# ASPIRE Evaluation

## Notes from Project Meeting in Granada April 2018.

The project is currently on course. There are a few workshops still to be held, but all will be completed by the end of April. However, a large part of the project plan is concentrated in the last six months. While the formal contract requirements can probably be delivered in that time, they may not be delivered as thoroughly as some partners would like. It is possible that the original project plan underestimated the disruptive effect of holiday periods on the timetable

The project leader is to explore the possibility of an extension.

## Progress on evaluation plan

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Agree evaluation strategy | completed |
| Survey progress every three months | On course (2 still to complete for quarter to 31 March 2018) |
| Survey views of social partners and workshop participants | Plan is now to use the feedback form designed by Chris Ball, and Matt Flynn’s checklist sheet) . All partners to send checklist sheet to evaluator |
| Produce internal interim report | completed |
| Produce final report | for completion in December |
| Contribute to dissemination | needs clarification when dissemination plan is refined |
| Report on the budget | for completion in December |

## Messages from pilot/workshops

Active ageing is not high priority for employers or trades unions in Italy or Spain. The issue is important but long term, attention is currently focused on more immediate priorities. Those who attended the workshops were enthusiastic, but probably unrepresentative of the wider community.

It proved difficult and time consuming to set up workshops, especially given the low profile of the issues in some countries.

The planned format for workshops proved too complex and repetitive. In practice partners adapted and shortened the process.

Large firms were more sympathetic, especially global companies with national branches.

Awareness of the policy context/legislation etc was low in Italy and Spain.

Workshop evidence suggests that there may be low willingness to use online tools among some target audiences, especially in Spain.

## Issues to consider

How to motivate potential partners to take an interest?

How to balance the two dimensions of the project – the research element and the development of practical tools.

## “Training tool”

What do we mean by a training tool? The general view is that it is closer to a bank of resources with some guidance, than a structured training programme.

## Dissemination

What is intended as “dissemination?” It is helpful that a process is being put in place to log contacts, so that the final evaluation can record the quantity and quality of dissemination activities and contacts.

It might also be helpful to produce some form of leaflet/flyer about the project, for distribution at relevant events.

The notion of a “community of practice” needs some refining. It could mean no more than an online space for people to exchange views and materials, or something more actively structured and curated. The latter model implies some ongoing resource for moderation and housekeeping after the end of the project. There is currently no plan for this.

## Data analysis

It is important to balance rigour with relevance. The NVIVO coding of the workshop data will be helpful in identifying issue and priorities for the learning tool, but it is important to remember that it cannot be claimed that the evidence is in any way representative.

## Final conference

What is the aim of the planned final conference? Is it to showcase the tools to potential users or to “sell” the work to policymakers (including the Commission)? There are unresolved questions about how to attract participants, and whether it is possible to pay for some to attend/contribute. It may be more effective to link this to an existing planned conference of another agency,

There is also potential to link dissemination to conferences/events run by other agencies, and this could usefully be explored as part of the dissemination plan.

## Project process issues

What is the role of academic outputs – not part of the project (and certainly not deliverable in the project timescale), but important to the career objectives of partners.

The project would have benefited from earlier attention to role and timing of translation. What evidence, evaluation material, learning resources are to be translated, at what stage?

Some elements of the project process could usefully have been clarified earlier.

The partners were working together for the first time, and several commented on the value of experiencing new approaches to project management.

It is important to allow long lead times for changes to planned work. Academic staff timetables are planned many months in advance, and extensions to the project may be problematic.

## Budget issues

There are currently no significant budget issues, although some partners are on plan and some have underspent to date. The project leader will be exploring how best to use resources in the final six months.

## Aspirations

At the beginning of the project, partners were invited to identify possible outcomes beyond the formal requirement of the contract.

These included:

* Academic outputs – important for the careers of the project participants, though not part of the project itself
* Opening dialogue with employer and employee organisations about aging issues, with the potential to stimulate long term change in thinking and action.
* Awareness of resources (like the ADAPT platform) relevant not only to the present project.