

SILVER CITY – Innovative urban strategies and action plans to increase the social and economic role of seniors

Mid-term evaluation report

The mid-term evaluation questionnaire was prepared by the LP for the 3rd Thematic Workshop (Galati, 5-6 November, 2013). This questionnaire was filled in by project managers and/or thematic leaders, who are deeply involved in the implementation of the project. LP received 7 filled in questionnaires in total (but not everybody answered all questions), and made the below summary and evaluation based on them. Where partners had to rank the answer, LP counted the average rank, and besides collected all written answers and comments below. The most significant answers and comments and those opinions, which may need actions in the future, are underlined. **This is your time now to share with the project partners in Galati what you think important from the list!!!**

The below answers are copied from the evaluation sheets.

1. How is SILVER CITY progressing so far? (6 point in average out of 10)

- Overall implementation of the project is in line with the AF, and project plan. At the same time there is some lagging behind with the schedule (e.g. LIPs). The communication among partners in between meetings is rare.
- There is still not clear idea for what some of the project products should be. The methodology for city surveys had some gaps and this led to big differences between the surveys resulting on poor quality of synthesis report.
- Firstly, two important partners resigned. Secondly, the participation of some partners is not fully professional and there is a general low-quality approach to outputs. Moreover, the cooperation / joint work between partners is limited only to international events (no backside job).
- Some activities are in line with the AF but not all; there is a lack of communication with the project manager, not clear tasks...
- It is progressing according to the application form but it laces an appropriate definition of common standards for the output delivering.
- Coordination should be more present, we are facing times in which there is a lack of communication in between partners and suddenly - related to coming meetings - an increase of mails.
- The activities seem to be in line with the implementation calendar. The work with the External Communication Manager of the LP could be improved.

2. Is the SILVER CITY project/topic meeting your expectations? (7,29 point in average out of 10)

- Best practices in active ageing at local level have been discussed, together with local context of partners. I feel that further focus needs to be put on local governments and authorities as service providers in the region.
- The topics are set in the approved AF, I don't think anything can be modified at this stage.
- I'm fully satisfied about the job done in Treviso Province (timing, results, etc...), but the reactions and inputs from some other partners is not always satisfying.
- the topic of the project is very relevant to local situation and we look forward to more exchange of ideas, good practices.

- As partners have different approaches to the participation at project meetings (very active participants and very silent participants) I propose to provide with the agenda a clearer description of the topics and issues that the meeting aims to solve and tackle. I think that the coordinator should check the effective presence of the persons registered at the meeting, avoiding that people officially registered at the meeting go away.
- I am very much interested in the topic, not always fully satisfied on how the topic is developed within the partnership.
- The activities implemented so far involving local and transnational expertise has led to relevant outputs at local level (city survey, the QHF, the solution engineering sessions, pilot project plan).

3. The information given by SILVER CITY is really useful for me (6,71 point in average out of 10)

- Management information, and experiences of other countries and localities are useful.
- To a good extend the information provided is useful, but more or less it is produced/provided by the team members at local level. As there are big differences between local situation of the project partners it is not every time applicable by all.
- The lack of a standardized methodology for collection of data for the Local Surveys is a mistake. The result is a set of information difficult to compare. In fact, the Synthesis Report is not satisfying. One by one, the local situation analysis are good.
- The communication should be fostered.
- It is not clear what the question wants to know. If it is related to the information given by the Silver City project coordinator is yes at financial level, less at technical level. More skype conference should be organised for focussing the output goal.
- Some are, some others are already part of my knowledge.
- The best practices examples given so far and the knowledge shared by the partners during the transnational meetings have been really useful for shading light on the local problems.

4. The information given by SILVER CITY is new for me (6 point in average out of 10)

- The output of city surveys, and local context, as well as some good practice examples were new to me.
- The information on the pilot project activities by different partners is new and useful. Same can be said for good practices implemented by partners or other cities, as some doesn't have so much experience in dealing with this topic and it is a good example to start with.
- The info collected in the different countries are quite interesting and new, in particular because they come from eastern countries (there is a general lack of info from these territories).
- Already working on the topic of demographical changes and ageing for some time.
- It is not clear the question.
- Some are some not.
- There are some aspects regarding the project theme that are specific to each partner country (legislation, best practices, previous experience etc.).

5. I am satisfied with the LP's work (6,71 point in average out of 10)

- Management of the project generally goes fluent, expect some periods in between meeting when there is little communication.

- Yes, very much. Minutes are well structured with clear deadlines. Even though does not always receive an answer on some questions by the communication manager.
- This is a mix between a 7 for the administrative and financial management (of the reassignment of 2 partners in particular, that took a lot of efforts) and a 5 for the coordination of the output realization (and quality & timing in particular).
- Almost no communication with project manager at Zugló.
- As said previously, LP's work is more than sufficient at financial level; is less sufficient and present at technical level.
- Coordination should be more present and in some cases also more direct. With special regard to transnational meeting in which the host shall organise the logistics, but the project coordinator should always take over the agenda and partnership work.
- Very good and hands-on communication, quick and professional solutions to various management issues. Very supportive.

6. I am satisfied with the WP2 Leader's work (4,83 point in average out of 10)

- I had comments on communication plan, which were not reflected, asked for the text of the flyer and brochure for translation because I could not get the text out of it because of the format, which didn't get; as soon as we get the brochure for translation, it was already outdated - the event has passed, web-site is difficult to use.
- Since the beginning of the project, there is a lack of coordination and quality in the communication and corporate image management: lack of decision making, delays in answering, absence in international meetings, very low quality texts (difficult to translate), website not updated, etc...
- Not a lot of communication management.
- No answer from the Communication Manager; no inputs and monitoring about the reached output; communication is strategic in that type of project and honestly the communication manager does not communicate as should be.
- Communication of these types of projects should be stronger and more efficient. As an example, the project web site is missing a lot of information.
- There was a lack of communication (e-mails remained unanswered), issues not clarified, the project site still not updated, although we have sent the required information.

7. I am satisfied with the WP3 Leader's work (7,17 point in average out of 10)

- The methodology for city survey was not clear, which cause big differences between city surveys by each partner. SES went well.
- Could be more communication, pro-activity.
- This is a mix between the 7 of the SES and Local Situation Analysis (organized and realized) and the 5 for the few time dedicated at the beginning to the creation of a standardized collection methods and for the Synthesis Report quality.
- Maribor has done a good job for the SES methodology. But there is any report about the success and work done putting in evidence what has worked or not, in order to find in advance solution to TS activity.
- I think this part has been working and has been properly coordinated.
- Good coordination of WP3 activities, in close cooperation with activity leaders: LP and Burgas. Good and active participation at transnational meetings.

8. I am satisfied with the WP4 Leader's work (6,83 point in average out of 10)

- Poor quality of 4.1 is result of 3.1, 4.3 was well communicated and coordinated.
- There is still too much doubts and low inputs for the SCAP, while the activation of pilot projects went on with no particular problems (even if some of them are still foggy).
- Not a lot of contacts.
- University of Zagreb has started since some month to be the coordinator of the work package. In any case, a part the pilot methodology, WP coordination activity should be improved.
- The leader of this WP shall be more present.
- Good coordination and collaboration with the thematic leaders, especially keeping in mind that they assumed unexpected tasks (due to withdrawal of Graz). The methodology for implementation of the pilot actions was well drawn up.

9. I am satisfied with the WP5 Leader's work (7,33 point in average out of 10)

- I don't see the role of WP leader at 5.1 as hosting partner prepares the programme and LP drafts the minutes. The way of summarizing info on 5.3 is ok.
- TAP and QHF had been scheduled, organized and monitored. TCM had been realized.
- More interaction between the meetings.
- Yes.
- This leader is quite proactive in the development of the project.
- Very good coordination and expertise, as well as monitoring of the TAP work and partners' QHF activities. Good participation within transnational meetings and organization of SES.

10. I am satisfied with the help I receive from "my" TAP expert (7,83 point in average out of 10)

- Gives ideas and suggestions what can be done better and how it can be approved.
- There are some TAPs very active (Italy, Hungary) and some other not so much. It is probably necessary that all TAPs share the workloads in the future.
- Many times they don't have time to participate.
- Yes, he is a professional expert and really supports the transnational activity.
- So.
- Quality documents, professional work and experience in similar projects.

11. I am satisfied with the SILVER CITY partnership (6,83 point in average out of 10)

- There should be more communication between partners in order to unify or have more similarities between the products developed by each partner.
- This is a mix between 7 for the wellbeing in staying together and 5 for the poor contribution and participation of some partners, both during the meetings and during the "homeworks".
- Best satisfied with Treviso.
- Partnership is good but should improve the quality of the work, defining in advance the standard quality of the outputs to reach; a silver city dropbox community should be done with the upload of project output; partners should meet more frequently via skype or other system in order to give themselves deadlines and mutual updates about the

state of the art.

- Some strong coordination is missing, partners - working from a distance - do not update or involve the rest of the partnership. Communication and sharing is somewhat missing.
- Good involvement in the project activities, quality outputs and great communication and participation at transnational meetings.

12. I am satisfied with the partner meetings (6,83 point in average out of 10)

- Yes, we the discussion on the content of the products and deadlines for accomplishment of tasks are very useful.
- Organization, hospitality and services are good (except for Burgas, where a hotel closer to the venue of the meeting), but the meetings should be more work-oriented.
- In some cases we are not well prepared for the discussion.
- Should be improved as explained before; agenda should be sustained with a clearer explanation of what are the goals of the meetings for putting all partners in the conditions to follow concretely the works; really involved people should attend at the project meeting and should be "obliged" to have an active role in the meetings.
- Some are productive, some other I had the impression that partners did not prepare well what they were supposed to deliver.
- Effective work, knowledge sharing and best practices experience, as well as viable solutions to the implementation issues.

13. What have you learnt in SILVER CITY so far?

- Better knowledge about the South Eastern countries, interesting information about over 50 employment systems in other countries.
- I was already aware of the situation regarding active ageing in some countries, Bulgaria and Romania situation was new to me; I learned some good practices - some of them similar to what we already have locally, some quite new ideas.
- The question is not clear. At what level?
- I learned about the situation of elderly in involved countries and what is most feasible to be done for them.
- A good partnership ensures the best solutions for identifying and solving local problems, by means of examples and common goals and outputs.

14. What key learning has SILVER CITY facilitated?

- None
- Successful practices shown that we can start small and simple, important is the belief and motivation; it is always about the attitude - positive thinking is sometimes crucial; there are a lot of good practices already out there - we have to share and use them according to the local needs.
- The question is not clear. At what level?
- Do not understand the difference with the previous question.
- Active ageing by volunteering - the theme of our pilot project - is an underexploited option for seniors in Galati. The implementation of the pilot project will form the basis for future actions.

15. What support do you need which is not currently offered by the partners or the project and which helps you to incorporate the SILVER CITY knowledge/lesson learnt to your local context (pilots, actions plans)?

- None
- -
- Staff exchange, good practice exchange, exchange of experiences and opinions (was already done, more would be even better).
- More interaction among partners a part the face to face meeting; definition of a common set of standard to give to the output and project products.
- A clear summary report of the research done in all countries. A clear vision of all the actions plans and the pilot testing.
- So far there was no need of additional support.