



Erasmus+



Evaluation's forms analysis after 1st Transnational Meeting shows the following conclusions:

For section 1 – Meeting organization at 1.1 The information about travel, accommodation etc. received before the meeting from host partner was satisfactory – one mark is 4, all other marks are 5.

1.3 Duration and timing of the meeting was well planned - one mark is 4, all other marks are 5.

1.5 Accommodation and food were satisfactory – two marks are 4, all other marks are 5.

For section 2 – Meeting contents and presentations at 2.1 The subjects discussed were relevant to the overall Project, 2.2 The activities (visit to the Clinics and Hospitals) were relevant to the Project, 2.3 Presentation of the objectives and work plan for the next period was clear, 2.7 The meeting fulfilled my expectations - one mark is 4, all other marks are 5.

2.9 All partners were equally involved in the discussions - two marks are 4, all other marks are 5.

For section 3 – Quality of partnership – at 3.1 Communication amongst partners was effective - one mark is 4, all other marks are 5.

For section 4 – Management and coordination – at 4.1 The information (on tasks, materials for the meeting etc.) received before the meeting from the coordinator was satisfactory - one mark is 4, all other marks are 5.

At final questions results are:

1. What were the most useful points of the meeting?
 - Planning future activities
 - Planning organization for multiple events
 - To get to know other cultures and how to take care of them
 - Getting to know another education culture good organization
 - Good organization and clear information
 - Communication arrange everything for the end of the Project
 - Individual contacts
 - Communications with partners
 - Analysis of all documents, reports which we filled till now and what we need for final report
 - The exchange between the countries the repetition of the list of the Project
 - New experience, to see hospital
 - New experience, people, contacts, to see hospital, new processing to care
 - Exchanging experience so far realized in Project activities
2. How might the format of this meeting be improved in order to be the most appropriate for the content presented?
 - Planning
 - Presentations before the meeting to participants prepare questions
 - No complaints
 - Everything is since the way it is



Erasmus+



- Early and complete presentation of the meeting on web
 - I think this form is ok
 - Maybe we could get presentation for the before time for better preparation
 - Everything is fine
 - Everything was perfect
 - It was nice and very interesting
 - Sharing materials some time before actual meeting so the questions may be prepared in advance for discussion
3. *What did you most appreciate was best about the meeting?*
- Hospitality, help with translation
 - Hospitality, productive discussions, unifying forms
 - The best of the meeting was the good teamwork
 - The exchange between the different nations and the good cooperation
 - Learn culture and methods of work in other countries
 - Hospitality
 - Exchanging experiences and impressions among colleagues
 - The brainstorming for the multiplier event and dissemination platform
 - The good cooperation the good communication with other
 - Experience exchange, new things to learn, new contacts
 - Most colleagues, town and food
 - Sharing our thoughts and ideas with colleagues
4. *Do you have any suggestions for the improvement?*
- No
 - No suggestions for improvement
 - More often personal contacts
 - This time destination is more than too away so maybe time could last for 3 days instead 2
 - Everything is okay
 - No, the meeting fulfilled my expectations
 - Often personal contacts
 - More direct contacts, E. A. Video or skype contacts visual

According to the evaluation we did after 4th TPM, we think that the organization of activity mostly met the expectations of participants. Some participants think that there were communication problems however majority of participants think that everything was well planned.

Project Organization Team;

Adnan YAVUZ, Muhammet ÇAKMAK, Ali Haydar KILIÇ, Fatih ATAR, Hatice TORUN