

EVALUATION REPORT OF THE SECOND TRIADE MEETING

Name of the project : TRaining for Inclusion of Ageing people with Disabilities through Exchange

Acronym of the project : TRIADE

Coordinator : den achtkanter vzw

Country of the second meeting: Kortrijk, Belgium

Number of evaluated partners : 9

Context :

The evaluation form is divided in three parts, first part is concerned with evaluating the meeting (coordination, structure, quality, duration, context, etc), second part is related to the evaluation of the transnational partnership (partnership quality), and third part is based on the open questions and that is why they are not part of the average scores.

The evaluation questions can be seen below.

Part I - Structure, content and delivery of transnational meeting :

Organization and coordination of transnational meeting :

- **Question n°1 :** Evidence of clear planning by coordinator and hosting organization ;
- **Question n°2 :** Appropriate and clear agenda linked to the aims of the meeting and overall aims of the project ;
- **Question n°3 :** The hospitality of the host of the transnational meeting ;

Travel :

- **Question n°4 :** The program was rich and interesting ;
- **Question n°5 :** The contact with the hosting organizer was fluid ;

Effectiveness of content and activities :

- **Question n°6 :** Appropriate content, clearly related to the aims ;
- **Question n°7 :** Quality of the study visit ;
- **Question n°8 :** Appropriateness of the social programme ;

Part II : Quality of transnational partnership

Input into the project meeting by the project partners :

- **Question n°9 :** Commitment to the project and investment by each partner ;
- **Question n°10 :** Every partner contributed to the meeting and worked hard ;
- **Question n°11:** Every partner listened and gave each other time to discuss and think ;

- **Question n°12** : Evidence of good communication and mutual understanding of all partners ;

Part III : Open questions


Question n°13 : What were your main hopes and expectations for the meeting in Kortrijk ?

Question n°14: Strong points-What did you enjoy most during the meeting ?

Question n°15: Weak points-Was there any part of the meeting that you would like to change ?


Question n°16: Do you have any suggestions for the future meeting?

Part I - Structure, content and delivery of transnational meeting



■ level 4 ■ level 3 ■ level 2 ■ level 1 ■ without answer

Part II : Quality of transnational partnership



level 4 level 3 level 2 level 1 without answer

Analysis of the graphic

9 partners have participated in the assessment of the meeting in Kortrijk. 7 partners have answered to the first 8 questions. From question 9 related to the partnership, 9 direct answers were collected. There wasn't any question without answer which means that all questions were clear enough for all partners. The questions n°1 regarding the evidence of clear planning by coordinator and hosting organizations, n°3 related to the hospitality of the host partners, questions n°4 et n°5 about the travel, gathered the unanimity of all partners by expressing their satisfaction. That means that the some partner's expectations expressed after the meeting in Valencia were taken into account for the second meeting.

Second graphic gives the information about partner's perception of the TRIADE partnership. The opinions are different. Generally, the partners were listening each other, but there are some efforts to undertake for the future meetings regarding the investment and the contribution of all partners.

Part III : Open questions

General comments exactly as expressed by partners

Question n°13 : What were your main hopes and expectations for the meeting in Kortrijk ?

- We were hoping to get a better insight into Belgium's work, and we think that they did a good job. It was easier to follow everything this time, we felt more prepared and also Belgium seems to be a lot like our country.
- Getting to learn about inclusive practices put into place in Kortrijk. Specifically the cross sectoral collaboration, how it is organized with which procedures/instruments protocols, at what level, who are the actors involved at local level. Could they be an example for other Regions. What were the success factors and the critical aspects of the collaboration between the services for disability and the services for the elderly in Kortrijk. Developing and going further on common policy/education recommendations for good practices based on partners work. Preparing Rotterdam meeting Updating/planning dissemination initiatives dialogue with EU. Exchanging about local proposals. News on expert groups.
- Our expectations collaboration between services that occupies of elderly and those working with disability, their networking. Also the processes to implement individual accompanying to ageing disabled persons. It was very interesting. Another expectation was learning more about new competence profiles of inclusive professionals. On this second point our expectations remained unmet as it has been postponed to the next meeting.
- To take part of good practices that we received before the visit and had the opportunity to discuss with the expert group at home in our own operations. To evaluate the templates we have started to work in and in the future should have.
- We had hoped to get some more information on how our Belgian partners include informal caregivers in their policy. We also hoped to do more site visits instead of presentations and workshops compared to the visit in Valencia. We also expected inspirational good practices which can be useful in the Netherlands as well.
- We had really high expectations with Flemish good practices and definitively we consider all of them really interesting. We would like to transfer some of them in our region.

- Our main expectations were : strong link between the practices and the issue of ageing people with disabilities and more discussion between all partners.

Question n°14: Strong points-What did you enjoy most during the meeting ?

- It was really interesting to hear about the Stimul ethics lab. It was totally not what we expected but it gave us a lot to think about even when we work with younger people. Also it was really interesting to hear about the economic ways that they manage some of the support.
- Getting to know local experiences, selected practices. and actors in the field of disability and elderly care. Good coordination of the lead partner- Excellent leadership of the project with a lot of time and quality work dedicated to it and it showed. Good interaction between the partners: everyone had the opportunity to present its work and discuss proposals- Good work organization. Excellent field visits. Strong added value to know and establish contacts with the actors involved at local level. Very positive to plan together future work that allowed us to organize the projects work and to build future collaboration proposals.
- From one side, the intensive interaction among partners during the visit, while learning and discovering presented practices. Then a presentation of cross-sectoral collaboration, made by Johan was very interesting. Another appreciated element was the emphatic education in ethics lab, not only activity that we did, but to discover methodology that they use in their activities.
- A clear agenda. Clear good practices.
- We really enjoyed the inspirational meeting by Stimul on the second day. We also enjoyed exchanging ideas and experiences with all the European partners. I was also very good to get to know the Belgian system. As we hoped we saw a lot of good practices in real life. We very much enjoyed the tour in Kortrijk.
- Hospitality of the host organization. The organization was perfect and the contents of the meeting were really interesting. High quality of the good practices. We enjoyed a lot with the Stimul-lab practice. Good atmosphere among partners.
- The presentations of the best practices were related to the issue of ageing people with disabilities. The quality of the presentations was high. There was a good synergy between all partners. The discussions were very constructive.

Question n°15 : Weak points-Was there any part of the meeting that you would like to change ?

- There were no weak points, maybe a little bit stressful but we think that was more to our own planning 😊 ;
- In addition: more work on informal support and care- Complementarity of the tasks of the professionalism and the informal caregivers, and how they can learn from each other ;
- One of points, the presentation of the Nursing students' attitude, could have been shorter. It was interesting, but could be given in more synthetic way, leaving thus space for other planned activity. In the presentation of Transition from a medical to a social inclusion model, we have understood the difficulties and challenges that are there, but probably there were missing examples on how this model includes families and society.
- Too large groups on study visits to both the elderly and function support. Doesn't feel ok to be so many people in other persons residence.

- We still feel that not everybody contributes in the same way. This could be because of the language barrier. For us it is really important to get to know everybody's opinion even if it's not in perfect English. All partners have to cope with the fact that English is not our first language. The time we have is very limited, so it is important to use our time very effectively. Especially when dealing with agenda items and practical appointments. Some of these things could be dealt with by email or with a proposal which is sent to everybody beforehand so we can speed up the procedure.
- We missed contributions of some of the partners.
- No, there wasn't the weak points actually. We think that we have to continue in this way of working and collaborating.

Question n°16: Do you have any suggestions for the future meeting?

- Just keep up the good work !;
- Have one part of the meeting open for interested authorities not part of the project. Have one part of the meeting with exchanges in informal care work. More synthetic description of the practices. Only One study visit is enough ;
- We can't wait to see in the next meeting how the Netherland partner implements informal care, but we also want to hear the missing presentation from this last visit regardin the competence profile of inclusive professions, as it is a basic for developing further trainings.
- It would have been good if we got information about the country and the legislation in the same time. There are major differences between our countries social care. And when we are going to talk with the expert group they have questions about how things are going on in the country we visited and thats hard to give an answer for.
- We have noticed after the second meeting that our interest in mainly focused on practical good practices. Activities and knowledge we can easily copy to our own situation. Like the Stimul lab and the research on nursing students.
- To continue in the same direction and to present more clearly different policies in the field of disability and elderly.

Conclusion :

All answers on open questions are interesting giving us the real situation of the past events, even if subjective. The question n°16 is the most important because it gives the recommendations for next meetings.