule OSM generieren

Webpace erstellen – mir zuvor fremd, notwendig zur Durchführung eines Projekts

Wie gestalte ich bzw. erstelle ich eine homepage war immer eine große Hürde, die man nicht nehmen wollte. Auch wenn nur in kleinem Rahmen, hat man nun ein Bild vor Auge.

Der Umgang mit Audacity zum Schneiden und Bearbeiten von Audiosequenzen. Interessant und relevant für mich, da ich dies als wertvolle Datenquelle sehe.

Konkrete Ideen, wie ich digitale Karten und Smartphones im Unterricht einsetze. Sehr wichtig als zukünftiger Geo-Lehrer.

Die einfache Verwendung von Webpace und wie einfach sich das ganze Projekt mit Hilfe von Webpace auf die Schule und den Unterricht übertragen und anwenden lässt.

Mich überhaupt mit dieser Thematik ernsthaft auseinanderzusetzen. Außerdem die Fähigkeit, das Erlernte umzusetzen. Ich werde dranbleiben, versprochen!

**4. War der technische Anteil im Kurs für Sie:**

zu hoch                      2 zu niedrig                      16 genau richtig?

**5. Wurden Ihre Erwartungen an den Kurs und die Inhalte erfüllt?**

18 ja     nein

Bitte machen Sie einige Angaben dazu:

übertraffen

Umfangreiche Medienanwendung, wobei ich teils Vertiefung und weitere Praxis benötige.

Ich hätte nicht gedacht, dass das Seminar so viele Themengebiete abdeckt!

Anfangs noch nicht so fassbar, was man alles damit machen kann. Zum Schluss Potenzial erkannt! Kreativität setzt hierbei keine Grenze

Die Vorstellung von Maps und Apps im pädagogischen Kontext wurde erfüllt, da man eigene Maps erstellt hat, interessante Apps vorgestellt wurden und immer wieder Bezug zur Erwachsenenbildung und Schule genommen wurde.

Sogar mehr als das – übertraffen! Ich hätte nie gedacht, dass ich so starkes Interesse an neuen Medien derartig entwickle.

Ich konnte vorhandenes Wissen anwenden, dazulernen und für schulische Zwecke nutzen.

Sinnvoller Einsatz von Smartphones im Unterricht.

Ich hatte anfangs die Befürchtung, nicht mitzukommen. Es wurde aber alles anschaulich und verständlich erklärt. Danke!

**6. Möchten Sie den KursleiterInnen eine Rückmeldung geben (Methoden, Kursmaterialien, organisatorische Dinge...)**

Ausgewogene Mischung aus Input (Vortrag) und selbständigen Arbeiten

Die Kursleiter\_innen sind kompetent auf die Fragen der Teilnehmer\_innen eingegangen.

Sehr bemüht und sehr kompetent.

Umfassende, gute Betreuung.

Freundlich und sehr offen!

Scheu vor Interview durch mehr Vorbereitungszeit nehmen.

Trotz 26 Stunden Kurs an 4 Tagen war es sehr kurzweilig, was auch durch das angenehme Arbeitsklima zustande kam.

Der Kurs war super aufgebaut. Die Folge von „Praktisch tätig werden“ auf „vorhergehenden theoretischen Input“ war stimmig.

Das „Tandem“ hat als Einheit gewirkt und agiert un die TNInnen im Blick gehabt. Auf technische Eigenheiten flexibel und entspannt reagiert.

Insgesamt sehr angenehm und hoher Wohlfühlcharakter

Insgesamt sehr gut, hohe fachliche Kompetenz und viel Erfahrung. Gute, übersichtliche Materialien, realistisches Zeitmanagement

Gute, kompetente Kursleitung, immer auf Fragen eingegangen und über den eigentlichen Seminarumfang hinaus gute Blätter und Erklärungen der technischen Arbeitsschritte.

Danke für eure Geduld mit mir. Genau das braucht man als Einsteigerin!

**7. Wie möchten Sie die Dinge, die Sie im Kurs gelernt haben, weiterhin nutzen? (z.B. privat, in ihrem Berufsalltag, für Aktivitäten im ehrenamtlichen Bereich... Bitte beschreiben Sie etwas genauer.)**

Noch offen

Im Unterricht / Volkshochschule

Auf Exkursionen mit Jugendlichen

Privat: Navigation und Planung von Mountainbiketouren und Wandertouren

Sowohl privat wie auch beruflich: z.B. Stadtkarte mit Informationen, Geschichtsobjekte und multimediales interaktives Lernen

Zum Erstellen eigener Caches.

Rallye im pädagogischen Kontext

Auf jeden Fall privat intensivieren und wenn möglich auch beruflich einsetzen.

Neben Maps werde ich privat sicher auch OSM benutzen. Ansonsten werde ich mit Schülern sicher auch digitale Karten erstellen.

In der Jugendarbeit , z.B. eine Geo Caching AG

In der Schule für Unterrichtseinheiten Geografie oder Geschichte

Sehr gern würde ich auf der Basis des Kurses mit Klienten eine Online Zeitung erstellen

**8. Haben Sie Verbesserungsvorschläge für:**

**a) Handouts und Lehr-/Lernmaterialien**

Keine 12

wäre gut, wenn die Handouts durchnummeriert wären

Inhaltsverzeichnis erleichtert eigene Projekte mit dem OSM

Handouts sind gut und nicht zu viel / wenig

Eine winzige nicht elementare Kleinigkeit: „lochen“. (Das wurde mir selbst mal in einem Seminar gesagt!)

**b) OSM – Generator**

Keine: 10

Funktionalität sicherstellen

Setzen der Marker könnte verbessert werden

Es gab zwar technische Schwierigkeiten, aber Potenzial voll zu erkennen

Verbesserte Kompatibilität mit diversen Browsern /Betriebssystemen

GPS Standort direkt in der OSM erstellten Karte erzeugen

**9. Was Sie uns sonst noch mitteilen möchten (bitte ggf. Rückseite nutzen)...**

Hat sehr viel Spass gemacht, diesen Kurs zu besuchen. Habe nachhaltig gelernt. Sehr freundliche und zielstrebige Truppe. Entspannter Umgang und super Atmosphäre

Danke für das schöne Seminar. Das „Du“ bringt Lockerheit rein, die bei solch einer Kursgröße eminent wichtig ist.

Die ständige Auseinandersetzung mit dem Bildschirm erfordert bei mir mehr Pausen.

Bitte weitere Angebote derart, auch wenn COMAPP als Projekt ausläuft.

Insgesamt ein tolles Seminar mit vielen praxistauglichen Tips.

Sehr guter praxisorientierter Kurs – definitive Verwendung in anderen Projekten!

COMAPP – Community Media Applications and Participation  
[www.comapp-online.de](http://www.comapp-online.de)

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission (Lifelong Learning Programme).  
This publication on the project reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

PROJECT NUMBER: 517958-LLP-1-2011-1-DE-GRUNDTVIG-GMP  
AGREEMENT NUMBER: 2011 – 3978 / 001 - 001

**Evaluation International COMAPP training course Algodonales, Spain, 5.-11.June 2013****Content:**

- 1) Preparation
- 2) Course Programme and Delivery
- 3) Evaluation instruments and findings
- 4) Final conclusion and suggestions
- 5) Literature
- 6) Appendix

**1) Preparation**

The objective of the preparation was to create a train the trainers' course "Communication, Maps and APPs" for teachers and trainers (adult educators, social workers, pedagogues, persons working in the context of community media...) from different European countries as well as accompanying teaching and training materials.

According to the COMAPP work plan the preparation of the final pilot COMAPP train the trainers' course started early. In the first year of the project the three different sections developed by the partnership were successfully tested by partners in their own countries. This phase was followed by a careful examination of the test schedules of the three test courses as well as the teaching and training materials with a view to creating the planned five day training course, taking into account the outcomes of the Year 1 experience. Emails and phone conferences among the partnership were used for continuous exchange. Two test courses on a national level were also run in Sunderland, UK and Freiburg, Germany (see separate evaluation reports) prior to the international course in Algodonales, Spain. Outcomes and evaluation results of the courses in Sunderland and Freiburg helped to improve the Algodonales course and the teaching and learning materials (see suggestions of the 2 evaluation reports).

The course schedule (see appendix 1) was jointly developed by partners based on the contribution of partners and the evaluation team P1, P2, P7 responsible for the delivery of the test courses in Sunderland and Freiburg and the forthcoming international course in Algodonales had a leading position during this process. A number of changes were made: some of the sessions of the three units, were put into a different order when composing the overall 5 day training course. Some parts originally developed in section III (teaching and learning) were already integrated into the first day of the overall course, for example the philosophy of teaching and learning and the innovative approach for training the trainers: "the dual role approach". It is still possible, though, either to run separate units which can be combined according to the focus and the time chosen, or to run the whole 5 day course. This flexibility is an important aspect of the project: since conditions for training within different organisations of adult education vary considerably, adult educators should be offered a variety of ways to apply the course content that suit their own situation.

The teaching and learning materials (ppt, handouts, readers) like the course itself were also jointly developed by partners based on the experience of the test courses.

**2) Course Programme and Delivery****Aims**

The COMAPP course is a “train the trainers’ course” and aims to enable adult educators, social workers, pedagogues, persons working in the context of community media... to contribute to the aim of “e – inclusion / digital – inclusion in intercultural and intergenerational activities by learning how to create and produce multimedia products and how to teach this to their respective target groups.

The concept for the final international pilot training course in Algodonales aimed at having a mixture of participants on the test course: staff from COMAPP partner organisations and “external” adult educators, people working in universities and /or NGOs, women and men coming from different European countries.

### **Backgrounds of participants**

Twenty participants, (8 staff of COMAPP partners), 8 men, 12 women from 6 European countries: they included adult educators, university lecturers, involved in adult education, a school teacher, staff in community media; of these several had experience of working with older people and children in informal settings. All had considerable competence in use of the internet and most in the use of smartphones and apps. What was new, and an attraction of the course, was the creation of apps and the use of OSM for interactive engagement with local history and culture. Creation of the material to be located in ‘hotspots’, involving interviewing and editing of recorded material, was new to most participants, except for those working in community radio. Even the latter, accustomed to the use of professional equipment, had not previously used smartphones for recording (see appendix 2: initial questionnaire participants and appendix 11: statistics of prior).

### **The training**

The full programme is attached. In summary, **Day 1** began with introductions of participants and programme and an explanation of the ‘dual role’ concept which required participants throughout the course to keep in mind their role as learners both of the course content and of the methods and general approach they would themselves use as trainers adapting the content for their target groups (see (Günnel 2010). On this first day, internet maps were introduced and the idea of ‘hotspots’; recording with smartphones, interviewing and the collection of sounds and images (photos); finally a ‘sound walk’ which included encounters with places, events and interviewees pre-arranged by the resident organisers. In **Day 2**, participants were shown how to save, organise and edit the material gathered, and to write brief explanatory or creative (poems) texts to accompany hotspot material. **Day 3** involved further editing, and introductions to FTP servers, uploading to servers, google maps and OSM, and the OSM generator developed in Freiburg. In **Day 4**, simple websites were created, geocaching as an activity was introduced, and illustrated in a search exercise in the vicinity. **Day 5** was devoted to discussion of teaching and learning methods and styles, an exercise in which groups designed a course which adapted what they had learned for use with chosen target groups, and a session on evaluation methods. **Day 6** was dedicated to exchange of experiences and collaboration with local institutions working in the field of adult education.

Each day included

- a session in which one of the participants did a presentation about their own work
- warm up exercises to illustrate ways that target groups could be made to feel at ease
- spaces where individual and small group comment was invited and discussed in plenary session.

## **Methodology**

The training course was (is) based on a holistic way of teaching and learning: The methodology “Action Oriented Media Pedagogy (AOMP)” developed by well known media pedagogues such as Schorb 2008, Schell 2006, Guennel 2006 and others, regards learners as active self dependent subjects who learn through action (producing media themselves), debate and reflection. Action Oriented Media Pedagogy in the COMAPP course is brought together with the “dual role approach” explained above All sessions / units and content aim to allow participants to easily apply content and materials to their own work situation once the course is over.

## **Activities of trainers**

This paragraph is based on contacts between the evaluation team and the trainers prior to the course and on interviews, questionnaires and observation used and evaluated during and after the course by the evaluation team.

The underlying training philosophy / methodology implies that the role of the trainers was more that of a facilitator than teacher. The sessions included a mix between trainer input, individual work, work in small groups, and plenary reflection and discussion. Input and information were provided whenever necessary but the focus was on encouraging the participants to try out ideas and to produce material (in small groups and individually) and, in the whole group, to reflect upon and discuss their own productions and issues that came up. Examples were: the ethics of journalistic interviews, protection of a person’s personal rights when recording sound and pictures, copyright questions, intercultural and intergenerational differences.

Participants were treated as subjects with their own history of how to learn and work. The consequence of following the underlying methodology already explained was that the trainers activated and included participants, their strength, their training needs and their contributions at every stage.

For example: the course includes several exercises to find out about skills, strengths and learning needs of participants and about the different learning styles of people and how these differences can positively contribute to the whole training. Also participants were invited to run their own session and share their experience with the whole group.

The test course was jointly run by 4 trainers (2 male, 2 female) - a mixture of teams who had run the test courses in Sunderland and Freiburg and additionally an assistant trainer from Freiburg. During the preparation of the course the trainers had an on going exchange which resulted in the course schedule and the handouts and ppts to be used during the course but as well as the agreed share of work. For the trainers it was an innovative and satisfying experience (see below). Observation during the course showed that the collaboration between trainers went smoothly and in a friendly and supportive way with no sign of competition. The course language was English – a foreign language for 3 of the trainers and the vast majority of the participants. This fact had been taken into account by the trainers in their planning: they allowed more time in the schedule for activities in the international COMAPP course in Spain compared to the ones in the UK and Germany which used the native language. Observation showed that this extra time was needed – the sessions were still ambitious and participants sometimes wished to have more time but overall, the sessions ran as originally expected. For the international trainers’ team the mixture of mother tongue and English was also an interesting experience. C. Mitchell and T. Guennel had collaborated for many years jointly delivering a number of training courses before the COMAPP project so they knew that sometimes the mother tongue speaker has to be patient when the non-mother tongue trainer expresses her/himself. Sometimes even “language help” is needed. On the other

hand the mother tongue English speakers sometime use expressions not very much in use, or speak too fast – so the non mother tongue trainers could ask on behalf of non English participants for the mother tongue trainers to speak more slowly and clearly. For the non English mother tongue participants it was very helpful to also have non mother tongue English trainers who were not perfect when speaking English. This fact encouraged those participants to dare to express themselves in a foreign language without fear to make too many mistakes.

The team work of the trainers also worked as a role model for training in a tandem, one of the innovative methodologies introduced in the “teaching and learning” session. The tandem training approach involves to teaching collaboratively with one or two other trainers, each expert in a specific subject and thus being able to cover more needs in a course. Tandem training is especially useful in intercultural and intergenerational work (see reader “training in a tandem”,

[http://www.soundnezz.de/meta/materials/unit3/unit3\\_case\\_study\\_%20handbook\\_training\\_in\\_a\\_tandem.pdf](http://www.soundnezz.de/meta/materials/unit3/unit3_case_study_%20handbook_training_in_a_tandem.pdf))

### **Activities of participants (involvement of partners)**

Many of the participants’ activities have been already described and evaluated in the paragraph above.

As have seen, participants continuously changed roles between the learner’s and trainer’s (dual role approach). The feedback of participants to this dual role approach was very positive: they pointed out that this approach made them constantly think of how to apply what they were learning in the course (for example work with the OSM generator to create an interactive map for the internet) to their own work as adult educators. By the end of the course they felt they were well prepared to directly use their new skills in their jobs.

There was continuous input by participants in relation to the different topics of the course (see above). The input of participants who where also project partners was based on COMAPP units and sessions they had developed , run and evaluated during the first year of the project in their countries. So – for example - the participants from Radio Robin Hood in Turku, Finland and from Civil Radio in Budapest, Hungary, shared their teaching experience in teaching elderly people how to operate a smart phone recorder; the participants from the University of Lodz and AlgoDoSol, Algodonales, Spain brought into the course useful strategies for teaching interview techniques to a mixed intergenerational group.

All participants during the COMAPP course collaborated in different sessions in small working groups which changed in their formation to allow as many different experiences in cooperation with colleagues from different countries. This was valued very much by all participants and led to many on going contacts after the course had ended thus contributing to a sustainable European collaboration between adult educators and their respective organisations / institutions.

### **Teaching and training materials**

In the course ppts and websites are used to support instruction and give examples (see handbook of good practice and accompanying materials). The teaching and learning materials went through several changes and improvements as the COMAPP project developed. As mentioned above in the first year 3 workgroups with different focuses (1. communication, interview, editing, guided audio walks/ 2. mapping: creation of an interactive internet based map, geo caching / 3. teaching and learning, evaluation) and composed of different partners,

developed, ran and evaluated 3 different parts of the overall COMAPP course and appropriate teaching and learning materials. These outcomes were discussed in the consortium and constituted the base for the course schedule and the teaching and learning materials for the overall COMAPP training course developed and run in year 2 of the project's lifetime. A few changes were made prior of the international course following the 2 test courses in the UK and in Germany. For example: the sessions planned for geo caching were shortened to only half a day of the overall 5 course days to make more time for sessions on the creation of the interactive map on the internet. A session on how to construct a very simple website was integrated into the course to allow participants to be independent of web masters should they want to launch interactive internet based maps when applying the course content to their regular work.

All the handouts were based on input by different partners and were created so as to directly support individual or group work during the course.

Three readers (topics: 1.digital editing of sound, 2.creation of interactive maps with the open street map generator, 3.geo caching) with more detailed explanation were created to take home and to help in applying the content to the regular work of the course participants.

In the COMAPP course only freeware is used (for example for digital editing of sound and pictures, for web space, for creating a website, for creating the interactive map) because of the philosophy of the project to encourage and to enable adult educators wherever they work to run the COMAPP course or parts of it without having to pay for any software or web space. This avoids barriers especially for NGOs and for course participants who do not have money to buy expensive software and guarantees that the course content and the knowledge and skills taught will be used and spread sustainably.

In the COMAPP course a special Map generator for open street maps( free ware) was developed to ease interactive mapping for people with limited technology know how. This generator was improved several times after testing and evaluating in the test courses during the last 1 ½ years. Some difficulties in handling the generator were noted by observation and reported by course participants. So –for example – it was not possible to change the language of the generator once the creation of a map had been started. Again there were slight changes recommended based on the evaluation of the international course in Algodonales, referring to the language choice button and tie selection of the part of the map to be shown on the screen (see conclusions and suggestions below).

### **Visit of local organisation**

The 6.day of the course was dedicated to contact local institutions of adult education or of media centres. There was a meeting with the local music school in Algodonales to learn about how this music schools operates in a small rural place and how they put into reality an intergenerational approach in their activities. Another meeting took place the same day with staff working in an interactive (media) art centre “ Fundación NMAC (Montenmedio Arte Contemporáneo), Dehesa de Montenmedio in Vejer de la Frontera / cadiz / Spain. Discussion took place as to how interactive media art including activities of visitors can contribute to the development of a critical view of media construction. Again contacts were established for further cooperation.

### **Location**

The course was run in Algodonales, Spain, a village with around 5.000 inhabitants who are very open and friendly towards foreigners. The “infrastructure” for training courses in

Algodonales is very good considering the size of the village. For example there is a training centre run by the community which COMAPP was allowed to use for the course. Of course, the infrastructure of a village cannot compete with the infrastructure of a university in a big town. For example: computers were not the latest, the DSL net of the village is slow .... These facts, however, were regarded as “an advantage” for the COMAPP course – as the course is meant to be run also in rural area by small NGOs. Participants of the course in Algodonales, especially when they came from large cities with highly developed technical infrastructure could explore rural conditions comparable to NGOs in other countries and thus prepare themselves for running the course in very different places.

### 3) Evaluation instruments and findings

Evaluation of the international COMAPP course in Algodonales included the course itself (also the process of preparation of the course) and the teaching and training materials developed for the course and consisted of different evaluation activities during the course. The evaluation team (partner 7, 1 and the external evaluator) had three short meetings, one before the course started, one during the course and a longer one after the course (see appendix 4: minutes of the meetings of the evaluation team).

Different evaluation **instruments** were used during the course

- Questionnaires

- **QP1**, initial questionnaire (20 completed, example in Appendix 2) asked participants in advance of the course to give details about their current work, their expectations of the course, their teaching experience, and their experience of media including smart phones and apps. (Appendix 11 shows the statistics).
- **QP2**, final questionnaire (20 completed, example in appendix 5) handed in during the last session of the course, asked in the first part of the questionnaire, how useful, in a grading of 1 to 5, the various aspects of the course were rated (Appendix 10 shows the results). The second half of the questionnaire left space for open answers to the questions
  - Which part / activity / unit of the course did you like best? Why?
  - What was your greatest success in learning? Why?
  - Was the level of technical information: too high/too low/about right
  - were your expectations for the activity /course disappointed in any way? Yes/no. Please give some details.
  - Do you have any feedback for the trainers? (About the course / about the methods / about teaching and learning materials / about course organisation.....)
  - what use will you make of what you have learnt during the course? (individually / as part of your work / your voluntary activities.... Please give some details)
  - suggestions for what could be improved: Handouts , readers and teaching and learning materials /The tools ( for instance the OSM – generator....)/the course in general
  - Any comments about rooms, facilities and food?
  - Any other comments (please also use reverse side).
- **QT**, questionnaire for trainers, (see appendix 3), 4 completed, asked respondents to self-evaluate their role in teaching the course and for comments on the effectiveness of the teaching and the course units in a scale of 1- 5. In addition, comments were invited on the effectiveness of other aspects of the

interaction between trainers and with the course participants, and suggestions about improvements that could be made.

As evaluation of the COMAPP project is a dynamic on going project the questionnaires were slightly changed (improved) based on the evaluation of the test courses in Sunderland and Freiburg. So for example the scaling of some answers was improved.

#### - **Other evaluation activities as part of the course**

During the course a variety of different evaluation tools was used.

- After day 1 there was a **short oral evaluation** (“flash light”) about what participants had liked most in the first day and what they would like to be improved.

- **Post-its** At various points in the course comment and feedback were invited: first, individuals wrote brief notes on post-its; these were then discussed in small groups; each group then reported in a plenary session; finally the individual notes were posted on the walls of the training room where all could examine and discuss them (see examples at Appendix 6 - 8).

- There was an evaluation on participants’ positive and negative experience as a learner and as a teacher (see appendix 6).
- There was a written mid course evaluation on cards which were pinned on the wall to share what was said with all trainers and participants (summary of findings see appendix 7).
- There was an evaluation exercise on the 5<sup>th</sup> day, “the head, heart, carrier bag and dust bin” (see appendix 8a and b) which allowed participants to evaluate the course but also to use in a training courses with different target groups including young and old people and people with different cultural back grounds.

- **Discussion summary charts** The trainer running a plenary discussion would often write the points raised on a chart visible to all participants (see photos of examples at Appendix 9a - 9d).

#### - **Observation and interviews by evaluators**

The evaluators systematically observed the course activities, the trainers and the participants and also the use of the teaching and training materials (how was it used, what seem to work well, what did not). Partner 7 (lead partner for evaluation) supported by partner 1 did this by having a “participant’s” perspective, while the external evaluator had the perspective from outside. During the meetings of the evaluation team these different perspectives were discussed and tasks (focuses for observation) were shared and determined. The external evaluator also interviewed course participants.

#### - **Findings:**

##### (a) **The participants’ experience of the course**

There was undoubtedly a very high level of satisfaction with the course. QP2, completed at the end of the course, is based on five days’ experience and is the participants’ final judgement. A glance at Appendix 10, which sums up the first part of the QP2 questionnaire, shows the concentration of high scores given to the mapping and creation of material for hotspots. This was for most the new, previously unknown skill they encountered and all found it fascinating; those who were educators could see exciting possibilities for its use in their work in the future. The process of recording and editing was new to some, but all found pleasure in the fixing of material thus gathered to a PIN on the map. Not all could claim they

would be able to repeat the process in their own teaching, though it was significant that the MD of Civil Radio, a COMAPP partner, commented “the new thing is definitely the map system. We’ve trained sound editing, but [this] technical possibility opens new dimensions”.

A university lecturer involved in adult education commented

“editing, audio walk, recording, interviewing exercises (with hand-out) – will all be extremely useful for my teaching back home.”

A similar comment came from a teacher at the start of her career

“I can use [the technical skills] for school projects and maybe later on for lessons for teaching students. It’s such a creative and easy/simple but so effective way to offer a fun project for children that are disadvantaged – using known/new technology”

Not all participants owned smartphones so some came with ones that were newly purchased or borrowed. For one, his answer to the greatest success question was “to realise the potential of using a smartphone”.

For another, the greatest success was “to record sound, bring it to the computer and edit with Audacity”.

Another commented “it was fun and work at the same time to plan the final audio material and work on it”

Alongside the technical skills learned and practised was unanimous praise for the training team, their methods, the variation in their style and their whole participatory approach,

“The trainers co-operated very well. They were a perfect team. They had a good feeling for the interaction with the participants, sometimes critical, sometimes humorous.”

“I learned a lot in terms of teaching from trainers”

“I learned so much about teaching, because the trainers were experienced experts and the trainer team had very different personalities, so I could pick up different things that could fit my [situation].”

“I really enjoyed the collaborative nature [of the work] and the skill swapping”

One comment was appreciative of the sessions where a participant explained what s/he did in their main work/project/radio station, but wished there had been time allocated for everyone to present themselves similarly.

It is interesting to compare these final, more considered responses with those written on post-it notes at the end of Day 2. There is little difference in the general direction – very favourable – but the flavour of first impressions is well conveyed by these comments in Appendix 7.

Taken away from their own working environments with all the usual interruptions and often stressful demands, the participants enjoyed the opportunity to concentrate on a single course, and valued the time to reflect “on things that I don’t have time to think about”, as well as on how the lessons learned in Algodonales, both as regards content and method, could be brought into their work at home. The responses mention the pleasure at meeting people from different countries, and the valuable informal exchanges with trainers and participants to clarify or explain what they had not understood in the sessions themselves.

The value for learning of the social setting and the personal exchanges as well as group experiences the participants enjoyed cannot be over-emphasized. From the small breaks agreed as a ground rule on the first day to the siestas, the shared meals and the evening musical entertainments, and to the final excursion which enabled further reflection and exchange, the informal communications and the fun cemented the commitment of the group. The trainers and the resident organisers are greatly to be commended on the arrangements which made this possible.

**comments on handouts / teaching and learning material by participants:**

- Handouts are good because they help us remember what we learnt
- Perfect, OK
- Too many handouts
- Could they be numbered to allow the filing of connected pieces to be a little easier.
- A file to keep things in order
- Not handed out separately but in a binder.
- Introducing the Generator: remember changing language first. Remember than once to fix the coordinates by pushing the button
- I like the little cartoons within the powerpoint
- Diagrams might help
- More info on how we get technical help when we go home and repeat the process and when applying in our own training sessions.
- I've seen some typing mistakes but all the rest is very well done.
- No comment 7

**(b)The trainers' evaluation** (QT – all 4 completed the questionnaires)

The four responses show appreciation of each other's contribution – a sign of how well the team worked together. This again supports the strength of the methodological approach "teaching in a tandem" which was not only taught in the teaching and learning sessions but was set into practice by the trainers themselves.

To follow through the sequence of sessions with both positive and negative points

**Preparation:**

- The initial questionnaire for participants (QP1, i.e. initial questionnaire for participants) needed to have been sent out sooner, well in advance of the course
- The participants' varied pre-knowledge/experience about technical skills created problems for the planning and pace of information delivery

**Teaching approach, group dynamics:**

- The approach of teaching and learning was very good due to the concept of the course, the "style" of the teachers, the open minded participants
- Participants came together very quickly as a group and the learning atmosphere was very good
- Many languages did not seem a problem, I presume via handouts and good communication
- participants reflected on their own teaching all the time. Change of input by trainers and group work worked very well
- Very good were the various presentations and inputs of participants who talked about their work and gave input to the COMAPP course. The dual role approach again was set into practise – also everybody learnt to know each other much better.
- "questions/discussions went deeper and [became] much more detailed over the days"
- I think that participants learnt a lot, they realized very good production (see the map) created their own individual ftp server... and all the time reflected on teaching and learning (dual role approach) and how to integrate parts of the course into their own professional work.
- "as we lived with the students the teaching didn't stop. This was nice but at times a little demanding"

**Technical issues:**

- the “non-university internet connection” meant that speed was slow which was often a frustration
- Some technical details did not work as well as they should but this was impossible to do better in a non university internet connection.
- Audacity: the pre knowledge of participants was very different. The explanation (input) by the trainer in the beginning was too extended for not so experienced participants. It would have been better to present the input in smaller bits. During the group work in some groups the more experienced did more of the editing and did not teach the less experienced.
- Creating OSM with the OSM generator: Good input, good handouts, participants keen to create the map. Difficulty: 1. it was not clear enough mentioned, that at first a title has to be filled in before choosing the map zoom.2. the computers and the limited internet connecting capacity in the training room caused trouble. Some participants could not upload there map.

#### **Geocaching:**

- the explanation of geo-caching was shorter than helpful and though working outside the classroom provided a good break, on the whole the trainers felt that more time should have been devoted to other technical areas (editing with Audacity, the OSM generator) and geo-caching omitted.
- Geo caching and recording on mobiles seemed to get the students working together.
- fun to leave the room and go for the search. Difficulty: it took very long time before some phones found the coordinates. It would have been better to turn on the gpx function a day earlier so that the coordinates can be found quicker.

#### **Entire course / teaching and learning materials:**

- Course feels more robust and structured than in February in Sunderland.
- Sometimes there was not enough time scheduled for participants to read the handouts carefully before starting to do their work at the computer. All in all the handouts and readers are very helpful. Slight changes should be made on the OSM Generator handout : to mention at first that you should never click into the map before having created the title of the project – otherwise the zoomed map selection causes problems, i.e. it disappears again.
- It went very well, great group of participants. I really enjoyed working with the other trainers and I appreciated inputs from participants.

## **4) Final conclusion and suggestions**

This final paragraph refers to what was presented in the earlier chapters of this report referring to the findings of the course evaluation.

Besides some minor changes which are listed below the COMAPP course (content, structure methodology, delivery, teaching and learning materials) seems now to have achieved its final sustainable form. The final course run in Algodonales was very successful and proved to be a really innovative training for trainers to cover new media and IT technology as well as intergenerational and intercultural approaches in media education. Thus the objectives of the project were matched very well.

During the past 18 months the course and the course materials had been jointly created by the consortium, pilot versions had been tested by partners in different countries. These pilot courses had been evaluated. Based on the findings of the evaluation and in close interaction between partners the final course had then been created.

The following suggestions should be taken into account when, during the next months, the partners complete and publish the final version of the course and the accompanying teaching and learning materials:

- The initial questionnaires for participants should be sent out to participants early before the course starts, asking participants to fill them out and send them back to the trainers. Thus the training course can be prepared taking into account the participant's pre knowledge, skills and learning needs right from the beginning.
- The handouts were very much valued by trainers and participants. To provide a good overview of handouts referring to different units of the course all should be numbered in their order of use during the course. Also binders / files should be provided for participants to keep handouts in a practical order.
- Some handouts should be improved a little: the one referring to the use of the OSM Generator should be structured in a better way and should integrate the changes to be made in the OSM Generator itself. The handout to set up a website should also be structured in a way to provide a better overview about the steps to follow. The handout which introduces the course planning exercise needs a more precise indication of what is expected from the participants in the exercise.
- The OSM Generator has to be slightly changed: 1. it has to be indicated that the language choice has to be made right at the beginning of working with the generator. 2. The generator has to be programmed as to allow the title of a project to be entered even when the map zoom has already been fixed.
- COMAPP has developed three very helpful readers (1. creating maps with the OSM generator; 2. digital editing with Audacity; 3. geo caching) which provide in-depth information for the relevant subjects. These readers should be introduced to course participants before the topics are taught in order to allow participants with more pre-knowledge to get into the subject in more detail during the course of the training.
- In the upcoming handbook for the training course geo-caching should be mentioned as an option which need not necessarily be included if – for example - it is decided to teach other units more intensively instead.

## 5) Literature

Günzel, Traudel (2006). Action – oriented Media Pedagogy. In: Peter Lewis & Susan Jones (eds). *From the Margins to the Cutting Edge-Community Media and Empowerment*, Hampton Press. pp 41-65.

Günzel, Traudel (2010). : META (Media Training Across Europe In: Medien im Deutschunterricht 2007. kopaed, Muenchen. pp. 171-173

Schell, Fred 2006: Handlungsorientierte medienpädagogische Praxis. In: merz, medien und erziehung, Jg. 50 H.5, S. 38-48 !!

Schorb, Bernd (2008). Handlungsorientierte Medienpädagogik. In Sander, Uwe/von Gross, Frederike/ Hugger, Kai-Uwe(Hrsg.) *Handbuch Medienpädagogik*. Wiesbaden, VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, S. 75-86

## 6) Appendix

- 1) Course curriculum
- 2) Initial questionnaire for participants (QP1)

- 3) Questionnaire for trainers (QT)
- 4) Minutes meetings evaluation team
- 5) Final questionnaire for participants
- 6) Teaching and Learning experience participants
- 7) Mid course evaluation
- 8a + b) Evaluation exercise “head, heart...”
- 9a-d) Summary, pictures: charts
- 10) Statistics QP2, final questionnaire
- 11) Statistics QP1, initial questionnaire

## Comapp: International course in Algodonales 5.6.-11.6.2013

	Time	Topic	Description	Who?	Methods, Materials, Links, handouts
<b>Wednesday 5.6.13</b>					
	19:00-21:00	Welcome meeting	Arrival, introduction, dinner,		
<b>Day 1</b>	<b>Thursday 6.6.13</b>				
	10:00-10:30	General aims, introduction	Comapp project presentation of Website, hotspots Algodonales Action oriented Media Pedagogy, holistic approach, intergenerational and , intercultural Learning, role switch (Pictures dual heads),	T & C	ppt <a href="#">COMAPP</a> , <a href="#">Dorfleben Littenweiler</a>
	10:30-11:00	Introduction to group	Introduction to group: soundbox intros. Activity Working in pairs each pair chooses a sound or two to introduce themselves and talk a little bit about why they are doing the course.	C	soundboxes
	11:00-11:10	Ground rules	Group discussion (plenary). Establishing ground rules for the course	T	Flip chart, pencils
	11:10-11:50	Skills in the group	Fiesta! skills exercise. What skills do we have as a group? General skills, good at..., Media, Smartphones and apps. Also discuss how much they use smart phones also listing strengths and weaknesses as a group Activity: Organise a party and blog it to your mum.... working in groups of 3-4 Exercise - Introduction by trainer (5 Min) - Write down what skills and experience you have-top 5 or each(10) - Discuss cards in groups of 4 (10 Min) (put cards on wall) (15 Min) -Organise a party-who does what -Put it on line	C	Cards, pencils
	11:50-12:15	Exploration of internet maps	Demonstration and exploration of internet maps- who is our target group? How do we integrate text, sound and images? Target group of internet map (participants could explore for themselves) and discuss in plenary	A,M	Linklist, websites: Weingarten, Singen, Sunderland <a href="#">.BfR</a>

	Time	Topic	Description	Who?	Methods, Materials, Links, handouts
	12:15-12:30	Break			
	12:30-13:00	Introduction to recorders	Recording of sound and pictures. Introduction to smartphones	A,M	
	13:00-13:30		participants present work about their project /media work/station		
	13:30-17:00	Break			
	17:00-18:00	Interview	Introduction to interviewing. Research, questions, technical aspects, microphones	T	Ppt, handout
	18:00-18:30	Introduction to sound walk	Route, Hotspots, Tasks (Ideas and collection of sounds, ambient recordings, creative writing etc. interview and sounds) groupbuilding	C & T	Ppt, handouts, research materials ferferring to hotspots
	18.30 -20.00	Sound walk	Walking tour with recording including appointments with some people of local interest to be interviewed and example of developing a hotspot poem in situ (early in walk)		map
	<b>Day 2</b>	<b>Friday 7.6.</b>			
	10:00-10:30	Warming up, objectives	Warming up exercise, open questions, objectives, planning for day ahead	C & T	
	10:30-11:00	Planing for group map	Plenary: what did we gather? Building/drawing a group map that includes hotspots. Who is in each group and what are they trying to achieve	C & T	Flip chart
	11:00-11:45	Saving data	Save all media data and put them on the computer. Listening to some examples	A,M,T,C	Leads,
	11:45-12:30	Detailed planning in groups	Groupwork, groups plan their hot spot. What additional materials do groups need?		material hot spot table checklist prepared by Caroline handout
	12:30-12:45	Break			
	12:45-13:00	Introduction to text, pictures, sound for maps	Why and how to reduce size of pictures How to compose text and edit down sound for internet maps.	T	handout
	13:00-13:30	Input by participants	participants present work about their project /media work/station		
	13:30-17:00	Break, lunch			
	17:00-17:15	Introduction to composition of online text	how to write for small spaces	C	handout

Time	Topic	Description	Who?	Methods, Materials, Links, handouts
17.15-18.45	Creating text	Groups write their text for the hot spot		
18:45-19:00	Editing pictures	How to reduce of size of pictures, cropping of pictures – exercise	T	handout
19:00–19:45 19:45-20:00	Editing sound	Introduction to Audacity, participants edit their hotspot recordings. Short feed back of first 2 days	A	Handout, reader
<b>Day 3 Saturday 8.6.</b>				
10:00–10:15	Objectives	planning for day ahead	C,T,A,M	ppt
10:15-11:45	Editing for hotspots	Group work on hot spots (text, sound, pictures).		
11.45- 12.00	Break			
12:00–13:00	Establish ftp server	FTP, Space for Websites, Everyone establishes an individual FTP server with bplaced, wordpress etc . Upload of files using individual FTP server	A,M	handout
13:00-13:30	Input by participants	participants present work about their project /media work/station		
13.30-17.00	Break, lunch			
17:00-17:30	OSM, Google maps	Background information to OSM, Google maps. Comparison of systems employed by map suppliers: Respective strengths and weaknesses	A	Handouts, link list
17:30-18:30	Generator, introduction and exercise	Introduction to OSM generator. Participants are introduced to the generator. Individual work to input hotspots: Participants construct first elements of map, integrating visual elements and sound	A,M	Handout, reader
18:30-18:45	Break			
18:45-19:30	Composition of group map	Uploads for the group map. Participants´ exercise with OSM continues	A,M	
19:30-20:00	Reflection, feed back	Presentation of group map, reflection and feedback in plenary	T,C;M,A	
<b>Day 4 Sunday 9.6.</b>				
10:00-10:30	Warm up, objectives	Warm up exercise, Open questions, objectives, planning for day ahead	T & C	

Time	Topic	Description	Who?	Methods, Materials, Links, handouts
10:30-12:00	Creation of website	Everybody creates a very simple website	A & M	
12:00-12:15	Break			
12:15-13:00	Introduction to geo caching	Geocaching as an intellectually demanding GPS based outdoor game.	A	Handout, link list: Link <a href="#">open caching</a>
13:00-13:30	Input by participants	participants present work about their project /media work/station		
13:30-17:00	Break, lunch			
17:00-18:00	Import of cache files to smart phones	Find ,download, and use online geo cache information( smart phones, outdoor devices). Participants download gpx files from the map /import the cache file into the app	A,M	Handout, reader, app on smart phone
18:00-19:00	Outside search for caches	Participants search caches with their smart phones		
19:00-20:00	reflection and adaptation for participant projects	Open questions geo caching, ideas for use in different settings, feed back		
<b>Day 5</b>	<b>Monday 10.6.</b>			
10:00-10:15	Warm up	Exercise	C & T	
10:15-10:20	Objectives	planning for day ahead	C	ppt
10:20-10:50	philosophy of teaching/learning.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The learning cycle</li> <li>- training in community media.</li> <li>- Action oriented media pedagogy,</li> <li>- holistic, interactive, student –centred approaches</li> </ul>	T & C	ppt
10:50-11:30	Experiences of teaching and learning	Exercise, participants put down their experience as learners and teacher, discussion in small groups, exchange in plenary	C & T	Cards, pencils
11:30-11:45	Learning styles	Introduction by trainer, discussion in plenary	C	handout
11:45-12:00	break			
12:00-12:30	Input by participants	Working with Special interest groups Community tutors/peer educators Tandem training Specialist techniques for different groups-eg migrants, women.		ppt, handout: toolbox

	Time	Topic	Description	Who?	Methods, Materials, Links, handouts
			Toolbox of possible group work activities and teaching methods (Possible participant presentation)		
	12:30-13:30	Course Design for community media course (specify target group)	Introduction. Divide into groups -Preparation-work on presentations in groups -Define course aims, content and approach - What skills and knowledge do you want the trainees to learn?	C & T	Handouts: course outline / plan form Groups will each present what they are doing on large white paper / feedback from everyone.
	13:30-17:00	Break lunch			
	17:00-18:00	Course presentation	Groups present courses followed by questions and feedback		Participants could be divided into 2 feedback rounds to save time
	18:00-18:15	Objectives	Introduction to evaluation session	T	ppt
	18:15-18:35	Information on evaluation	Trainer provides basic information	T	ppt
	18:35-18:50	Brainstorm methods, instruments	Brainstorm on different evaluation tools people have experience of	C	Flip chart
	18:50-19:20	Evaluation exercise	Head Heart Carrier bag.....evaluation exercise and handout	C & T	Large paper, cards in 4 colours, pencils
	19:20-19:30	Open questions	Plenary discussion		
	19:30-20:00	Course evaluation	Participants and trainers fill in COMAPP questionnaire		questionnaires
<b>Day 6 Tuesday 11.6.</b>					
		All day	excursion		



**Eberhard Böß / Monika Löffler / Dr. Peter Lewis**

PROJECT NUMBER: 517958-LLP-1-2011-1-DE-GRUNDTVIG-GMP, AGREEMENT NUMBER: 2011 – 3978 / 001 - 001

**Innitial questionnaire for course participants (please fill in before the course starts)**

---

**Annotation:**

We would like to ask you to fill in this short questionnaire. The questionnaire is used only for evaluation purpose. It can help to improve the quality of future project activities. Anonymity is guaranteed: your personal data will not be published. Thank you very much for your support!

---

**A Personal data**

**Gender:**  male  female      **Age:**      **Languages spoken:**

**How did you learn about the course?**

- personal contact       newspaper       flyer       Internet  
 other, namely: ...

**What is your current occupation or voluntary work?**

- adult educator /  school teacher /  professor / lecturer /  social worker /  
 member / staff in community radio /  student /  volunteer at NGO  
 other.....

**B Expectation**

What do you want to gain from the course?

What new knowledge and new skills would you like to acquire?

### **C Teaching experience**

What target groups do you usually work with or intend to work with?

What training methods do you normally use? (for example: lecturing, group work, one to one training, learner centred, teacher centred, etc.)

### **D Media experience**

What experience have you had personally using the following media and communications applications?

:

#### **(1) Smartphone – use / application**

none  a little  quite a bit  a lot

If you use smartphones: what for?

telephone  SMS  internet  taking pictures  videos  apps (please give examples)

others.....

#### **(2) Apps**

none  a little  quite a bit  a lot

#### **(3) Use of digital / virtual (geographic) maps (e.g.. Google, Open Street Map...)**

none  a little  quite a bit  a lot

Did you ever create / edit such a map?

yes, with (Google, OSM...): no

**(4) Geocaching**

none a little quite a bit a lot

Did you ever create an own cache?

yes no

**(5) Computer**

none a little quite a bit a lot

**(6) E-mail**

none a little quite a bit a lot

**(7) Web surfing / web research**

none a little quite a bit a lot

**(8) Social networking** (e.g. facebook, twitter...)

none a little quite a bit a lot

**(9) Blogs**

none a little quite a bit a lot

Have you got your own blog?

yes no

**(10) Taking still pictures**

none a little quite a bit a lot

Please say with what device (e.g. mobile phone , digital camera...).....

**(11) Taking moving pictures**

none a little quite a bit a lot

Please say with what device e.g. (mobile phone , digital camera, film / video camera...).....

**(12) Digital editing**

none  a little  quite a bit  a lot

What software did you use? (e.g. Audacity, Adobe...).....

**(13) Audio recording**

none  a little  quite a bit  a lot

Please say what kind of recorder.....

**(14) Uploading materials onto websites**

none  a little  quite a bit  a lot

**(15) Any other experience:**



## Questionnaire for Trainers – for use at end of activity / course

### 1. Place, date:

Name:

#### Did you teach:

Training Tandem ? (for instance: media tutor/s, working alongside partner organisation...)

Training alone?

Other variations? (for instance: if you only taught parts / a part of the course). Which parts...

### 2. If you taught in a team: What was your role?

Which parts / units of the course did you teach? What was your main focus?

### 3. Please comment (where applicable) on the **effectiveness of the teaching** and on the **course units** relating to what is listed below. Please refer to the content, the methods, the timing, technical issues, interaction with participants and between participants. Please also mention reasons and suggestions for possible changes.

**(a) Approach of teaching and learning, the dual role approach, dynamic of the group, collaboration between participants during group work**

	1	2	3	4	5	
Very good	<input type="checkbox"/>	not good				

Reasons:

**(b) Audio editing**

	1	2	3	4	5	
Very good	<input type="checkbox"/>	not good				

Reasons:

**(c) Taking and editing pictures**

	1	2	3	4	5	
Very good	<input type="checkbox"/>	not good				

Reasons:

**(d) Doing and recording interviews**

	1	2	3	4	5	
Very good	<input type="checkbox"/>	not good				

Reasons:

:

**(e) Sound walk, sound perception (supported by the handouts)**

	1	2	3	4	5	
Very good	<input type="checkbox"/>	not good				

Reasons:

**(f) Creative writing for hotspots**

	1	2	3	4	5	
Very good	<input type="checkbox"/>	not good				

Reasons:

**(g) Creation of maps with the Open Street Map Generator (OSM)**

	1	2	3	4	5	
--	---	---	---	---	---	--

Very good                        not good

Reasons:

**(h) Introduction / creation of website with b-placed**

                          1        2        3        4        5  
Very good                        not good

Reasons:

**(i) Geo caching / search for a cache**

                          1        2        3        4        5  
Very good                        not good

Reasons:

**(j) Teaching / learning methods for different target groups**

                          1        2        3        4        5  
Very good                        not good

Reasons:

**(k) Applying course content to teaching contexts**

                          1        2        3        4        5  
Very good                        not good

Reasons:

**(l) Evaluation (introduction and exercise)**

                          1        2        3        4        5  
Very good                        not good

Reasons:

4. **(a)** Please comment on the **effectiveness of other aspects** of the interaction between yourselves as trainers and the course participants (besides those listed above). Please mention reasons and make suggestions what to improve.

**(b)** What would you say worked well in the **interaction between course participants**? What worked not so well? (Please give reasons).

5. What do you think of the **success / achievement of the participants** in general? How did you observe / register the achievements in learning? (Please give examples).

6. **Course materials and equipment:** What was missing? Problems?

7. **Administrative aspects?** (including travel, accommodation, participants' comment on arrangements at venue, childcare etc...)

8. Did the moments of **evaluation** for participants work? Please "tick"

- Questionnaire at start (QP1)

- Final questionnaire (QP2)

- Group discussion

Others (which).....

9. Space for **additional comments** (please also use reverse side)

## **Minutes of meetings of evaluation team along the international COMAPP course in Algodonales**

Prior to the evaluation of the international COMAPP course in Algodonales /Spain an extended exchange had been taken place between the evaluation team and the partners involved in preparation of the course. The input by the evaluation team was based on the evaluation of the 2 prior pilot courses in Sunderland (02/2013) and in Freiburg (04/2013) and the discussion with partners about suggested changes and improvements (see evaluation reports Sunderland course and Freiburg course).

Additional to the meetings reported below there were short meetings after every day of the Algodonales course to have a short daily exchange of experience among the evaluation team.

### **1. Meeting of the evaluation team 05.06.2013**

**Participants:** Eberhard Boess, Monika Löffler and Peter Lewis

#### **Topics:**

1. Evaluation instruments
2. Share of work between team / main focus of each member of the team

#### **1. Evaluation instruments**

The following instruments had been suggested by the evaluation team and had been agreed upon by partners to use for the evaluation of the Algodonales COMAPP course in order to collect a wide range of feedback, impressions and opinions based on different ways of collecting data.

- QP1, initial questionnaire
- QP2, final questionnaire
- QT, questionnaire for trainers,
- short oral evaluation (“flash light”)
- Post-its: individuals, small groups, reports in plenary, individual notes posted walls + and - experience as a learner and as a teacher
- mid course evaluation - cards pinned on the wall
- Head, heart, carrier bag and dust bin
- Discussion summary charts: Trainer writes points on a chart visible to all participants
- Observation and interviews by evaluators

The instruments had been prepared earlier and had been presented to and discussed with the partners prior to the course. At the meeting of the evaluation team the instruments were reviewed and it was planned in detail when in the course of the course which instrument should be used and who should introduce and lead the respective evaluation activities. It was agreed that some of the activities (bullet points 4-8 from the above list) were introduced and run by the trainers of the course, as evaluation as a topic plays an important part in a train the trainers course like the COMAPP course and should be integrated into teaching activities. So if the trainers of the COMAPP themselves carry out evaluation sessions they are positive role models for participants who will later incorporate evaluation into their own training with different target groups.

#### **2. Share of work between team / main focus of each of the team**

It was decided that the evaluation team should act in different roles during the course. EB and ML should evaluate the course and the teaching and learning materials more from a “participant’s” perspective – i.e. they take part in the course and experience the course as a “participant” doing all the activities together with the other participants while at the same time observing the trainers and their way of teaching, reviewing the activities, the teaching and learning materials, the group dynamics. They are going to take notes.

PL as the external evaluator, in contrast, observed the trainers, the participants, their activities, the group dynamics and the use and the suitability of the teaching and learning materials from an “outside” perspective.

It was agreed to have a very short meeting after every course day for a short exchange and to see whether the share of work is working well.

## **2. Meeting of the evaluation team 07.06.2013**

**Participants:** Eberhard Boess, Monika Löffler and Peter Lewis

The meeting took place after day 2 of the course. It was scheduled to exchange findings and impressions about the first 2 days of the course and – in case this would be necessary – to suggest changes / corrections of the course curriculum, the activities, the teaching for the next days.

### **Topics**

1. Exchange of first experience and draft findings – consequences
2. Share of work between team / main focus of each of the team

#### **1. Exchange of first experience and draft findings – consequences**

The evaluation team examines the first draft of findings and exchanges and discusses their observations:

After day 2 of the overall course the impression and first draft of evaluation results (based on the oral feed back round (“flashlight”) at day 1, on the short written feed back at the end of day 2 and observation and talks) show that the course is developing very well. The course sessions are in time according to the schedule. The activities (sound walk, recording, production of pictures, text and sound) develop as planned. Participants gave very positive feedback, the trainers are happy with their collaboration. So there is no need to implement any changes at this stage.

#### **2. Share of work between team / main focus of each of the team**

The different roles of the members of the evaluation team work well. EB and ML experience the excitement of participants and the dynamics of teamwork in working groups during production. They also report about quite some “side talks” between participants about how to implement course content into future daily work.

Both, EB and ML think that the short daily meetings of the evaluation team are very important – for exchange of observations and also for reminding them to systematically write down their notes every night

## **3. Meeting of the evaluation team 11.06.2013**

**Participants:** Eberhard Boess, Monika Löffler and Peter Lewis

The meeting took place after the end of the course.

## Topics

1. Exchange of experience and findings
2. Division of work to analyse data, timetable
3. Structure of evaluation report
4. Preparation of up coming evaluation

### 1. Exchange of experience and findings

All originally planned evaluation instruments had been applied. The data now need to be analysed. All members of the evaluation team expressed that their first impression

- of the entire course,
- of how it was delivered,
- of the outcomes ( audio guide and OSM map produced by participants, ideas of how to apply the content into participants daily work)
- and of the quality of the teaching and learning material was very satisfying.

The congruent impression of the members of the evaluation team (which is not yet based on detailed analysis of the evaluation data) is that the feed back of participants and trainers is positive and helpful – also giving some details of (minor) issues that should be improved for the final version of the course curriculum and the teaching and learning materials. They suggested for example to improve some handouts: the one referring to the use of the OSM Generator, the handout to set up a website and the handout which introduces the course planning exercise. They also suggested to slightly change the OSM Generator.

### 2. Division of work to analyse data, timetable

The evaluation team agreed that the evaluation report of the COMAPP course should be ready as soon as possible – to enable partners to integrate suggested changes and to improve the course curriculum and the teaching and learning materials in order to get the final versions ready and – in a second step – translated into the partner languages.

So it was envisaged to present the report by mid July the latest. It was decided that EB analyses the questionnaires, PL the short oral evaluation, the post-its, the mid course evaluation, the evaluation exercise “head, heart, carrier bag and dust bin” and the summary charts. EB, PL and ML each structure the notes they took. All findings are to be exchanged by 24.06.2013. After discussion of the findings among the evaluation team via email and skype EB and PL will compose the first draft of the evaluation report. It is envisaged to present the first draft to the team at the 05.07.2013 the latest for discussion and revision and to send the report to the partners by 15.07.2013. Afterwards discussion and exchange among the consortium is foreseen via email and skype.

### 3. Structure of evaluation report

The evaluation team discussed how to structure the COMAPP course evaluation report and agreed upon the following issues to be part of the report:

- Preparation
- Course programme and delivery
- Evaluation instruments and findings
- Final conclusion and suggestions
- Appendix containing the detailed findings and examples of the evaluation activities

#### 4. Preparation of up coming evaluation

At the final COMAPP conference in Budapest in September 2013 there will be a session on evaluation which will be prepared mainly by EB and PL in exchange with ML. One important issue will be to evaluate the cooperation and collaboration of the partners. It was decided that EB will prepare an appropriate questionnaire which also will be the starting point for a following discussion. The project's outcomes and the dissemination and exploitation of results and outcomes will also be part of the evaluation in Budapest, prepared by ML. To evaluate the conference PL will prepare a short questionnaire. The evaluation team decided to start the detailed preparation of the evaluation of the Budapest conference after mid July.

Draft outlines for the final evaluation report which has to be composed after the Budapest conference were also discussed:

The team recommends to integrate into the final evaluation report the evaluation reports of year 2 of the project, as they show the development of the project in detail.

The final evaluation report should show findings along 4 categories:

1. the courses developed and delivered
- 2 teaching and learning materials (handouts, the 4 handbooks / readers,
- 3 target groups that were reached (participants and exploitation, dissemination)
- 4 collaboration of the partners

Also a future perspective how the outcomes might be used by whom (sustainability) should be pointed out.

The evaluation of the project itself – how did it work – should be presented, too.



**final questionnaire for course participants (please fill in at end of course)**

---

We would like to ask you to fill in this short questionnaire. The questionnaire is used only for evaluation purpose. It can help to improve the quality of future project activities. Anonymity is guaranteed: your personal data will not be published. Thank you very much for your support!

---

**Personal data**

**Gender:**  male  female

**Age:**

**Languages spoken:**

1. Please indicate how useful you found the different parts of the activity / course

- **Researching and developing content for interactive maps including the sound walk**

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not interesting	<input type="checkbox"/>	very interesting				

- **Learning about, practising and doing journalistic interviews**

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not interesting	<input type="checkbox"/>	very interesting				

- **Creating hot spots using photographs, text, narration, sounds**

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not interesting	<input type="checkbox"/>	very interesting				

- **Digital audio editing**

	1	2	3	4	5	
Not interesting	<input type="checkbox"/>	very interesting				

- **Working with interactive digital maps**

Not interesting      1      2      3      4      5      very interesting  
                       

- **Using the COMAPP OSM generator to create a map**

Not interesting      1      2      3      4      5      very interesting  
                       

- **Creating a website and transferring the OSM map on to the web**

Not interesting      1      2      3      4      5      very interesting  
                       

- **Introduction of geo caching & search of a cache**

Not interesting      1      2      3      4      5      very interesting  
                       

**Applying what you have learnt about smart phones, creation of interactive maps, geo caching to your own teaching and learning setting**

Not interesting      1      2      3      4      5      very interesting  
                       

**Teaching and learning techniques for work with different target groups in different settings (e.g. adult education centres, community media, schools, youth clubs...)**

Not interesting      1      2      3      4      5      very interesting  
                       

- **Evaluation strategies and instruments**

Not interesting      1      2      3      4      5      very interesting

2. Which part / activity / unit of the course did you like best? Why?

3. What was your greatest success in learning? Why?

4. Was the level of technical information:

too high

too low

about right

5. were your expectations for the activity /course disappointed in any way?

yes  no

Please give some details!

6. Do you have any feedback for the trainers? (About the course / about the methods / about teaching and learning materials / about course organisation.....)

7. what use will you make of what you have learnt during the course? (individually / as part of your work / your voluntary activities.... Please give some details!)

**8. suggestions** for what could be improved: :

a) Handouts , readers and teaching and learning materials

b) The tools ( for instance the OSM – generator....)

c) the course in general

**9.** Any comments about rooms, facilities and food?

**10.** Any other comments (please also reverse side)

Name (optional).....

Thanks!

---

COMAPP – Community Media Applications and Participation  
www.comapp-online.de

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission (Lifelong Learning Programme).  
This publication on the project reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use  
which may be made of the information contained therein.

PROJECT NUMBER: 517958-LLP-1-2011-1-DE-GRUNDTVIG-GMP  
AGREEMENT NUMBER: 2011 – 3978 / 001 - 001



## **Appendix 7: evaluation on participants' positive and negative experience they had made in their life with having been a learner and having been a teacher**

### ***Learning- Positive***

Patience, no panic; good friendly atmosphere; practical – end product; sense of ownership; removal of control; student-led; voice

### ***Learning- Negative***

Dry/theory curriculum; teacher-led; school methods; large groups; bureaucracy, paper; fear of seeming stupid; physical/psychological; parents'/teachers' expectations; pressure – time; preconceived prejudices

### ***Teaching – Positive***

Humour x 2; personality; balance between doing it for someone and DIY; seminars, workshops; TRUST “let them go”; leading/helping

### ***Teaching – Negative***

Students sceptical of new methods; remembering names; lecturing; working against another teacher; teacher talks too much

### **Written Evaluation Day 2.1**

#### Positive

- We were intensely (?) supported by the technical problems of the digital transfer. All the subjects were prepared carefully. [*Nothing negative*]
- Audacity. Good morning start [*Nothing negative*]
- I like the diversity of subjects and tool we are using to get an objective. The course very attractive and interesting. I like also the opportunity we have to be ‘trainer’ and trainee’ [*Nothing negative*]
- The pace of the course for me is perfect. There is also enough time to take on board and practice with equipment. Also the group I am in has allowed me to be removed gently out of my comfort zone but with the support and encouragement not to leave me too insecure or drowning. [*Nothing negative*]

### **Written Evaluation Day 2.2**

- (1) very helpful and supportive trainers (2) good trainer to trainee ratio (3) very good balance of hands-on practical experience and taught sessions (4) very interesting to hear of other group members’ projects. Nothing negative
- [...] project. [...] supportive learning (trainers). Meeting new friends, working together, learning from each other. Room for improvement: can’t think of anything since cold shower was fixed!

### **Written Evaluation Day 2.3**

- I really liked to listen to the material recorded yesterday. I learned new things about editing. Trainers are really great! **Challenge:** writing a 150-character text for our hotspot was a great challenge but we were able to overcome the problems with the help of trainers.
- (1) Trainer team works well (nice to have different types of characters as trainers). (2) [Good] mixture of information on technical matters, teaching ideas and things concerning creative writing for maps/internet.
- (1) Very good and friendly people + team. Always open for questions and improvement. (2) the sessions are in a very good timing (3) on the 2<sup>nd</sup> day I think a bit more time for audio editing would be good (4) but I enjoy being here, everything is a pleasure, from teaching time to [?]
- Still enjoying absorbing different ways of doing things. Nothing negative yet.

### **Written Evaluation Day 2.4**

- I liked the workshop and learning about the files, text, pictures and recording. BUT it would be better if we could use more files on the website
- We got a lot of help from the tutors – good to work as a team. [BUT I would like] more short breaks

trainings/  
community development

- importance of  
trainers who ~~had~~ people  
and communities  
in ~~the~~ ~~community~~  
development

How to use a  
device that a lot of  
people have to be  
creative. Smart phone  
art, images, sounds  
& the use of G.P.S.

# CREATIVE PEOPLE

\*JOY  
\*LOVELY  
ATMOSPHERE  
\*LAUGHTER

Meeting with wonderful  
people  
wonderful ambience  
of the training  
place (outdoor  
activities)

MY LIFE IS & WILL BE  
RICH

Very well organized  
→ perfect training  
atmosphere  
Wonderful group  
supportive and creative  
humans  
Excellent Organization,  
with heart, culture  
and (people) in  
→ thank to Callixto Zeta

feel I have become  
part of a creative,  
humorous, community  
network training  
fraternity.

The best  
Group of people  
I met.

I loved the  
different kinds  
of inputs from  
various participants  
of different  
countries.

Good  
Feelings

-humor connects  
Callixto Zeta / Leo  
community (2)

- Andalusia
- Alpujarras
- Flamenco
- the choir
- concert in  
Sabbatina Church
- friendly  
GROUPMATES!!

MEDIA  
TECHNICS

Truly positive  
We were extremely supported by the technical problems of the data transfer and the subjects were prepared carefully  
Things to improve: -

Good  
Such city  
Good Morning start  
  
BAD

I LIKE THE DIVERSITY OF SUBJECTS AND TOOL WE ARE USING TO GET AN OBJECTIVE.  
IT DO THE COURSE VERY ATTRACTIVE AND INTERESTING.  
I LIKE ALSO THE OPPORTUNITY WE HAVE TO BE "TRAINERS" AND "TRAINEE"

With  
The pace of the course for me is perfect there is enough time to take on board and practice with the equipment.  
Also, the other group I am in has allowed me to let go of my comfort zone and with the support and encouragement not to leave me too insecure or dreaming.  
  
Nothing -ve to say.

POSITIVES  
Energy helpful & supportive trainers.  
Good trainer to trainee ratio.  
Very good balance of practical hands on experience & taught sessions.  
Very interactive & hear of other group members projects  
Room for improvement  
\* None, all good & stuff \*

Points  
• Existing project - ultra support  
• Supporting lecture (resources)  
• Having more feedback, asking the trainer  
• Learning from other others.  
  
Any for improvement?  
Can think of anything since the end. Since was final?

I enjoy very much the system of the training and the "balance" - the way the bits parts are combined with practical exercises. I enjoy very much the pair-work and the general atmosphere of the course.  
So far I would not change anything.

POSITIVE I really liked to listen to the material recorded yesterday I learnt new things about editing. Projects are meaning great

CHALLENGE Writing a 100-character text for our laptop was a great challenge but we were able to overcome the problems with the help of trainers.

- ① Trainer team works well together (nice to have different types of characters as trainers)
- ② Well mixture of information on technical matters, teaching ideas and things concerning creative writing

- ① My use and finally pack - team always open for questions and improvement
- ② The lessons are a very good thing.
- ③ On the second day I think a bit more time for audio editing would be good
- ④ But I enjoy being here, everything is a pleasure for me looking back to before.

+ still enjoying absorbing different ways of doing things

- ~~the~~ Nothing yet

- ① My use and finally pack - team always open for questions and improvement
- ② The lessons are a very good thing.
- ③ On the second day I think a bit more time for audio editing would be good
- ④ But I enjoy being here, everything is a pleasure for me looking back to before.

+ still enjoying absorbing different ways of doing things

- ~~the~~ Nothing yet

I like the workshops and ~~more~~ learning about the .so files, text, pictures and recording

It would be better if we could use these .so files on the network

I liked - we got a lot of help from the TUTORs - good to work as a team

Proposal: more short breaks



*Eberhard Böß / Monika Löffler / Dr. Peter Lewis*

**Appendix X: QP2 question 1, completed answers COMAPP course Algodonales**

**male: 8, female: 12**

1. Please indicate how interesting [we suggest USEFUL rather than interesting] you found the different parts of the activity / course

**-Researching and developing content for interactive maps including the sound walk**

		1	2	3	4	5	
Not interesting	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	19	very interesting

**-Learning about, practising and doing journalistic interviews**

		1	2	3	4	5	
Not interesting	<input type="checkbox"/>		1	3	11	5	very interesting

**-Creating hot spots using photographs, text, narration, sounds**

		1	2	3	4	5	
Not interesting	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	18	very interesting

**-Digital audio editing**

		1	2	3	4	5	
Not interesting	1		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	5	13	very interesting

**-Working with interactive digital maps**

		1	2	3	4	5	
Not interesting	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	1	1	18	very interesting

**-Using the COMAPP OSM generator to create a map**

		1	2	3	4	5	
Not interesting	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	18	very interesting

**-Creating a website and transferring the OSM map on to the web**

		1	2	3	4	5	
Not interesting	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	4	13		very interesting

**-Introduction of geo caching & search of a cache**

		1	2	3	4	5	
Not interesting		2	4	12	2		very interesting

**Applying what you have learnt about smart phones, creation of interactive maps, geo caching to your own teaching and learning setting**

		1	2	3	4	5	
Not interesting	<input type="checkbox"/>		3	2	15		very interesting

**Teaching and learning techniques for work with different target groups in different settings (e.g. adult education centres, community media, schools, youth clubs...)**

		1	2	3	4	5	
Not interesting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	8	10		very interesting

**-Evaluation strategies and instruments**

		1	2	3	4	5	
Not interesting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3	9	8		very interesting

COMAPP – Community Media Applications and Participation: [www.comapp-online.de](http://www.comapp-online.de)

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission (Lifelong Learning Programme).

This publication on the project reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

PROJECT NUMBER: 517958-LLP-1-2011-1-DE-GRUNDTVIG-GMP, AGREEMENT NUMBER: 2011 – 3978 / 001 - 001



**Eberhard Böß / Monika Löffler / Dr. Peter Lewis**

PROJECT NUMBER: 517958-LLP-1-2011-1-DE-GRUNDTVIG-GMP, AGREEMENT NUMBER: 2011 – 3978 / 001 - 001

**Initial questionnaire for course participants (please fill in before the course starts)**

---

**Annotation:**

We would like to ask you to fill in this short questionnaire. The questionnaire is used only for evaluation purpose. It can help to improve the quality of future project activities. Anonymity is guaranteed: your personal data will not be published. Thank you very much for your support!

---

**A Personal data**

**Gender:** 8 male 12 female      **Age:**      **Languages spoken:**

**How did you learn about the course?**

13 personal contact       newspaper       flyer       Internet

7 other, namely: ...

**What is your current occupation or voluntary work?**

5 adult educator / 4 school teacher / 4 professor / lecturer /  social worker /  
2 member / staff in community radio /  student / 6 volunteer at NGO  
2 other.....

**B Expectation**

What do you want to gain from the course?

What new knowledge and new skills would you like to acquire?

**C Teaching experience**

What target groups do you usually work with or intend to work with?

What training methods do you normally use? (for example: lecturing, group work, one to one training, learner centred, teacher centred, etc.)

## **D Media experience**

What experience have you had personally using the following media and communications applications?

:

### **(1) Smartphone – use / application**

**4** none **8** a little **7** quite a bit **1** a lot

If you use smartphones: what for?

**14** telephone **11**SMS **9** internet **12** taking pictures **7**videos **5** apps (please give examples)

others.....

### **(2) Apps**

**5** none **10** a little **4** quite a bit a lot

### **(3) Use of digital / virtual (geographic) maps (e.g.. Google, Open Street Map...)**

**2** none **14** a little **4** quite a bit a lot

Did you ever create / edit such a map?

**5** yes, with (Google, OSM...): **15** no

### **(4) Geocaching**

**16** none **3** a little **1** quite a bit a lot

Did you ever create an own cache?

**1** yes **19** no

### **(5) Computer**

none **3** a little **8** quite a bit **9** a lot





## **Evaluation summary of COMAPP Conference, Budapest, 13.-18.09.2013**

### **1. Conference programme**

The conference took place in the same hotel - the City Inn hotel in central Budapest - where participants from outside Budapest stayed. The main features of the programme (attached, see appendix 1) besides exchange between organisations involved in adult education and discussion about problems with mass media law in Hungary were the presentations by partners of the outcomes of COMAPP as they experienced them, their reflections on the project as a whole. This involved discussion of the handbooks, the teaching and learning materials, the tools such as the COMAPP generator, and the website. In turn this led to the potential use of these outcomes in the future (exploitation), to dissemination and the possibilities of a further training project. The session devoted to evaluation is discussed below.

Some small changes were made to the programme to accommodate discussions that over-ran the allotted time.

The planned events on the social side of the conference were evening meals in restaurants. To exchange experience and disseminate results visits to Civil Radio, to Tilos Radio, to the Association of Open Trainings, to the 60+ senior programme Centre, and to the association of Community Developers were scheduled. A press conference was scheduled after the end of the conference,

### **2. Session on evaluation**

The session was presented by EB and PL and began with a summary of the methods used in the courses run within COMAPP, culminating in the final international course in Algodonales. The methods were:

- QP1, initial questionnaire
- QP2, final questionnaire
- QT, questionnaire for trainers,
- short oral evaluation ("flash light")
- Post-its: individuals, small groups, reports in plenary, individual notes posted walls
- Positive and negative experience as a learner and as a teacher
- mid course evaluation - cards pinned on the wall
- Head, heart, carrier bag and dust bin, a method which identifies respectively what is learned, what has appealed, lessons that can be taken home, and what was not useful

*Dr. Peter Lewis, Eberhard Boess, Monika Loeffler*

- Discussion summary charts: Trainer writes points on a chart visible to all participants
- Observation and interviews by evaluators.

Participants (15 in number) were then divided into groups and asked to first individually complete QP3 (questionnaire with focus on the collaboration within the consortium and on outcomes, see appendix 2) , next to discuss the answers in the group, then finally to report them in plenary session.

At the last session, individual participants completed QP4 (feed back on the conference, see appendix 2).

### **3. Summary of QP3**

The first page of this questionnaire (appendix 2) asked about the success of the COMAPP project under the headings of timetable (6 questions), products and activities (3 questions), goals for the whole partnership (5 questions) and what has been learned especially with regard to the aspect of European cooperation (5 questions). The questionnaire was adapted from Survival Kit 2010. The yes/no answers required were intended to ensure the different aspects of the project were covered in discussion rather than to deliver some statistical result. That said, the vast majority of the questions were met with a tick in the 'yes' box.

The answers individually entered, then discussed within a group, then reported to all, can be summarised as follows:

#### *1. What ...is the strength of this project?*

- International collaboration, cooperation between academics and NGOs, interdisciplinarity and the mix of skills among COMAPP partners
- the professionalism and team spirit of the group
- the participatory approach applied both in the courses and in the organization of COMAPP
- the thorough testing and development of an innovative course and its flexible application to different target groups
- the involvement of new NGOs eg Algodosol
- the fact that the project is more than a training curriculum: it is also a tool that helps to build and develop communities.

#### *2. What so far are the weak points?*

- Collaboration with EU officials and the financial complications
- chasing partners to keep to deadlines

*Dr. Peter Lewis, Eberhard Boess, Monika Loeffler*

- project communications – if would help if the website could have been set up earlier - need for e-conferencing between meetings in the first year, communication though was improved in the second year
  - the incompatibility of some smartphones to take maps
3. *Define two problem areas that should be tackled as soon as possible*
- too much bureaucracy, changed financial demands of funders -> better collaboration with EU officials
  - translation: deadlines too tight and all coming at the end of the project, more funding for translation,
  - insufficient time / time pressure at the meeting to get the handbook into its final version
4. *Suggest some measures or ways for solving the problem*
- “open ears” from Brussels = discussion with EU funders
  - translate earlier
5. *Name two successful activities (actions) you did within the project*
- writing a poem for a Spanish hotspot; learning how to interview and edit; work in groups in my local project; finding a cache; learning new apps
  - joint development of the course; by the end I felt I could teach whole course myself; Lodz pilot course + park map using COMAPP generator
  - collaboration with diverse types of partner institutions; strengthening contacts and making new ones; working with artists to develop creative activities in Algo
  - outcomes: the materials – handbooks, webpage of COMAPP
  - I have been able to include COMAPP results into my university curriculum
6. *Name two achievements you realised through the project*
- As an NGO, working with universities
  - introduction of maps and smartphones into training
  - collaboration with European partners; encouraging different nationalities and cultures to work together; appreciation of other cultures’ working methods; positive and creative outcomes
  - summary and evaluation of test course
7. *What new links have you made at a local and institutional level?*
- New project partner, Algodosol
  - Potential cooperation with partners within Erasmus
  - links with Artworks NE (UK); more understanding of local history and culture networks and community groups in region (NE of UK)
  - contact with many local and national organisations

*Dr. Peter Lewis, Eberhard Boess, Monika Loeffler*

#### 4. Summary of QP4

This brief questionnaire was answered individually and the results are summarised as follows:

*What were the **most important things** for you at this meeting?*

- seeing two years' work come together; "I see now the global sense of the programme"; sharing reflections about the project; the discussion about outcomes-handbook-website; checking and re-working outcomes together; feedback and corrections; "brilliant outcomes" shown by presentations; "I was amazed by the quantity and quality of outcomes. We have done a really good job"; finalisation of project eg website, now simple and clear - making sure it's accessible and sustainable; the success of project- the Algodonales presentation was inspiring
- stronger reconnection with European partners; meeting again; pleasure expressed by Civil Radio at being able to host the conference; all partners emphasised their appreciation of this and the arrangements for seeing Budapest and socialising
- the importance of a mixture of skills within the group
- learning about Hungarian partners' problems
- Discussion of future collaboration
- Advice on financial aspects available to individuals

*What was **good overall**?*

- the collaboration and cross-cultural exchange of working practices, problem solving; the creativeness and knowledge of the group
- inspiring participants; wonderful atmosphere
- local organisation; "perfectly organised conference"; hospitality of our hosts
- discussion of everything
- realising what an excellent project we have

*What was **not so good overall**?*

- lot of work in every session; conference too short; didn't keep to scheduled time; important elements felt rushed
- need for more time for overall evaluation to be discussed in small groups
- bad news – the uncertainty re future funding; sad that there was to be no future project

*What was **missing**?*

- end of the project
- some individuals, present at previous meetings but not at the Budapest conference
- trip to countryside or to Lake Balaton (comment by hosts)

#### 5. Comments by external evaluator

The evaluation team included the Project Coordinator, one of the Partners and the external evaluator. The comments which follow are his alone.

5.1 A limited budget did not allow for the presence of evaluators at certain key moments in the development of the COMAPP project, for example the pilot courses in Turku, Finland, and Lodz, Poland. All three members of the evaluation team were present at the opening and closing conferences and at the final international course in Algodonales, Spain, but the evaluation scheme as a whole depended to a large extent on self-evaluation whose importance was emphasised and explained from the start as being an essential element in training and the planning of training courses. The efficient testing and development of the pilots and the bringing together of the separate experiences and materials and tools to create the final national and international versions of the course is evidence that the self-evaluation worked well.

The same budget limitation applied to the extent of face-to-face meetings that could be realised, a limitation that has been experienced in all the previous projects (*Creating Community Voices, Digital Dialogues, META-Europe* and *Crosstalk* mark a sequence of development over a 15 year period). There has always been a difficult decision to make about when to hold the first meeting – at the very start of the project or some months into it? Skyping or video-conferencing can to some extent overcome this dilemma, but were not at first used in COMAPP, leading to criticism about communications in the first year of the project by some partners and by the Grundtvig assessors' comments on the Interim Report. In the second year serious attempts were made to improve the communication via skype, email and extended reports by partners. An additional partnership meeting was held in June 2013 to enable face-to-face communication at a decisive phase of the project. The meeting was successful in deciding changes to the training course, the teaching and learning materials and the website in order to improve the final outcomes. For the website in particular, a completely different structure was agreed in order to facilitate sustainable use for the public. There is no doubt for this evaluator that the 'team spirit' and strong connections between Co-ordinator and partners was the best yet compared to all the previous projects and this is supported by the feedback summarised above. It is greatly to the credit of the Co-ordinator that this should be so, especially taking into account the following point (5.4). The workplan and timing of the separate contributions to the project, as well as the checking of deadlines and distribution of information was very effectively handled by the Co-ordinator and her supporting staff.

5.2 What was very evident in this latest project was the increase in administrative demands made by the funding agency compared to the experience of previous projects in the 'family' sequence. This placed a very marked strain on the Co-ordinator and her assistants which in turn had an effect on the administrative returns required of partners, none of whom were contractually involved in a full-time capacity with COMAPP and all of whom had demanding work in their main occupations. It is not coincidental that this will be the last project the Co-ordinator will undertake. COMAPP brought together a team which has worked well, is justifiably proud of its achievements and is disappointed that there is not an opportunity to continue the partnership. The final evaluation in which every partner criticised the excessive bureaucratic demands imposed on COMAPP underlines the need for the programme administrators to re-examine the effect on potential applicants of the heavy administrative burden that a project imposes.

5.3 The importance of the social side of the project cannot be over-emphasised. At each venue, the opportunity to be shown a city and to be introduced to local organisations of adult education by people who live and work there is a very special experience. The personal cross cultural exchanges (also during shared meals) as well as group experiences the participants enjoyed and enabled provided space for further reflection and exchange and cemented the commitment of the group to continue their European wide collaboration.



## Success of the COMAPP project<sup>1</sup>

Timetable (for each partner)	Yes	No
Have all activities taken place according to your work plan and timing?		
Did you meet the deadlines for delivering (sub) products?		
Did the work load correspond to your estimation?		
Did you communicate (within the partnership) as planned?		
Did you communicate (within your institution) as planned?		
Was the timetable changed during year one / year 2?		
Products and activities (for each partner)		
Have you undertaken all activities you should have according to your work plan?		
Did you deliver all products (material, training day ...) you were supposed to deliver?		
Are you happy with the quality of your activities or products?		
Goals (whole partnership)		
Did the project meet the main goals?		
Were all activities appropriately conceived for meeting the goals?		
Were some goals not met?		
Are you happy with the quality of activities and products of the partnership?		
Were all activities or products the right ones in the light of the envisaged goals?		
Learning (added value of European cooperation)		
I have learned through being a partner in this project		
European co-operation offered input I would never have obtained if I had not been a partner in this project		
The group has evolved during year one. Opinions and visions regarding the project subject have changed		
We are all aware of each others' point of view regarding European citizenship		
We know each other very well because of our work contacts		

<sup>1</sup> Adaption from Survival Kit 2010

**1. What , according to you, is the strength of this project?**

--

**2. What ,, so far, are the weak points?**

--

**3. Define two problem areas that should be tackled as soon as possible:**

a)

b)

**4. Suggest some measures or ways for solving the problem:**

--

**5. Name two successful activities (actions) you did within the project:**

a)

b)

**6. Name two achievements you realised through the project:**

a)

b)

**7. What new links have you made at a local and institutional level?**

--

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission (Lifelong Learning Programme). This publication on the project reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

PROJECT NUMBER: 517958-LLP-1-2011-1-DE-GRUNDTVIG-GMP  
AGREEMENT NUMBER: 2011 – 3978 / 001 - 001



## Evaluation of Budapest meeting (QP4) (Adaption from Survival Kit 2010)

### FEEDBACK

1. What were the **most important things** for you at this meeting?

1. \_\_\_\_\_

2. \_\_\_\_\_

3. \_\_\_\_\_

2. What was **good overall**?

\_\_\_\_\_

3. What was **not so good overall**?

\_\_\_\_\_

4. What was **missing**?

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

5. **Did the event meet your expectations?**

		o		
---	---	---	---	---

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission (Lifelong Learning Programme).  
This publication on the project reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use  
which may be made of the information contained therein.

## **Appendix 3**

Progress evaluation report (covering year 1 of the project)



## Evaluation report / Progress Report COMAPP

### Evaluation strategy and method

The evaluation for COMAPP uses a method which has worked successfully in previous EU-funded projects in which the COMAPP evaluation team has taken part (*Creating Community Voices, Digital Dialogues, META-Europe, Crosstalk*). It is based on a combination of two approaches: (1) action research methodology which involves a continuous dialogue between ‘researchers’ and ‘subjects’ resulting in modifications of the actions of the latter in the light of research findings; (2) participatory research which involves the ‘subjects’ in the research so that they themselves become researchers, self-evaluating their own actions.

In COMAPP this has meant frequent exchange between the evaluation team and those in the field – the teams developing modules and running courses. Self-evaluation by the trainees/participants of the pilot courses is also one of the instruments used to assess the effectiveness of the courses.

By the end of COMAPP’s first month the evaluation team (Project coordinator, the KoMMedia partner and external evaluator) had prepared an evaluation plan and suitable instruments to be used in the different actions for assessment and evaluation purposes (questionnaires, interviews, observation, reports). As the three Work Groups or Sections were formed and began their planning, they were sent a checklist which invited them to compare their work with the objectives listed in COMAPP’s application.

“In our application to the European Commission we were required to tick boxes about COMAPP’s objectives. The Commission will judge our work by the extent to which we have met our claims. Now we are asking *you* to tick boxes! Not all the objectives apply to each working group/section. Please read through and see what is applicable to you. We suggest you keep the list by you in your COMAPP work so as to keep the project on target.”

In addition, partners was asked to complete a brief questionnaire (QT1) which asked them to comment on the basic idea of COMAPP, the working group to which they had been are assigned, whether they anticipated any particular difficulties in fulfilling their role and/or completing their task, and what positive outcomes they expected for themselves, the project and the course participants (trainees). In anticipation of the first meeting of all partners at Lodz, each Work Group/Section was asked to prepare a report to include (a) a definition of group’s specific objectives, (b) a definition of the intended target group (c) what dissemination, publicity and recruitment had taken place, and whether there had been any involvement of a local university, college or adult education institution, or community radio in commenting on the website, curriculum and materials (d) what had been the highlights and difficulties in the planning process so far (e) the development of course curriculum and materials for the pilot stage.

### 1. Formation and activity of work groups

The Work groups were organised as follows:

Work Group 1, **Communication, interviewing, audio editing, production of a mp3 guided audio tour: UK** – University of Sunderland (Partner 2), **Finland** – Radio Robin Hood (P3), **Poland** – University of Lodz (P5)

Work Group 2, **Multimedia and the public sphere. Creation of applications for web-based guided tour: Germany** - University of Education, Freiburg (P1), **UK** – University of Sunderland (Partner 2), **Germany** - KoMMedia e.V, Freiburg (P7)

Work Group 3, **Holistic intergenerational and intercultural teaching and learning, participatory evaluation strategy: Germany** - University of Education, Freiburg (P1), **Hungary** – Civil Radio, Budapest (P4), **Spain** - AlgoDoSol – Music and Culture Association, Algodonales (P6)

It will be noted that in each group one partner was also a member in another group, an arrangement which assisted communication between groups.

## **2. Project meeting at Lodz, May 2012**

The major part of the three day meeting was devoted to presentation and comparison of the pilot courses and materials so far developed by each Work Group. In one session, the External Evaluator reported on partners' responses to the questionnaire QT1 which can be summarised as follows (quotations taken from individual responses):

**The basic idea of COMAPP:** The project develops a train the trainers' course. By training multipliers (adult educators, social workers, community workers) it is directed towards 'marginalised, under-represented groups'; is about 'tackling (e-)inclusion as well as communication, contact, collaboration between generations and different cultures...bridging gaps between social groups'; exploring opportunities that Smartphones offer in education; [the project] 'forces radio station to step outside into the neighbouring community'; [initiates partners] 'to 'share methods, tools and work evaluation with other institutions '

**Difficulties in the planning stage so far:** The main problem mentioned was lack of time to complete the requirements of COMAPP while carrying on with the demands of partners' work and daily lives. One partner had to deal with the threat of reduced funding from government; some mentioned initial difficulties of communication with partners.

**Positive outcomes expected - for individuals** included that the COMAPP course was adaptable for use in adult education, university teaching, the ongoing META-Europe course etc; allowed partners to gain knowledge and experience of apps and applying this to community media training; learn more about new technology within media pedagogical work with different target groups; led to sustainable contacts with COMAPP partners  
Somewhat similarly **for the project**, uses and adaptations were possible for different settings and groups in partners' own country and across Europe e.g. META- Europe; an expected demand for COMAPP materials by adult educators, teachers, educational institutions, NGOs; possibility of developing a flexible design and single course sections.

**For the participants (trainees):** new media skills to be used for their regular work as adult educators, working on intercultural and intergenerational basis and in a community media context; overcoming barriers in communication and collaboration between different groups of society; will enable them to expand their repertoire using smartphone technology in a creative way and develop and foster communicational and social skills within their respective target groups.

### **Dissemination**

For the Lodz meeting, COMAPP partners also reported the various events, media coverage and attendance at national and international conferences where dissemination of COMAPP was achieved. These are listed in the Progress Report (public section) and show a commendable range of international contacts and local media reports.

### **3. Pilot courses**

#### **3.1 Germany**

**27-28 February 2012** A first pre-test 2 day Pilot Course was delivered at the University of Education Freiburg to test smartphones for later use in Freiburg, and test and further develop the COMAPP map generator so that it would be ready for the Freiburg and Sunderland pilot courses. The six participants included team members and invited adult educators. The success of the technical aspects of this preliminary work can be seen in the positive responses in the later pilots, reporting the popularity of the OSM adaptation and the accessibility of the mapping process.

**13 & 20 July 2012** Thirteen participants (8 women, 5 men) attended this pilot course which worked on the use of Open Street Mapping (OSM) using the Generator developed for COMAPP and the ‘landscape’ provided by the Algodonales pilot (see below) and introduced geo-caching.

Responses to the ‘diagnostic’ questionnaire, QP1, intended for completion by participants before or at the start the course to show their background and training experience with the target groups, and existing technical expertise, show that most were members of the University of Education, working in teaching theory and practice and in youth and adult education. All had teaching experience and were especially interested in the use of Smartphone, OSM and Geo caching for teaching children, students and adults (also in non-formal contexts). All were familiar with computer, the internet and to using a digital photo camera; some had some experience with Smart phones and Apps, and with audio recording and editing. Only 1 participant (male) was (very) experienced in geo caching.

The questionnaire QP2 sought feedback from participants which here was very positive. They found the technical process of producing an interactive map for the internet easy and could see the various ways the smart phone technology, interactive maps and geo caching could be used in educational contexts. The final discussion on potential pedagogical contexts was found particularly valuable. *“Creating those OSM maps by setting pins is highly suitable for use in schools as well as in community settings like adult education centres or youth clubs. Students can be sent to places to solve special tasks for the lesson. That promotes interactive and explorative learning!”*

From the trainers’ point of view (reported in responses to the questionnaire QT2 and through observation) the explanations and hand-outs including the draft of handbooks of good practice were rated excellent, the timing of the training sequence was about right, but more time should be allowed for understanding the ‘dual role’ (see Part 2 of the Progress Report, Public part). On the technical side, there was the useful discovery of an improvement in the COMAPP generator that simplified pin-setting in the interactive maps and saved time.

#### **3.2 Spain**

**10 & 17 March 2012** The ten participants included two representatives from women’s associations, two from disabled associations, a youth worker, two women from a local choir, a woman goat farmer who sings in a band, and a male guitarist who is experienced in recording and teaching music. Two sessions in successive weeks, organised by AlgoDoSol, a Music and Culture Association, were aimed at making a music map of Algodonales, a village in Andalusia with a strong musical tradition music making and teaching. The course

was concerned both with imparting a participatory approach to training, and to the use of the technical skills needed to harness musical experience to the map making goal. Sessions included the sharing of teaching and evaluation skills, audio recording, a sketch of examples of successful community media projects, and the actual construction of the music map. Feedback from participants showed appreciation of the value of music as a medium for bringing together generations and cultures, of learning from others (participatory teaching and learning), and of how one can generate more ideas than one previously believed possible. The handouts and teaching materials were very much valued for their use in delivering the forthcoming training for different target groups.

### **3.3 UK**

**29-30 May 2012** A total of sixteen participants, mostly composed of adult educators, lecturers and postgraduate and undergraduate students from the University of Sunderland, attended this two-day course; almost all were familiar with smart phones and users of apps (QP1). A four-hour ‘sound walk’ starting at 5.30 am on the first day was led by a soundscape expert, a naturalist, and a local historian who had personal connections with the now defunct mining and shipbuilding industries. Participants were introduced to the sounds and sights of the natural history of the riverside and the historical memorials to the former industries which line the river Wear. Recordings in audio and video provided the material for use later in the day (editing for insertion into a sound map), while the walk allowed the group to get to know each other. An explanation of the production of an App made for the local council featuring a park walk, which had been shown at the Lodz meeting, led to the second day’s work using the COMAPP generator to produce a sound map of cultural, historical and natural history aspects to be found along the river Wear.

Feedback in questionnaires (QP2) and from observation was very positive, commenting on the inspirational contributions of the contributors to the course, the unusual experience of the soundwalk, and the satisfaction in successfully learning to use OSM, getting to know the world of apps, creating a short piece of writing and embedding moving images/audio in the interactive map. Those with teaching experience began to discuss ways to introduce the approach and technology into their own teaching.

### **4.4 Hungary**

**26-27 September 2012** The Budapest pilot course, run by Civil Radio, had two main objectives: first, recruiting volunteers to make radio shows and audio materials for the station; second, testing and evaluating an intergenerational media teaching method for use by adult educators in their own courses, as well as different types of evaluation method. Seven retired but still active people registered for the training, all over 60 – 5 women, 2 men. Five trainers, adult educators and community workers, also joined the course as participant observers and evaluators.

The first day introduced ideas about communication, journalistic skills, and different media genres. The second day was devoted to technical training – the use of basic studio equipment and recording devices. Participants were then required to make short audio pieces about public places and buildings in Budapest based on memories and impressions. They had to use smartphones to make photos and moving pictures, and to involve young people, perhaps their grandchildren, to compare their feelings towards the same places.

The reflections of the trainers include some insightful comments about dealing with older people – the need for flexibility, tolerance and patience. At the same time there were some useful comments about method – a comparison of questionnaires, plenary discussion and the use of post-its to record written comment.

#### **4.5 Poland**

**28-29 October 2012** The Department of American Studies and Mass Media in the University of Lodz organised this pilot course which took the form of a listening walk on Day 1, and the editing and compiling of an audio guide on Day 2.

The group of participants was diverse in background and age (five women and five males including an eleven-year old boy): students, teachers (primary, secondary, higher and adult education levels), parents who are home schooling their son. All, except the boy, had various teaching experiences and all were familiar with computer work (including social media, blogs), taking photos (with digital cameras) and some knew something about recording and editing audio.

The feedback was very positive. The course met participants' expectations, indicating that the publicity and the description of the course was accurate. Almost all reported that the audio walk was the most interesting part of the workshop. All said they would be willing to use the knowledge gained in their professional work.

*“It would be good if the same course was offered for teenagers in order to give them awareness of wide possibilities of the equipment they have. Children have a lot of interesting electronic devices (e.g., advanced telephones) but they are not using creatively their technical opportunities; they only play”.*

#### **4.6 Finland**

**20-21. October 2012** For this pilot course on audio editing and production of an audio tour there were nine participants, 3 male and 6 female, ranging in age from 14 to 69. They included adult educators, a teacher, students and volunteers from an NGO whose target groups in work were migrants, women, pensioners and unemployed people.

The course was a success judging by the trainee's enthusiasm and the QP2 questionnaire results. The greatest success in learning was “learning to listen to the environment” and enjoyed most was “editing your own recordings” which most found easy, using their own smartphones. The majority of participants were able to envisage teaching the activity to their target groups. One technical difficulty took some time to solve: finding the recorded files on the trainees' own smartphones and converting them to a format Audacity accepts. The android phones provided by COMAPP worked well, but the older participants needed one to one help from the trainer.

### **4. Discussion**

#### **4.1 Course participants**

There was no plan at this stage to involve the ultimate beneficiaries – the target groups themselves – and it was a bonus that senior citizens were participants in the Budapest pilot. Even so, the participants recruited for the pilots *did* clearly gain new **media competencies** and

in each course the age range of the trainees led to **intergenerational communication** and opportunities for **senior citizens** to share their experience as well as validate that of young people by learning new skills from them. As trainers themselves, the participants were stimulated to discuss and discover ways to introduce both the skills learned and the pedagogical approach in their own work. Introductory contextualisation of the course allowed some **understanding of the rationale for, and record of, community media** in remedying the defects of mainstream media.

## **Training methods**

Trainers being trained should constantly remain aware of their ‘dual role’ and despite the complexity of some of the technical knowledge to be grasped, it is clear that participants in the pilots learned at both levels. The participatory approach, new to some trainees, worked well and the creation of interactive maps was particularly successful as a way of bringing together local knowledge, local history, personal memory and different ages. That it used a technology familiar to the younger, ‘digital generation’ also added social cohesion, an aspect that will be valuable when migrants are brought into the exercise by the trainers trained in COMAPP. The instruments for self-evaluation, already tested in previous projects, worked well in this case.

### **4.2 Technical aspects**

The first pilot in Freiburg was important in testing Kommedia’s innovative adaptation of OSM and the structure of the project allowed feedback from the field to further improve and simplify the technology. The project plan was correct in judging that the widespread familiarity with smartphones could be exploited to the benefit of the training goals.

### **4.3 Project management**

**4.4 Meticulous planning with clear deadlines and a built-in reporting requirement**, together with good inter-partner communication, meant that this stage of the project has proceeded smoothly. The tight budget did not allow for a project meeting at the start, so that partners had to use their own interpretation of project aims in developing plans in advance of the first meeting at Lodz. On the whole communication at a distance worked well. **Dissemination**

The partners’ **professional, national and European networks**, with which the consortium has connection, were used **to publicise and transfer the courses**. In addition, as individuals, partners were able to draw attention to COMAPP at various conferences and seminars in which they participated in the course of their professional activities.

## **5. Year 2**

Each pilot course can be said to have “played to the strength” of the training team involved: experience with migrant communities, in handling questions of diversity and gender in the public sphere, and in inter-generational work. The results, together with advice aimed at countering problems experienced in the pilot courses as well as the curricula and the teaching and learning materials developed and successfully used in the pilot courses will be incorporated into the overall training course which is currently being developed and will be delivered in the second year of the project.