

ELGPN Plenary Meeting

22nd to 23rd September 2010

Lisbon, Portugal

Summative Evaluation

ELGPN 2009/2010

Peter Weber, University of Heidelberg

Overview

- Data for the summative evaluation of the ELGPN 2009-10 work programme and outcomes were collected in May-June 2010, using a questionnaire designed for this purpose.
- 26 of the 29 participating countries responded (89.7%). Experts and cooperating institutions did not take part in this evaluation.
- The data are summarised in a comprehensive table (quantitative data) and in a descriptive qualitative form (qualitative data)
- Data e.g. about developments reg. WP issues and the added value has been used also in the general report See Annex 4, 6, 9.

Some Conclusions (quantitative summative evaluation)

- Most results showed a high level of satisfaction with the quality of work in the ELGPN during the work period 2009-10 (see tables in the summative evaluation report).
- In general, the scores were higher than the comparable average scores across the single events (see ELGPN summary evaluation report 5/2010).

Some summarized highlights (qualitative evaluation)

- Partners report a Common understanding of LLG, opened minds on LLG, better understanding of own and different national guidance systems and practice.
- All respondents show a high identification with the process and the network
- Important has been the exchange of ideas and experience.

Some summarized highlights

- We can identified in almost all countries positive developments, especially in co-operation between ministries, establishment of national Forum etc..
- Many stressed a co-evolution in the national and international areas.
- State measures were inspired or even enforced by the fact of participation in ELGPN.

Some summarized suggestions

- Many reported the need for continuity and progress (e.g. in WP)
- Development and re-definition of work-programme in work-packages toward concrete solutions for the (different) national situations is asked
- Further development of work-methods regarding needs and suggestions of partners and WP, including cooperation between WP
- Balance of different interests and perspectives (e.g. policy makers/Ministry view and expert view) in the different work arrangements
- Recognition of “open Window in time” to stabilize and develop the LLG developments (national/trans-national)

Thank you

Peter Weber
pweber@ibw.uni-heidelberg.de