FINAL TRANSNATIONAL EVALUATION REPORT

Project Applicant: CKZiU (PL)

with the technical support of Pixel (IT)

Period: 1 October 2018 – 31 December 2020

Report produced by: Pixel (IT)

Project Number: 2018-1-PL01-KA201-050865

Index

Introduction

This Evaluation Report is resulting from the implementation of the Evaluation strategy adopted by the Parsifal project consortium.

The present Evaluation Report therefore offers a comprehensive picture of the project outlining its main points of strength to be potentially transferred in future activities, eventual weaknesses and how they were addressed.

The evaluation strategy was developed by Pixel (IT) and CKZiU (PL), it was presented and discussed with all the project partnership during each of the 4 meetings organised.

Monitoring and evaluation activities allowed prompt intervention to correct and adapt particular elements, in order to assure that the planned activities are carried out in the best possible way, inserting, where necessary, further actions not originally included in the project planning phase, but which have identified themselves as a necessity.

The implementation of the evaluation strategy has therefore been carried out through an active cooperation of all the project partners. Each partner has identified a person responsible for the monitoring and evaluation of the project activities and results. As the project partners had all a consistent experience in EU funded projects, the selected responsible person has been effective in ensuring the quality of the monitoring and evaluation activities.

As far as evaluation is concerned, as mentioned above for every single project stage, an ad hoc "Evaluation Questionnaire" was created, to be filled in by the project's partners as far as the management activities; information systems; meeting organisation etc. are concerned.
The Questionnaire addressed:

- Project planning: responsiveness of the idea to the existing needs, clarity of the objectives, consistency of the results achieved etc.
- Project management: Effectiveness of management of strategies, respect of deadlines, appropriateness of the problem solving strategies.
- Project activities: quality of each activity completed as well as its level of efficiency.
- Project results: Results ability to fulfil users' expectations, availability, accessibility etc.

Project partners also constantly verified the satisfaction of the target groups.

The intellectual output has been presented to teachers/trainers, headmasters and students to collect their feedback.

The evaluation activity resulted in the creation of this transnational evaluation report, based on the elaboration of the results of each single evaluation activity carried out.

The evaluation report addresses the following:

- Identification on what has been achieved (availability of a structured presentation of what has been achieved, satisfaction levels of the users; level of transferability);
- Verifying the aim (congruity of the choice of users; level of achievement of the initial objectives in terms of impact and results);
- Quality of the contents (availability of standards of reference for the defined methods; suitability of the materials developed; efficiency of the monitoring methods and evaluation etc.).
- Evaluation of the results reached

Based on, alongside other factors, the following general elements addressed both from the project partner and the end users point of view:

- Identification on what has been achieved (availability of a structured presentation of what has been achieved; characteristics of the direct and indirect users of the project activities, satisfaction levels of the users; level of transferability);
- Verifying the aim (congruity of the choice of users; level of achievement of the initial objectives in terms of impact and results);
- Quality of the contents (suitability of the qualification levels of the subjects involved in all the phases of the project; availability of standards of reference for the defined methods; suitability of the materials developed; efficiency of the monitoring methods and evaluation etc.).
- Feedbacks of the target users involved

All the above aspects were to be assessed on a scale from 0 (poor) to 10 (excellent). An average result of 7,5/10 would be considered satisfactory.
The Parsifal project well exceeded these expectations with marks averaging well above 9 with many level often near 10 out of 10.

All main project phases and outputs were evaluated, including:

- Evaluation of the project planning

Addressing the quality of the action plan; the level of co-operation between the project's partners, the response of the idea to existing needs, a structured and clear definition of objectives, the expected results of planned objectives and the reached results etc.

- Evaluation of the project management
  Observing the effective management of project activities (e.g. administrative and financial resources, human resources, time, work organisations, etc.) and taking into account the effective management of the partnership by the project's coordinator (e.g. organisation and management of activities, respect of time and of milestones, meeting management information management).

- Evaluation of the project activities
  Observing in detail the quality of each activity completed as well as its level of efficiency in relation to the project objectives and outputs.

- Evaluation of the results reached
  Based on, alongside other factors, the following general elements addressed both from the project partner and the end users point of view:
  - Identification on what has been achieved (availability of a structured presentation of what has been achieved; characteristics of the direct and indirect users of the project activities, satisfaction levels of the users; level of transferability);
  - Verifying the aim (congruity of the choice of users; level of achievement of the initial objectives in terms of impact and results);
  - Quality of the contents (suitability of the qualification levels of the subjects involved in all the phases of the project; availability of standards of reference for the defined methods; suitability of the materials developed; efficiency of the monitoring methods and evaluation etc.).
  - Feedbacks of the target users involved

The evaluation report is based on the following data and information:
- Results of the Evaluation Questionnaires addressed to the project's partners
- Results of the testing activities involving target groups (please also see End users evaluation report available at: https://parsifal.pixel-online.org/project-results.php , Username: partner, Password: pixel)
- Assessment of the Deliverables and outcomes produced (please also see the 3 issues of the Quality Plan, available at: https://parsifal.pixel-online.org/project-results.php, Username: partner, Password: pixel)

Evaluation of the Project Planning

The evaluation and assessment of the project planning is based on the following criteria:

- Compatibility of the idea with the context
- Compatibility of the idea with the existing needs
- Compatibility of the idea with the partnership skills
- Clarity of the objectives
- Effectiveness of the planned resources
- Consistency between the planned objectives and the results reached

The graph below shows the results provided by the Progress Evaluation Questionnaires submitted to the partners during the Second Partners Meeting held, on 27 - 28 May 2019, in Kaunas (LT)

Evaluation of The Project Planning
May 2019

Criteria	Score
Compatibility idea/context	9,9
Compatibility…	9,9
Compatibility…	10,0
Clearness of the…	10,0
Effectiveness resources	10,0
Consistency…	10,0
AVERAGE	10,0

The average score of 10.0 represents the best result, showing that the participants considered the project very interesting and, most important, truly responding to users existing needs.

Zornitsa Staneva from Zinev Art Technologies (BG) declared that "*the project is surely going to create connections between youth from different nations and an improved understanding of the reasons and forces behind our present reality.*"

The graph below shows the results provided by the Final Evaluation Questionnaires submitted to the partners during the Fourth Partners Meeting held, on 25 May 2020, online due to the anti-COVID19 measures.

Evaluation of The Project Planning May 2020

|	Score
Consistency objectives/results	9,7
Effectiveness resources	9,7
Clearness of the objectives	9,8
Compatibility idea/Existing...	9,8
Compatibility idea/context	9,8
Average	9,8

The average score of 9.8 represents a very good result, showing that the participants considered the project very interesting and, most important, truly responding to users existing needs.

"Compatibility of the project idea with the context", "Compatibility idea/Existing needs" and "Clearness of the objectives" gained a score of 9.8 demonstrating that the object of the project is clearly identified in the frame-work and it is in line with the priority and prerogatives of all the participants involved Countries.

Andreea Ionel from EurEd (RO) was very enthusiastic about the project: *'The resources created within the project are very attractive and raised the interest of the teachers and students. The products offer a great support for the learning process and acquisition of cultural exchange among students, but also increased the reading and writing skills. In the schools there is a big need in this direction, so the Parsifal project came to offer the proper support in this direction. "*

Gediminas Grėsius from Jono and Petras Vileišių school commented: "*everything went as planned, because organization was flexible and ready to help*".

Talking about the "Consistency of the objectives with the results" and the "Effectiveness of the resources", they both were valuated with a score of 9.7. Although slightly lower than the other indexes, it can be

considered a good result because producing good deliverables both qualitative and quantitative is not always easy to reach, considering also that the partners had to deal with the COVID19 pandemic and tis consequences from a managerial point of view.

Evaluation of the Project Management

The project management was of course a very important indicator of the effectiveness and efficiency of the project.

The evaluation of the Project management took into consideration different aspects such as:

- the coordination of the project activities
- the quality of the partnership
- the communication among project partners
- the administrative issues

The way the project partnership was organised and the work methodologies that were adopted and implemented proved to be effective and managed to ensure that through the full commitment of all the different institutions involved, despite their different backgrounds and experiences.
Also the management strategy was a key factor in ensuring that the project managed to achieve its aims in an efficient and effective way respecting as much as possible the planned timetable.

The results presented below come from the questionnaires filled in by each partner and the comments coming from the evaluation reports filled in during the partners meeting.

Coordination

Each partner has been asked to evaluate main aspects related to the project management:

- Overall project management by the project coordinator
- Management of the financial and administrative resources by the project coordinator
- Time management of the project activities and the respect of deadlines
- Organization and management of the project meetings
- Effectiveness of the project website for the management of the project

The graph below shows the results provided by the Project Evaluation Questionnaires submitted to the partners during the Fourth Partners Meeting held, on 27 - 28 May 2019, in Kaunas (LT).

Evaluation of The Project Coordination
May 2019

Category	Value
Project management	10,0
Administrative management	10,0
Time management	10,0
Organisation meetings	10,0
Effectiveness website	10,0
Effectiveness problem solving…	10,0
AVERAGE	10,0

The result obtained on average (10.0) was very high and satisfactory demonstrating that the coordination and the management of the meeting were much appreciated.

In fact, all the categories received a valuation of 10.0. This means the partners are totally satisfied with the coordination of all the activities of the project and that the there is a good synergy in the partnership that helps the partners to carry out a high level qualitative work.

The graph in the following page shows the results provided by the Final Evaluation Questionnaires submitted to the partners during the Fourth Partners Meeting held, on 25 May 2020, online due to the anti-COVID19 measures.

Evaluation of The Project Coordination
May 2020

Category	Score
Effectiveness problem solving…	9,8
Effectiveness website	10,0
Organisation meetings	10,0
Time management	10,0
Administrative management	10,0
Project management	10,0
Average	10,0

The result obtained on average (10.0) was very high and satisfactory demonstrating that the coordination and the management of the meeting were much appreciated.

In fact, all the categories, but one, received a valuation of 10.0. This means the partners are very satisfied with the coordination of all the activities of the project and moreover shows that there is a good synergy in the partnership that helps the partners to carry out a high level qualitative work.

Andreea Ionel from Fundatia EuroEd commented: *'The Parsifal project consortium respect the project and showed their professionalism in dealing with the tasks. The coordination and the monitoring process are at high level and the efficient management, strategy and tools, keep the project on high standards also. '*

The only category that scored lower than the other was "Effectiveness of problem solving strategy" (9.8). Being in a partnership is not always easy to find a common solution to which agree upon, but the score of 9.8 assigned to this category demonstrate the partners, despite some difficulties, always managed to cooperate among themselves in order to pull off the tasks and carry out good results.

Miglena Molhova from ZAT commented: *'Excellent overall management and coordination*.'

Project Partnership

The partnership did not change from the beginning of the project.

Information about the institutions part of the Parsifal project consortium is available at: https://parsifal.pixel-online.org/contractual-partners.php.

The 6 partners representing 5 European Countries were the protagonists of a joint and cooperative effort in order to produce the project foreseen deliverables valorising the different expertise of each of the involved institutions:

- High schools
- Teacher training centres

The organization of the project partnership and the work methodology adopted has been planned by CKZiU (PL), with the technical support of Pixel (IT), so to ensure the full commitment of all partners to the project and the consistency of the activities with the aims of the project and the planned timetable.

The repartition of the different tasks has been presented during the kick off meeting and duly discussed and resulted in a detailed calendar of activities and related partners' role document, both attached to the contract signed by the coordinator with each of the partner institutions.

According to the plans described in the Application form, project partners have developed the contents of Intellectual Output 1 – Legends and Traditional Tales, sharing the related tasks as follows:

Zinevart Tenchology (BG) and EuroEd (RO) had to involve 5 schools, 10 teachers and 200 students each in order to identify the legends and tales of their countries.

The 3 schools partner of the project, CKZiU (PL), Montale (IT) and Kauno Jono (LT) were in charge of involving 5 teachers and 100 students each identify the legends and tales of their countries.

Finally, Pixel created the platform hosting the contents took care of the editing, digitalization, organization and upload of the contents available on the portal at:

- Bulgarian legends and tales: https://parsifal.pixel-online.org/bulgaria.php

- Italian legends and Tales: https://parsifal.pixel-online.org/italy.php

- Lithuanian legends and Tales: https://parsifal.pixel-online.org/lithuania.php

- Polish legends and Tales: https://parsifal.pixel-online.org/poland.php

- Romanian legends and Tales: https://parsifal.pixel-online.org/romania.php

The project partners have also cooperatively defined the structure and characteristics of the Intellectual Output 2 - Essays.

Each partner, cooperating with the involved teachers and students, had to develop 5 essays each regarding 5 different topics identified in the project planning phase and finalised at the Kick-off Meeting.

Pixel (IT) was in charge of the Adaptation of the contents online which are now available at: https://parsifal.pixel-online.org/essays.php them to tell traditional tales during classroom activities.

The project partners have finally planned and finalise the structure and characteristics of the Intellectual Output 3 – Interactive Map.

Pixel (IT) was in charge of the planning and development of:

- The Interactive Map on the portal (https://parsifal.pixel-online.org/travel-ui.php)

- The iOS mobile app (https://apps.apple.com/it/app/parsifal/id1532377200)

- The Android mobile app (https://play.google.com/store/apps/details?id=net.pixelonline.parsifal)

The schools and training centres partners of the project, developed different travels, going through the legends developed in the IO1 which appear on the interactive map.

All project partners have implemented the necessary Coordination and support activities and implemented Exploitation and Dissemination activities.

Each partner has been asked to evaluate the following aspects of the project partnership:

- Partnership agreement
- Responsibilities of partners
- Effectiveness of partners' cooperation
- Cooperation among project partners
- Project meeting organisation
- Integration in the team
- Personal involvement
- Respect of deadlines

The graph below shows the results provided by the Project Evaluation Questionnaires submitted to the partners during the Fourth Partners Meeting held, on 27 - 28 May 2019, in Kaunas (LT).

Evaluation of Partnership
May 2019

|	Score
Partnership agreement	9,9
Responsibilites of partners	10,0
Effectiveness of partners'…	10,0
Cooperation among project…	10,0
Project meetings organization…	10,0
Integration in the team	10,0
Personal involvement	10,0
Respect of deadlines	10,0
AVERAGE	10,0

The evaluation of the "Partnership", on average, obtained 10.0, namely the maximum. All the indexes obtained a score of 10.0 showing how the partners cooperate and work together as a strong team and that each partner contributes to the partnership in the best way as possible.

"Partnership agreement" is the only voice that obtained a score slightly below the maximum, i.e. 9.9. Finding agreements could sometimes be difficult among different partners with different ideas, but the score of 9.9 demonstrates that this is a cooperative and strong partnership able to find a common solution that suits everyone.

The graph below shows the results provided by the Final Evaluation Questionnaires submitted to the partners during the Fourth Partners Meeting held, on 25 May 2020, online due to the anti-COVID19 measures.

Evaluation of the Partnership
May 2020

	Score
Respect of deadlines	9,5
Level of involvement	9,7
Partners' integration	9,5
Quality of project meetings	10,0
Level of cooperation	9,8
Effectiveness of partners'…	9,8
Responsabilities of partners	10,0
Partnership agreement	10,0
Avarage	9,8

The results presented by the graphic above are in line with the level of excellence registered so far.

The average is 9.8 / 10 and the marks range from 9.5 up to 10 out of 10.

"Quality of project meetings", "Clarity and transparency of partners' role and responsibilities" and "Appropriateness of the partnership agreement" obtained a score of 10.0 showing how the Partners cooperate and work together as a strong team and that each partner contributes to the partnership in the best way as possible.

The aforementioned success is also demonstrated by "Level of cooperation among partners" and "Effectiveness of partner's cooperation" which, despite receive the lowest score (9.6) can still be considered a good result and confirms that the partners found a strong balance in order to carry out the activities required all together.

The results show that the partnership worked according to and effective and clear repartition of the activities and responsibilities that were appropriately formalised in the partnership agreement. This allowed a good cooperation and a consistent involvement of all the institutions and experts.

Partners:
- shared a common view of the project and managed to respect it until the end
- Appreciated Project meetings organization and management

- Were committed in carrying out a great effort and cared about the cooperative effort implemented by the project team.
- Were duly coordinated and supported in doing project activities
- Felt that there was a great integration among them

The only voice slightly beyond standard is "Respect of deadline", which reaches a score of 9.5, mostly due to some delays coming from the difficulties arisen from the COVID 19 pandemic. Despite these difficulties the score is still high and shows that the partnership had the ability to carry out all the activities according to the agreed deadlines.

Andrea Ionel fomr EuroEd (RO) reported that the strong points of the project were the "*supportive collaboration among the partners*"

Project Internal Communication

A good communication strategy is an important aspect to be taken into account to ensure the success of a project.

For the purpose CKZiU and Pixel made an effort through the:

- Adoption of a transparent and democratic approach for the decisional process.

All the main project decisions, in terms of activities, results and deadlines, have been jointly taken by the entire partnership. A steering committee has been created at the beginning of the project including at least one representative of each partner institutions.

The steering committee participated in 4 transnational meetings during which all the outputs produced were assessed and reviewed and the planning of the following activities were agreed upon.

The transparency of the decisional process, and its democracy also prevented from possible internal conflicts of the partnership and contributed to the creation of a shared vision on the project matters.

Please see the minutes of the partners' meeting available at https://parsifal.pixel-online.org/meeting.php (username: partner; password: pixel).

- Constant circulation of information

The information related to the project was clear, available and continuously updated. This was possible thanks to the Project Management section of the project web site that allowed a constant sharing of information within the project partnership.

Reports were uploaded within dedicated sections on the Parsifal Portal and available in the Management section. Within the Work in progress section (https://parsifal.pixel-online.org/wip.php) the project partner

shared information about the activities carried out while in the Dissemination (https://parsifal.pixel-online.org/dissemination.php) they registered their dissemination activities.

During each project meeting a clear presentation providing the up to date information about the project achievements was delivered and guaranteed that each partner was constantly aware of what the other partners were doing, and to learn from each other's experience.

This allowed each partner to be constantly aware of what the other partners were doing, and to learn from each other's experience.

Each partner, during the partners' meetings, has been asked to evaluate the following aspects of the project internal communication:

- Communication means used for managing the project activities
- Circulation of the information within the partnership
- Access to information

The graph below shows the results provided by the Project Evaluation Questionnaires submitted to the partners during the Fourth Partners Meeting held, on 27 - 28 May 2019, in Kaunas (LT).

Evaluation of Internal Communication
May 2019

|	Value
Communication tools	10,0
Circulation of…	10,0
Access to information	10,0
AVERAGE	10,0

0,0 2,0 4,0 6,0 8,0 10,0

The subject in general gained very high results, showing an average score of 10.0. All the voices were evaluated with the maximum score showing that communication means and accessibility to project information were very appreciated by the partners and that the appropriateness of circulation of information between partners and coordinators is very good.

The graph below shows the results provided by the Final Evaluation Questionnaires submitted to the partners during the Fourth Partners Meeting held, on 25 May 2020, online.

Evaluation of Internal Communication
May 2020

Project information accessibility	10,0
Appropriateness of circulation of information	10,0
Appropriateness of communication means	10,0
Avarage	10,0

This chart proves that the communication and interaction among the project partners, the quality, timing and effectiveness of the answers provided to the partners, the sharing of information, experiences and solutions were all appreciated, with an average of 10.0.

All the voices were evaluated with the maximum score showing that communication means and accessibility to project information were very appreciated by the partners and that the appropriateness of circulation of information between partners and coordinators is very good.

Andreea Ionel from EuroEd (RO) says that "*Great communication among the partners. Transparency in communication*" reflecting the high score obtained by the internal communication.

Financial Management

The Budget control was ensured through the effective cooperation between CKZiU, as project coordinator, and Pixel that provided the necessary support as from its own experience in the coordination of European projects.

The two institutions worked during the whole project in order to put every project partner institution in the position of appropriately monitoring, reporting and documenting their Grant.

The first element that was used for the purpose is the contract that was signed by the coordinator with each of the partner institution.

It clarified the main elements related to the administrative and financial tasks for budget control:

- The Grant and as an attachment the Budget approved with figures for each budget heading

- The main deadlines and rules for reporting

- The instalments and related deadlines for the transfers of the Grant from the coordinator to the partner

- The official administrative and financial provisions (as an attachment)

Each project partner prepared the contract by the kick off meeting for being countersigned by the coordinator legal representative. After the finalization of this first step each partner received the first instalment. Further payments were linked to the checking of the reports and of the documents assessing the Grant declared. This allowed the check of the consistency of the partner in spending, reporting and proofing its own Grant.

The second element was the Administrative and Financial Manual of the project that was distributed during the kick off meeting and made available on the project Portal: https://parsifal.pixel-online.org/documents.php (Username: partner, Password: pixel)

The Manual provided the necessary information and templates on how to manage, monitor and report the project costs according to the rules of the Erasmus + Strategic Partnership action.

The manual included also formats and examples of the supporting documents to be used to back up the reported expenditures.

The third element was the dedication of a specific moment of each meeting to the administrative and financial presentation with which the coordinator and Pixel clarifies to the project partners the reporting rules and deadlines.

Fourth element was the shared reporting methodology.

During the project, the partners were asked to produce an intermediate report at Progress stage (September 2019) and a final one. The report contained the information about the figures needed to calculate the Grant according to the Unit costs model and of the costs incurred by the partners and was accompanied by the necessary supporting documents (e.g. contracts of staff involved, time sheets, attendance certificates) as defined by the National Agency rules.

Both the figures and the supporting documents were double checked, by Pixel and by the project coordinator.

A final version of the report was therefore agreed upon between Coordination team and each project partner and the related data were used to produce the Financial Report on the Mobility tool.

To evaluate the consistency of the process the project partners were asked to give feedback concerning:

- Information on the organisation of financial documents
- Explanation of project financial rules
- Financial resources adequacy

- Adequacy of distribution financial resource
- Management of financial resources

The graph below shows the results provided by the Project Evaluation Questionnaires submitted to the partners during the Fourth Partners Meeting held, on 27 - 28 May 2019, in Kaunas (LT).

Evaluation of Financial Management May 2019

Category	Score
Management of financial resources	10,0
Adeguability of distribution financial resources	10,0
Financial resources adeguacy	10,0
Explanation of project financial rules	10,0
Information on the organisation of financial…	10,0
AVERAGE	10,0

The average score of 10.0, in this category, can be considered a great success because of the natural criticism that the financial aspect involves in a project.

Good results are obtained by "Explanation of project financial rules" and "Organisation of finacnial document" that with a score of 10.0 show a good level fo finacial management and communication of fincancial rules during the first year of the project.

Also the index "Financial resources adeguacy", received a score of 10.0. This can be consodered a very high result considering that project's tasks are often considered higher than the allocated budget, so in this case we can say that transaction costs are proportionated to the benefits.

The graph below shows the results provided by the Final Evaluation Questionnaires submitted to the partners during the Fourth Partners Meeting held, on 25 May 2020, online.

Evaluation of Financial Management
May 2020

Usefulness of administrative information provided	9,7
Clarity and transparency of administrative rules	9,7
Consistency of financial resources with the project's tasks	10,0
Appropriateness of financial resources distribution	9,7
Management of financial resources by the project coordinator	9,7
Avarage	9,7

The average score of 9.7, in this category, can be considered a great success because of the natural criticism that the financial aspect involves in a project.

A good result is obtained by "Consistency of financial resources with the project's tasks" which scored 10.0; it was a positive result considering that project's tasks are often considered higher than the allocated budget, so in this case we can say that transaction costs are proportionated to the benefits.

All the other indexes received a score of 9.7, which can be still considered very high considering the financial aspects a difficult matter. In general we can say that participants appreciated the way in which the project coordinator managed financial resources and particularly the appropriateness of financial resources allocation between partners.

Evaluation of Partners Meetings

The Parsifal project benefited from the organisation of 4 transnational meetings of the steering committee in which representatives of the project partners participated with 1 to 2 representatives.

The kick off meeting was held in Florence, Italy in December 2018, the second meeting was held in Kaunas, Lithuania in May 2019, the 3rd meeting was held in Sofia, Bulgaria in February 2020 and the Final meeting was held online, in May 2020. Information about each of the 4 meetings is available on the project Portal at: https://parsifal.pixel-online.org/meeting.php (password protected, username: partner, password: pixel)

The aim of every meeting was, for the partners, to jointly report on the activities carried out in every country. During every meeting the partnership assessed the activities carried out until that moment and made detailed plans for future project developments and activities. Four transnational meetings have been organized.

Each meeting provided the project partners with the opportunity to share and discuss all relevant project's aspects and to check activities carried out, to validate the results achieved, to verify possible room for improvement and to plan future deadline and activities. Moreover each partner meeting give to each partner the opportunity to meet the other partners, to compare the results achieved and to take inspiration from the other partners' methodologies.

Each partners' meeting was carefully organised trough the implementation of the following activities:

- **Practical Organization of the Meeting**: the possible dates and the agenda for the meeting were proposed and approved with the partners. Information was given in order for the partners to organize the travel in the due time. The hotel was reserved and information was given about the hosting city and the practicalities available.

- **Preparation of the Meeting**: meeting folders were distributed to each project partner representative, containing all the necessary material to appropriately follow and participate to the discussions. The Meeting folder included: the calendar of activities; a summary of the project deadlines; the PowerPoint presentation of the activities carried out; templates to be used for reporting the project management activities and the administrative and financial state of art. The approved version of the meeting folders contents was also uploaded after the meeting, on the project Website.

- **Management of the Meeting**: During the meeting the agenda was proposed and approved, all the activities carried out were presented, the in progress results were analysed and the future deadline discussed and approved. The partners' questions were answered and the doubts clarified.

- **Minutes of the Meeting**: After each of the meetings, detailed minutes were prepared and shared among the project partners. The annexes were also produced, updating when necessary the draft

version presented and discussed during the meeting. The minutes and the annexes were then uploaded on the website to be easily available for all the partners.

The evaluation strategy developed by Pixel (IT), foresaw the use of questionnaires which were designed to evaluate the management of the partners meetings.

At the end of each meeting, the partners are requested to complete these questionnaires. The coordination team then analysed, collected and organized this information.

This allowed for an immediate and constant monitoring on behalf of the partners regarding the organisation of the meetings and their involvement.

The information derived from the evaluation questionnaires could be used to improve the planning and organisation of the following meetings.

The aspects of the meeting that each partner was required to evaluate are the following:
- The meeting secretariat
- The information provided before the meeting
- Facilities available for the meeting
- The technical equipment
- The agenda of the meeting
- The material distributed
- The reception at the meeting
- The planning of the meeting
- The time management
- The working conditions
- The working atmosphere
- The general management of the meeting
- The development of the work
- The level of participation
- The time available
- The results reached
- Consistency between the results and the initial objectives
- The degree of participation in the meeting

Kick Off Partners Meeting

The graph below illustrates how the project partners evaluated the Parsifal meeting which took place on 4 – 5 December 2018 in Florence, Italy.

Evaluation of Parsifal Partners' Meeting

Category	Score
The meeting secretariat	10,0
Information before meeting	10,0
Facilities available for the meeting	9,5
Technical equipment	8,8
Meeting Agenda	10,0
Material distributed	10,0
The reception at the meeting	10,0
The planning of the meeting	10,0
Working condition	9,6
Working atmosphere	10,0
General meeting management	9,9
Answers' satisfaction	10,0
Time available	10,0
Time Management	10,0
Results reached	9,9
Consistency results / objective	10,0
Participation in the meeting	9,9
The Social activities	10,0
Average	9,9

The general average is 9.9, a very good result for Pixel that testified the success obtained by this meeting.

12 categories reached 10.0 points, the maximum score; they are.

- "The meeting secretariat". It testified that the secretariat support system worked well in the purpose of facilitate the participation of the partners at the meeting.

- "Information before meeting". This result demonstrated that all the partners were very satisfied about the information that Pixel offered them before the meeting in view of preparing as best as possible.

- "Meeting agenda" and "The planning of the meeting". The partners appreciated a lot the activities proposed during the meeting and the way in which they were presented.

- "Material distributed". The type and the amount of materials and tools offered for carrying on the meeting's activities fully encountered the expectations of the partners. Rossella Risso from IIS Montale (IT) appreciated *"the precise and detailed folders provided for the project in general and for the financial management"*.

- "The reception at the meeting". The partners were satisfied about the way in which they were received at the meeting by Pixel' staff, highlighting the kindness and the professionality of the organizers. In particular, Agnieszka Godlewska from CKZiU (PL) appreciated so much the welcome she received that gave a score of 11!

- "Working atmosphere". The result obtained by this categories means that during the meeting a positive and productive atmosphere was created and it allowed working in the best way. Anca Constantin from Fundatia EuroEd (RO) liked *"the working atmosphere"*.

- "Answer' satisfaction". The maximum score gained by this category is another point of great satisfaction because testified that the meeting was very useful to the partners for clarify all interrogatives and doubts they had about the working activities linked to their role in the project. Gediminas Grėsius from Kauno Jono ir Petro Vileišių mokykla (LT) expressed that *"everything was explained clearly and that all the questions were answered"*.

- "Time available" and "Time management". Another very important success for Pixel because according to the results obtained by these two categories demonstrates that the timeline of the meeting was valuated appropriate to the necessities of the partners.

- "Social activities". All the partners enjoyed a lot the activities proposed during and at the end of the meeting.

- "Consistency results/objective" and "Results reached", that gained a score of 9.9 points, was also another reason of satisfaction because their high results demonstrated that the meeting was very fruitful for the entire project. The aims planned were respected and the results were very good.

"General meeting management" obtained a score of 9.9, so it means that the general organization of the meeting worked very well. Gianni Vallebona from IIS Montale (IT) appreciated *"the professional attitude of the hosts"*. Stefania Matei from Fundatia EuroEd (RO) appreciated "*the presentation of management part"*. *In particular,* Miglena Molhova from Zinev Art Technologies (BG) *"liked the most about the meeting the discussion of the themes of the legends and the financial presentation"*.

The same score of 9.9 points was obtained by "Participation in the meeting". This means that there was a high level of cooperation between the partners and a strong interest in reach the expected results. Agnieszka Godlewska from CKZiU (PL) liked *"the level of cooperation between Pixel and the other partners".*

"Working condition" gained a score of 9.6, a little below the general average but always a good result. It means that the working context was perceived as satisfactory by the partners according to their job requirements.

At only 0.1 points of difference from the previous category was collocated "Facilities available for the meeting" (9.5). This result expressed that Pixel' staff carried on a good job in the aim to provide to the partners the right support they need to work as best as possible.

The lower score, 8.8, was obtained by the category "Technical equipment". The score, further from the average then the others, was due to the fact that Internet connection functioned badly and this inconvenience took some discomforts to the participants' work activities. It is not a bad result however, it was the only defect of the entire meeting.

In conclusion, this evaluation shows a very positive feedback, a source of great satisfaction for Pixel.

Second Partners' Meeting

The graph below illustrates how the project partners evaluated the second Parsifal meeting which took place on 27 – 28 May 2019 in Kaunas (LT).

Evaluation of Second Parsifal Partners' Meeting

Category	Score
The meeting secretariat	9,9
Information before meeting	10,0
Facilities available for the meeting	10,0
Technical equipment	10,0
Meeting Agenda	10,0
Material distributed	10,0
The reception at the meeting	10,0
The planning of the meeting	10,0
Working condition	10,0
Working atmosphere	10,0
General meeting management	10,0
Answers' satisfaction	9,9
Time available	10,0
Time Management	10,0
Results reached	9,9
Consistency results / objective	9,9
Participation in the meeting	10,0
The Social activities	10,0
Average	10,0

The general average is a 10, a great result for Pixel that testified the success obtained by this meeting.

14 categories reached 10.0 points, the maximum score; they are.

- "Information before meeting". This result demonstrated that all the partners were very satisfied about the information that Pixel offered them before the meeting in view of preparing as best as possible.

- "Meeting agenda" and "The planning of the meeting". The partners appreciated a lot the activities proposed during the meeting and the way in which they were presented.

- "Material distributed". The type and the amount of materials and tools offered for carrying on the meeting's activities fully encountered the expectations of the partners.

- "The reception at the meeting". The partners were satisfied about the way in which they were received at the meeting by Pixel' staff, highlighting the kindness and the professionality of the organizers.

- "Working atmosphere". The result obtained by this categories means that during the meeting a positive and productive atmosphere was created and it allowed working in the best way. Morello Mariagrazia and Rossella Risso from IIS Montale (IT) liked that the atmosphere was relaxed, cooperative and exciting.

- "Time available" and "Time management". Another very important success for Pixel because according to the results obtained by these two categories demonstrates that the timeline of the meeting was valuated appropriate to the necessities of the partners. What Miglena Molhova from Zinev Art Technologies (BG) liked the most about the meeting was the management: time management, discussion management…

- "Social activities". All the partners enjoyed a lot the activities proposed during and at the end of the meeting.

- "Technical equipment". Showing that the resources used in this area were perfect.

- "General meeting management". So it means that the general organization of the meeting worked very well.

- "Participation in the meeting". This means that there was a high level of cooperation between the partners and a strong interest in reach the expected results. Zornitsa Staneva from Zinev Art Technologies (BG) liked the nice, creative group, open for dialogue and good ideas.

- "Working condition". It means that the working context was perceived as satisfactory by the partners according to their job requirements.

- "Facilities available for the meeting". This result expressed that Pixel' staff carried on a good job in the aim to provide to the partners the right support they need to work as best as possible.

The other 4 categories reached 9.9 points, almost a perfect mark; they are.

- "The meeting secretariat". It testified that the secretariat support system worked well in the purpose of facilitate the participation of the partners at the meeting.

- "Answer' satisfaction". This shows that all the doubts and criticisms have found a clear and satisfying response.

- "Consistency results/objective" and "Results reached", that gained a score of 9.9 points, was also another reason of satisfaction because their high results demonstrated that the meeting was very fruitful for the entire project. The aims planned were respected and the results were very good.

Anca Constantin from Fundatia EuroEd (RO) liked the general management, the agenda of the meeting and the results reached.

In conclusion, the results are really satisfying and positive for the organizer, showing the aim of this meeting was fulfil.

Third Partners' Meeting

The graph below illustrates how the project partners evaluated the Parsifal meeting which took place on 20-21 February 2020 in Sofia, Bulgaria.

Evaluation of the Third Parsifal Partners' Meeting

Category	Score
The meeting secretariat	9,9
Information before meeting	10,0
Facilities available for the meeting	9,9
Technical equipment	9,9
Meeting Agenda	10,0
Material distributed	10,0
The reception at the meeting	9,9
The planning of the meeting	10,0
Working condition	10,0
Working atmosphere	10,0
General meeting management	10,0
Answers' satisfaction	9,9
Time available	9,8
Time Management	10,0
Results reached	9,9
Consistency results / objective	9,9
Participation in the meeting	9,8
The Social activities	9,8
Average	9,9

The general average is 9.9, a very good result for Pixel that testified the success obtained by this meeting.

8 categories reached 10.0 points, the maximum score; they are.

- "Information before meeting". This result demonstrated that all the partners were very satisfied about the information that Pixel offered them before the meeting in view of preparing as best as possible.
- "Meeting agenda" and "The planning of the meeting". The partners appreciated a lot the activities proposed during the meeting and the way in which they were presented.
- "Material distributed". The type and the amount of materials and tools offered for carrying on the meeting's activities fully encountered the expectations of the partners.
- "The planning of the meeting". The partners appreciated the information they received before the meeting and the activities to be done during the meeting.
- "The working condition". The partners appreciated the cooperative environment among them. Agnieszka Godlewska from CKZiU (PL) liked the most the atmosphere and cooperative attitude. A very well-composed group.
- "Working atmosphere". The result obtained by this categories means that during the meeting a positive and productive atmosphere was created and it allowed working in the best way. Mihaela Vatavu from Fundatia EuroEd (RO) liked the fact that the working atmosphere was excellent. Lots of aspects were clarified, next steps were established and useful guidelines on how to do that were offered.
- "General meeting management". The partners liked the efficiency with which the meeting was mamanged. Gediminas Grėsius from Kauno Jono ir Petro Vileišių mokykla (LT) liked the most the efficient management of the activities. Useful experience echange.
- "Time management". Another very important success for Pixel because according to the results obtained by these two categories demonstrates that the timeline of the meeting was valuated appropriate to the necessities of the partners.

"Answer' satisfaction" received a score of 9.9 leading to a great satisfaction because testified that the meeting was very useful to the partners for clarify all interrogatives and doubts they had about the working activities linked to their role in the project.

The same score was given also to "Facilities available for the meeting" (9.9). This result expressed that the host's staff carried on a good job in the aim to provide to the partners the right support they need to work as best as possible. Rossella Risso from IIS Montale– Nuovo IPC (IT) liked the most the conference room in the same hotel where we were staying.

The lower score, 9.8, was obtained by the category "Time available". The score was due to the fact that there were several topics to discuss, scientifically and technically, but unfortunately there were some time restriction due to pending activities that were to be done as soon as possible. However the score represents a quite positive result, being close to the maximum, showing that generally the partners can be considered quite satisfied.

In conclusion, this evaluation shows a very positive feedback, a source of great satisfaction for the organiser.

Fourth Partners' Meeting

The graph below illustrates how the project partners evaluated the Parsifal meeting which was held online on 25 May 2020.

Evaluation of the Third Parsifal Partners' Meeting

Category	Score
The transnational coordination functioned	10,0
Information before meeting	10,0
How was the technical equipment (virtual room) available during…	9,8
Meeting Agenda	10,0
At the start of the Meeting, the themes, the time available and…	10,0
The planning of the meeting	10,0
Working atmosphere	10,0
General meeting management	10,0
Answers' satisfaction	10,0
Time available	10,0
Time Management	10,0
Results reached	10,0
Consistency results / objective	10,0
Participation in the meeting	10,0
Average	10,0

The general average is 10.0, a very good result for Pixel that testified the success obtained by this meeting. All the categories obtained the maximum score, showing that the planning, organization and the management of the meeting was very appreciated by the partners, despite the difficulties derived from the COVID19 pandemic and the resulting re-organisation of the meetings. This was also the reason why the meeting was held online.

Positive feedbacks were given to the following categories:

- Working atmosphere. The partners really appreciate the collaboration and the commitment by each partner in carrying out the activities in spite the difficulties arisen. Andreea Ionel from Fundatia EuroEd (RO) liked the efficient collaboration among the partners.

- Answer satisfaction. The partners liked the answers they were given during the meeting, especially those connected to the re-organisation of events and activities that were changed du to COVID19. Miglena Molhova from Zinev Art Technologies (BG) liked that all questions raised were answered timely and accordingly.

- Results reached. The partners were very satisfied with all the high quality results obtained so far. Andreea Ionel from Fundatia EuroEd (RO) liked the efficient respect of the project deadlines and the great coordination and monitoring of the project implementation.

The lower score, 9.8, was obtained by the category "technical equipment". This was due to the fact that the partners were still getting used to the organization of a full online meeting, discovering new ways and platform to be used. However, despite small difficulties, the score can be considered as high and the partners were satisfied.

In conclusion, this evaluation shows a very positive feedback, a source of great satisfaction for the organiser.

Evaluation of the Project Activities

The *evaluation of the project activities* observes in detail the quality of each activity completed as well as its level of efficiency in relation to the project objectives and outputs.

In order to ensure the achievement of all its planned and expected results the project has been methodologically conceived in order to promote the highest level of commitment of the project partners to work cooperatively and enhance the transnational dimension of the activities and results and based on the effective integration of the different project phases.

In order to do so:
 - The necessary activities were defined for the creation of the two intellectual outputs to be duly supported by the transversal activities functional to their correct implementation that is national and transnational coordination, monitoring and evaluation, dissemination and exploitation activities.
 - Project partners adopted common formats and templates to be used to carry out each of the project activities. Each proposed format was discussed, checked, assessed, changed, integrated and finally adopted by the whole partnership.
- Further steps in the project logical framework were the organisation of a short term joint staff training event through which project partners representatives further developed the necessary skills to use storytelling methodologies in kindergarten and the organisation in each country of a Multiplier Event to enhance the impact and sustainability.

The creation process of IO1 contents was discussed during the Kick off meeting, then involved project partners during the first 10 months of the project and the related achievements were assessed during the third meeting held in Sofia (BG) in February 2020.

The main features of the Repository of Legends and Traditional Tales were presented and discussed upon among the project partners.

During the second meeting the Repository of Legends and Traditional Tales were presented and Project partners decided together possible improvements that were then cooperatively implemented by the responsible partners.

The creation of the IO2 contents required a strong effort in order to properly develop the planned output and reach the expected results.

The project partners defined a first idea for the structure of the Essays during the second meeting in Kaunas and then worked in close cooperation among them to tailor the output to the specific needs of teachers and students.

Each partner had to develop 5 short essays on 5 topics previously planned and then finalised during the second partners' meeting.

The 5 topics are:

- Essay on Main Characters and Animals, Real and Mythological

- Essay on Connection with the Heritage of the Countries

- Essay on Usual Environments and / or Common Objects

- Essay on Recurring Situations and Challenges

- Essay on Similar Moral and Ethical Meaning and Purposes

The partners then connected the essays to the legends developed in the Intellectual Output 1 according to the topic.

During the third meeting in Sofia (BG) the partners had a transnational discussion among them on the connection and the aim of the essays and the legends from a European integration point of view.

The creation process of IO3 contents were presented and discussed during the third meeting. Pixel (IT), as technical responsible, presented the structure of the Interactive Map on the portal and the 2 mobile apps (Android and iOS). The partners agreed on developing 35 travels (7 each) around the legends produced in the IO1, connecting them according to a chosen topic.

The main features of the Interactive Map were presented and discussed upon among the project partners during the last meeting held online. All the decisions were taken in order to improve the travels created and the functionalities of the Map.

Each project partner was asked to evaluate the project activities. The activities were evaluated according to the following parameter.

- Implementation
- Organization of the project activities
- Proposed calendar of activities
- Reviewing of deadlines
- Respect of the deadlines
- Consistency between the activities carried out and the expected outcomes
- Quality of the work carried out

The graph below shows the results provided by the Final Evaluation Questionnaires submitted to the partners during the Fourth Partners Meeting focusing on project activities evaluation.

The graph below shows the results provided by the Project Evaluation Questionnaires submitted to the partners during the Fourth Partners Meeting held, on 27 - 28 May 2019, in Kaunas (LT).

Evaluation of The Project Activities
May 2019

Implementation	10,0
Organisation	10,0
Calendar	10,0
Reviewing of…	10,0
Respecting of…	10,0
Activity/aims	10,0
Work carried out	10,0
AVERAGE	10,0

The average ratio it's very high (10.0). The partners put a strong effort in trying to respect the schedule as much as possible. The partners managed to respect the agreed deadlines with very few delays which did not endanger the results of the project obtained so far.

The graph below shows the results provided by the Final Evaluation Questionnaires submitted to the partners during the Fourth Partners Meeting held, on 25 May 2020, online.

Evaluation of The Project Activities
May 2020

Work carried out	9,8
Compatibility of…	9,5
Respect of deadlines	9,5
Project deadlines	9,7
Calendar of the…	10,0
Appropriateness of…	9,7
Consistency between…	9,6
Avarage	9,7

The average ratio it's very high (9.7). Due to the COVID 19 the partners had to slow down their work in order to understand the situation around Europe and to re-organise their work trying to respect the

schedule as much as possible. The partners managed to respect the agreed deadlines with very few delays which did not endanger the results of the project obtained so far. Indeed, while the calendar of deadlines was considered adequate (10.0) the respect of deadline scored 9.5, showing the difficulties that came up with COVID19. Overall we can say that the partners managed to pull off the required tasks re-organising the calendar of deadlines according also to the extension of the project.

A very good result concerns the "Appropriateness of the work carried out by partners" that shows how much important is a cooperative partnership able to find good solutions in developing deliverables, despite big difficulties.

Evaluation of Project Results

Graphs below show the results provided by the Final Evaluation Questionnaires submitted to the partners during the Fourth Partners Meeting.

The graph below shows the results provided by the Project Evaluation Questionnaires submitted to the partners during the Fourth Partners Meeting held, on 27 - 28 May 2019, in Kaunas (LT).

Evaluation of The Project Results: General May 2019

Availability of planned results	10,0
Compatibility to initial objectives	10,0
Quality of project results	10,0
Effectiveness of management tools	10,0
Project portal	10,0
Satisfaction of the end users	10,0
AVERAGE	10,0

With an average score of 10.0 the chart demonstrates that partners were really satisfied by the general results obtained thanks to the project.

The highest score reached by "Effectiveness of management tools" and "Compatibility of initial objectives" shows a high quality of the tools produced for project management. In fact also "Project portal" obtained the highest result (10.0) and it is important in order to permit a quickly communication between partners. Talking about "Availability of planned results" it is very positive for the project that the score obtained was

10.0, this means that the deliverables produced by the partnership were immediately available online on the project portal. This high score is definitely connected to the aforementioned "Project portal" that, as just said, was valuated a perfect tool to communicate the results at current project stage.

Also the maximum score obtained by "Quality of project results" and "Satisfaction of the end-users" show that partners really appreciated the quality of project deliverables and the consistency between results and original aims and objectives.

The graph below shows the results provided by the Final Evaluation Questionnaires submitted to the partners during the Fourth Partners Meeting held, on 25 May 2020, online.

Evaluation of The Project Results: General May 2020

Level of satisfaction of end users'…	9,0
Quality of the project Website	9,8
Quality of the tools produced for…	9,8
Quality of project deliverables produced	9,8
Consistency between results and…	9,8
	9,7
Avarage	9,7

With an average score of 9.7 the chart demonstrates that partners were generally satisfied by the general results obtained thanks to the project.

The majority of the indexes scored 9.8, "Quality of the tools produced" "Consistency between results and original aims" showing that the partnership considered the products of high quality, especially after they were showed to end users and stakeholders. Moreover also "Quality of the project website" obtained a good results (9.8) and it is important in order to permit a quickly communication between partners. Andrea Ionel from EuroEd (RO) commented "*great intellectual outputs created, very supportive materials for the teachers, very attractive resources to increase the students achievements in literacy and digital skills*".

Talking about "Availability of planned results at the current stage" scored 9.7, mostly because of the App that took a little bit longer than expected to be fully available. From the other side this could be seen as a positive delay, meaning that the partners waited to make it available as soon as it was fully functional and usable for end users.

INTELLECTUAL OUTPUT 1 – ONLINE REPOSITORY ON LEGENDS AND TALES

The graph below shows the results provided by the Project Evaluation Questionnaires submitted to the partners during the Fourth Partners Meeting held, on 27 - 28 May 2019, in Kaunas (LT).

Evaluation of The Project Results: Intellectual Output 1
May 2019

Usefulness and Transnferability	10,0
Innavativeness	10,0
Usability	10,0
Readability	10,0
Consistency	10,0
Relevance	10,0
AVERAGE	10,0

The average score of 10.0 is in line with the high results obtained of the other charts, indeed all the voices received a score of 10.0 showing how the partners are satisfied with the material produced in the Intellectual Output 1.

The graph below shows the results provided by the Final Evaluation Questionnaires submitted to the partners during the Fourth Partners Meeting held, on 25 May 2020, online.

Evaluation of The Project Results: Intellectual Output 1
May 2020

Usefulness and Transferability	9,7
Innovativeness	9,5
Usability	9,7
Readability of the contents	9,7
Consistency of the contents	9,8
Relevance of contents	9,8
Avarage	9,7

The average score of 9.7 is in line with the high results obtained of the other charts, indeed all the voices received a score between 9.7 and 9.8 showing a general satisfaction of the partners with the material produced in the Intellectual Output 1.

"Usefulness and Transferability", "Usability" and "Readability if the contents" obtained a score of 9.7 showing how the partners think that the project deliverables of the Intellectual Output 1 are a very good product that can be used by the partners themselves and end users in the future, highlighting the strong potential the Legends produced can have.

Moreover, "Consistency of the contents" and "Relevance of the contents" obtained almost the highest score, i.e. 9.8, showing that the partners put a strong effort to produce the deliverables in line with the aim of the project and addressed to the target groups identified.

IO2 – Essays

The Intellectual Output 2 obtained a general score of 9.5, which can be considered as a good score, taking into consideration coming from the COVID19 pandemic and that no indexes received a score below 9.

"Relevance of the contents" received a score of 9.8, showing that the partners believe that the products are in line the objectives of the project and the needs of the target groups.

A high score (9.7) was also given to "Readability of the contents" and "Consistency of the contents". This is a good result since the partners had to develop small essays addressed to students according to specific topics, connecting also the legends of the first IO, which was not an easy task. However, thanks to the strong cooperation and interaction among partners, the result was considered very highly positive.

"Usefulness and Transferability", "Innovativeness" and "Usability" received 9.3. This was more an Intellectual Output that falls in-between the other two, indeed its usage was to improve the connection

among the legends of the Intellectual Output 1 thorough specific topics. Although lower than the other voices, it is still a good result for the project and the output itself.

INTELLECTUAL OUTPUT 3

Evaluation of The Project Results: Intellectual Output 3

Category	Score
Usefulness and Transferability	9,8
Innovativeness	9,8
Usability	9,8
Readability of the contents	9,8
Consistency of the contents	9,8
Relevance of contents	9,8
Avarage	9,8

A good result was obtained by the Intellectual Output 3, with a score of 9.8. Indeed, all the categories received 9.8 showing the satisfaction of the partners toward the innovativeness, consistency and usefulness of this Intellectual Output.

It is important to underline the high score obtained (9.8) by "Usefulness and Transferability" and "Readability of the contents" that shows a strong level of satisfaction from the partners toward the access and usage of the deliverable addressed to teachers and students.

Rossella Risso from Montale (IT) comments "*I think this may be the best output and definitely the most innovative and for best use in class*".

Project Number: 2018-1-PL01-KA201-050865

Evaluation of Dissemination

The graph below shows the results provided by the Project Evaluation Questionnaires submitted to the partners during the Fourth Partners Meeting held, on 27 - 28 May 2019, in Kaunas (LT).

Evaluation of Dissemination May 2019

Category	Score
Quality and usefulness…	10,0
Clarity and…	10,0
Friendliness and…	10,0
Effectiveness of…	10,0
Quality dissemination…	10,0
Quality dissemination…	10,0
AVEARAGE	10,0

The average score gained by dissemination is 10.0, being in line with the results obtained by the "Availability of planned results" in a previous chart, and it can be valuated very positively. "Organisation of the Project web-site" (10.0), and "Usability of the Project web site" (10.0) in fact the project portal was valuated as useful and helpful, considering also its organization that resulted very clear and friendly to use. "Effectiveness", "Activities" and "Results" of the project dissemination gained also 10.0, showing that the partners managed to disseminate the project in the best way they can using all the possible means in order to spread the project deliverables around their networks.

The graph below shows the results provided by the Final Evaluation Questionnaires submitted to the partners during the Fourth Partners Meeting held, on 25 May 2020, online.

Evaluation of Dissemination May 2020

Category	Score
	9,7
Quality of the…	9,7
Effectiveness of the…	9,7
User friendliness and…	9,8
Clarity and…	9,8
Quality and usefulness…	9,8
Avarage	9,8

The average score gained by dissemination is 9.8, considering that there is no ratio uder 9.7 can be valuated very positively. The "quality", "clarity" and "user-friendliness" of the project portal scored 9.8, showing that the project portal was valuated as a useful and helpful tool with which to present the project outside the partnership.

Moreover, the high score obtained from "Effectiveness of the overall project dissemination" and "Quality of the dissemination activities" highlight how, despite the difficulties arose by the COVID19 in meeting with other organisation and persons in presence, the partners still managed to disseminate the project in the best way they can using all the possible means in order to spread the project deliverables around their networks.

Andrea Ionel from EuroEd (RO) commented "*great intellectual outputs created, very supportive materials for the teachers, very attractive resources to increase the students' achievements in literacy and digital skills*".

Conclusions

The **planning** of the project proved to be effective.

The Parsifal project managed to respect the initial expectations both in terms of consistency with the needs of the context it is addressing and in achieving the foreseen results through the cooperation of the project partners and the effective use of the planned resources.

The **objectives of the project** were understood by the project partners and proved to be consistent with the needs and expectations of the end users.

The partners were very satisfied with the **Project management** carried out

The coordination was one of the key success factors of the project and managed to guarantee that all project partners were involved to reach the planned deliverables and bring their added value to the project.

Communication among the partners has been outstanding ensuring a constant circulation and sharing of information.

The **project meetings** reached the highest degree of participation from all the institutions and people involved. The optimal working atmosphere, combining effectively the needed leadership and the necessary flexibility and democratic approach has been recognised by the project partners as a key point for the success of the project. To highlight is the strong participation and availability of the partners in the fourth meeting, which, due to the COVID19 pandemic, was held online. The partners showed a solid commitment in schedule and putting an effort in the organisation and participate actively in the online meeting.

The **project partnership** has shown excellent capacity to work in team and fully achieved the initial aim of combining the different experiences, skills and expertise of the involved institution and staff.

The **activities** carried out are in line or even in advance with the expectations. The careful planning of the activities and related deadlines has ensured that the delays arose due to the re-organisation needed with the spread of the COVID19 pandemic did not affect at all the project achievements.

The **project results** were highly evaluated by the project partnership and they are in accordance with the initial project objectives and expectations.