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# **1.INTRODUCTION.**

This report gathers and summarises the responses received based on the initial and intermediate assessments of all educational and institutional partners that participated in the first and second pilot tests of the PlaySports project.

The educational and institutional actors participating in this assessment process were international and local organizations, as well as the volunteers participating in the project up until now.

The methodology followed for the assessment process and to gather the relevant information consisted in developing and answering several assessment questionnaires, both quantitative and qualitative, that were sent to all educational and institutional partners on a regular basis using *Google forms.* The reason for using both quantitative and qualitative questions in the assessment has been to gather accurate, precise and reliable information.

Once the responses were obtained for the questionnaires, the data was extracted and studied to help take accurate and contextualised decisions based on the needs expressed by the participants and beneficiaries of the project.

The aim behind this report is to gather and summarise the information taken from the assessment questionnaires to then report the results taken from all of the participants in the project.

# **2. INITIAL AND INTERMEDIATE ASSESSMENT REPORT BY INTERNATIONAL PARTNERS.**

In this section of the report will reflect the responses of the International partners to the different questionnaires that have been completed during the project. This section is divided into two main blocks: initial and intermediate assessment questionnaires.

On the other hand, it evaluates aspects related to the operation and implementation of the different working packages, the challenges faced by the different international institutions, as well as the opportunities that have been presented and the strong and weak points of the project, among others.

## **2.1. Initial assessment report for international partners.**

This section refers to all the answers collected along the initial assessment questionnaires.

### **2.1.1. List of work packages with the lead countries.**

As for the distribution of leadership for each work package among international partners:

- WP2: FIMU (Finland).

**-** WP3: No response.

- WP4: DRPD (Slovenia).

- WP5: MSV (Italy).

- WP6: FPT (Spain).

- WP7: FARE (United Kingdom).

**Graph 1. List of work packages with the lead countries.**

### **2.1.2. Main difficulties experienced by international partners.**

As for the difficulties faced by international partners at this stage, the most common was preparing the practical and technical parts of the project. Next, they found it complicated to communicate with other international partners using e-tools, Also, a few mentions that some international partners have not led their work package adequately and have avoided certain responsibilities. Last but not least, some mention the difficulties in finding volunteers to implement the project.

**Graph 2. Main difficulties experienced by international partners.**

### **2.1.3. Initial expectations of international partners relating to the project.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
| **Describe your initial expectations of the project** | |  |
| Country | Answer |  |
| Spain | We expect to test the sport inclusion methodology and learn from other partners different tools and methodologies! |  |
| Slovenia | Get in touch with active local YAG, helping kids to develop different skills, encourage them, develop voluntary work, that's also connected with sport etc. |  |
| ITALY | To affirm the positive result of Music through the multidisciplinary Sport with the concrete opportunity to increase teacher training through the results of the Pilots developed |  |
| Finland | FIMU was interested in creating international contacts for itself and its member organisations. FIMU was interested in methodological innovations and supporting the social inclusion of children and youth with immigrant background. |  |
| United Kingdom | Contributing to new educational tools/ curriculum to promote social inclusion by promoting the project within our network and among our members. |  |

### **2.1.4. Foreseen challenges for international partners for the duration of the project.**

As for the challenges that international partners think they will face during the project’s first pilot, responses were very diverse. Nevertheless, some of the most commented challenges were developing meaningful knowledge from the implementation of the project and keeping in touch with partners and social inclusion of beneficiaries. Other less commented challenges were identifying good praxis, coordinating with European Entities and promoting the inclusion of children and teenagers with special needs.

**Graph 3. Foreseen challenges for international partners for the duration of the project.**

### **2.1.5. Main benefits expected by international partners from participating in the project.**

Regarding the main benefits from participating in the project, the most common responses were: participating in a European project; creating new contacts among partners and providing a social service. Other less common benefits mentioned were: improving inter-personal relations, training future employees for the organization and helping volunteers to find a job.

**Graph 4. Main benefits expected by international partners from participating in the project.**

### 

### **2.1.6. Future opportunities expected by international partners from participating in the project.**

On the future opportunities that might arise from the Play Sports project, most international partners believe it will open doors to participate in another European project and will give them the opportunity to keep collaborating among themselves and with other local organizations. Finally, a marginal group mentions it may allow them to employ the volunteers they’ve helped train.

**Graph 5. Future opportunities expected by international partners from participating in the project.**

## **2.2. Intermediate assessment report for international partners.**

This section refers to all the answers collected along the intermediate assessment questionnaires of international institutions.

### **2.2.1. Assessment on the progress of each work package with the lead country.**

In general, when evaluating the progress of their work packages, all international partners made positive self-assessments. FIMU was the partner that gave itself the lower mark, two over five; FARE evaluated the progress of its work package with three over five; FPT, DRUSTVO and DRPDNM four over five and, finally, ASD marked five over five.

**Graph 6. Assessment on the progress of each work package with the lead country.**

### **2.2.2. Main difficulties experienced by international partners during the first pilot test of the project**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| **Describe the main difficulties which you have been facing during the first pilot** | |
| Country | Answer |
| DRPDNM (Slovenia) | No bigger issues. |
| FIMU (Finland) | We have not been able to produce the sport events and meetings with parents yet. The partners and volunteers are not all very committed to the project. |
| ASD (Italy) | Development of the framework with the other Local Sport Clubs/YAGs trying to schedule all the event organized. The different levels of methodology and skill profile matched with Pilot Test preparation. |
| FARE (UK) | Main difficulty is knowing the ins and outs of the pilots other groups are doing and disseminating the results in a structured outcome |
| DRUSTVO (Slovenia) | No difficulties. |
| FPT (Spain) | Lack of time in the project resources and follow up activities. Loneliness with the rest of the partners. Lack of monitoring of the quality of the materials being produced, etc. |

### **2.2.3.** **Main challenges experienced by international partners during the implementation of the first pilot test.**

Regarding the challenges faced by partners during the pilot, responses were varied. However, they match the main challenges marked in the initial evaluation questionnaire. This means the main challenges identified have been: developing meaningful knowledge from the implementation of the project and keeping in touch with partners. They also mention the challenge of coordinating with European entities to move the project forward, and to a lesser extent, the social inclusion of beneficiaries. Other less common responses were: identifying good praxis and the inclusion of children and teenagers with special needs.

**Graph 7. Main challenges experienced by international partners during the implementation of the first pilot test.**

### 

### **2.2.4. Description of the main challenges experienced by international partners during the first pilot test.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Describe the main challenges which you have been facing since now** | |
| Country | Answer |
| DRPDNM (Slovenia) | No bigger challenges. |
| FIMU (Finland) | The coordination of different WP's have been left mostly on FIMU. Developing the training strategy and different methods have not been easy. Most of the partners have not been able to develop the methods from E-learning platform contents. |
| ASD (Italy) | Preparation and planning the E-Learning platform structural organization |
| FARE (UK) | Main challenge is that not the same staff members are involved from the beginning. Other main challenge is that it feels we are behind schedule on some aspects of the program (e-learning tool) |
| DRUSTVO (Slovenia) | No specific difficulties. |
| FPT (Spain) | A lot of partners are lost in his task. Some partners did not implement the project, there's no innovation. Leaders of WP3 and WP4 doesn't act as a leaders. E-learning platform hasn't done. Leader of WP5 is forgiving his task. Only FIMU and FPT implement activities related to the aim of the project. MSV only works basketball skills through music; DRPDNM is lost in the methodology: GEA is a mystery what they are doing; Just FPT organised 3 sports events. |
|

### **2.2.5. Assessment on the development of the project’s main goals.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Do you think that the main goals of the Project are being developed?** | | |
| Country | Answers | Reason |
| DRPDNM (Slovenia) | Yes | We have already reached quite good number of volunteers and YAGs of a target group which I guess is the most important thing. |
| FIMU (Finland) | No | Recruiting volunteers for the project has not succeeded in all cases, some are using trainees or have not been able to get but a few youngsters interested. The dissemination of the project has not reached all the aimed recipients. Some of the tasks are delayed or not completed. |
| ASD (Italy) | Yes | It's created a positive feel and cooperation with other partners |
| FARE (UK) | Yes | Yes I have the feeling the pilots for all partners are running ok. But I do have the feeling that the e-learning platform is a big issue that is not being developed at the moment. Dissemination can be more structured and is something that needs to be improved in 2019. |
| DRUSTVO (Slovenia) | Yes | We reached good numbers of volunteers and participants for whom this project was initially addressed to - marginalized children/youth. |
| FPT (Spain) | No | Lack of involvement of most of the partners implementing the pilot activities. |

### 

### **2.2.6. Qualitative and quantitative assessment by international partners of the relationship with local partners.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluate your relationship with the local partners** | | |
| Country | Progress | Reason |
| FPT (Spain) | 4 | Differences among local partners. Some difficulties involving them in the project: they see the project as normal sport activities, instead of helping them in their task. |
| DRUSTVO (Slovenia) | 4 | No particular difficulties. |
| FARE (UK) | 2 | Not applicable. |
| ASD (Italy) | 4 | Preparation at bureaucracy approach with Sport Club Management for to explain the main WPs OF play |
| FIMU (Finland) | 2 | Difficulties: Securing a suitable time for the sport session; insert the project method; not enough resources for cooperating with immigrant sports clubs. |
| DRPDNM (Slovenia) | 4 | No difficulties. |

**Graph 8. Qualitative and quantitative assessment by international partners of the relationship with local partners.**

### 

### **2.2.7. Quantitative assessment by international partners of the educational task done by their YAGs.**

**Graph 9. Quantitative assessment by international partners of the educational task done by their YAGs.**

### **2.2.8. Quantitative assessment by international partners of the task done by their YAG coordinator.**

**Graph 10. Quantitative assessment by international partners of the task done by their YAG coordinator.**

### 

### **2.2.9.** **Main benefits obtained by international partners from participating in the project.**

With regards to the main benefits that the project is providing to the different sports entities, responses are virtually identical to the expectations generated by the European partners. The most commented benefits were: participating in a European project; creating new contacts among organizations and providing a social service. Responses with a lower percentage were similar to those provided in the first questionnaire: train future workers in the organization and help volunteers to find a job. Nonetheless, some aspects changed compared to the initial questionnaire, since none of the international partners have improved interpersonal relationships in their organizations.

**Graph 11. Main benefits obtained by international partners from participating in the project.**

### 

### **2.2.10.** **General satisfaction of international partners from the overall implementation of the project.**

**Graph 12. General satisfaction of international partners from the overall implementation of the project.**

# **3. INITIAL AND INTERMEDIATE ASSESSMENT REPORT BY LOCAL PARTNERS.**

In this section of the report will reflect the answers to the different questionnaires of local entities and institutions that have participated throughout the project. This section is divided into two main blocks: initial and intermediate assessment questionnaires.

On the other hand, this is evaluated aspects related with the operation and implementation of the project to each institution, the challenges that have been faced, the opportunities that have been presented throughout the project, the strengths and weaknesses of this , the main benefits of participation in the project, the evaluation of the educational task of the different YAG's and the educational coordinator who have participated in each local entity, the degree of satisfaction towards the project, in addition to the relationship with the International institutions.

## **3.1. Initial assessment report by local partners.**

This section refers to all the answers collected along the initial assessment questionnaires.

### **3.1.1. Relationship of local partners with their countries of origin.**

As for the local partner countries participating in the Play Sports project, we can see that Italy has eleven local educational institutions participating; Spain and Finland developed the project through three educational institutions and Slovenia worked with two local partners.

### **3.1.2. Reasons why local partners decided to participate in the project.**

The main reasons for local educational partners to participate in the Play Sports project were creating new contacts at a local and international level; provide a social work service to their communities; and also participating in a European project. On another note, more residually, some local partners decided to participate in the project to increase their international visibility and also to gain social recognition.

**Graph 13. Reasons why local partners decided to participate in the project.**

### **3.1.3. Initial expectations of local partners relating to the benefits from participating in the project.**

As for the benefits that the project can bring for the local partners, the main highlights are that the project can lead to the implementation of new didactic methodologies from other countries and cities; help the social inclusion of groups at risk of exclusion through sport and develop different values using sport as a tool. With lower percentages, we find the option to change bad behaviours in children and teenagers, and create new contacts between local and international partners, as well as exporting didactic methodologies from each partner.

**Graph 14. Initial expectations of local partners relating to the benefits from participating in the project.**

### **3.1.4. Sports implemented by local partners during the first pilot test of the project.**

Regarding the sports that will be used by the different local partners in the first pilot of the project, the most used sport is basketball (by far); football; Indoor football and dance as the second most used; and finally sports such as cheerleading, baseball, hockey, volleyball and gymnastics.

**Graph 15. Sports implemented by the local partners during the first pilot test of the project.**

### **3.1.5. Age ranges of project beneficiaries during the first pilot test of the project.**

The beneficiary age ranges to develop the project will be from 6-7 years to 16-17. Most local partners will work with age ranges from 8 to 14 years.

**Graph 16. Age ranges of project beneficiaries during the first pilot test of the project.**

### **3.1.6. Main educational aspects for local partners to develop through the project.**

Concerning the main aspects that the entities would like to work with beneficiaries of the project, we find: boosting social inclusion of beneficiaries and increasing group cohesion. Partners also expect to change disruptive behaviour; transmit values through sport and strengthen healthy habits and entrepreneur competences.

**Graph 17. Main educational aspects for local partners to develop through the project.**

## **3.2. Intermediate assessment report by local partners.**

This section refers to all the answers collected along the initial assessment questionnaires.

### **3.2.1. Countries of origin of local partners.**

Regarding the number of local partners per country, Slovenia participated with four local partners, Spain with three, Finland with two and Italy with one.

**Graph 18. Countries of origin of local partners.**

### **3.2.2. Age ranges of beneficiaries participating in the first pilot test.**

The age ranges of beneficiaries from local partners participating in the project go from 6-7 years to 22-24 years of age. Most local partners worked with age ranges from 8 to 18 years of age.

**Graph 19. Age ranges of beneficiaries participating in the first pilot test.**

### 

### **3.2.3. Quantitative assessment by local partners of their relationship with international partners.**

Overall, looking at the relationships between local and international partners, we can say that the evaluation is very positive, as almost all local partners said the relationships were excellent or really good. However, two local partners said the relationship was good or fair.

**Graph 20. Quantitative assessment by local partners of their relationship with international partners.**

### **3.2.4. List of YAGs for each of the local partners.**

As for the number of YAGs working in each local entity during the first pilot, the numbers differ significantly. Each sports centre had between one and ten volunteers. From data taken from the questionnaires, the most common number of YAGs was three.

**Graph 21. List of YAGs for each of the local partners.**

### **3.2.5. Quantitative assessment by local partners of the educational task of their YAGs.**

Regarding the educational work done by the YAGs during the first pilot, local partners said it was good or excellent. 36% of partners said the educational work of their YAGs was excellent and 36% said it was really good. The remaining 27% said it was good. We can therefore affirm that YAGs did a good job and that their work was adequate to the needs at each partner organization.

**Graph 22. Quantitative assessment by local partners of the educational task of their YAGs.**

### **3.2.6. Quantitative assessment by international partners on the educational task of their YAG coordinator.**

As for the evaluation of the YAG coordinators, local partners said the work done by them was good or excellent. 73% said the work done by YAG coordinators was excellent; 18% said it was

really good and the remaining 9% said it was good. This shows that YAG coordinators in each of the countries did an excellent job at work and that the needs in the different local educational institutions were met.

**Graph 23. Quantitative assessment by international partners on the educational task of their YAG coordinator.**

### **3.2.7. Main benefits for local partners from participating in the project.**

As for the main benefits from the Play Sports project for the local partners, we have seen that the responses given vary largely. However, the most common response was the development of different values using sport as a tool; this indicates that the project is meeting its guidelines. The other main benefits that are most mentioned are the following: implement new didactic methodologies from other countries, changing bad behaviours and increasing social recognition for local partners. All of these responses allow us to say that the first pilot of the project has been a total success in terms of the impact it has had on local educational partners.

**Graph 24. Main benefits for local partners from participating in the project.**

### **3.2.8. Main educational aspects being developed by local partners through the project.**

As for the main educational aspects that are being developed through the project’s first pilot, the first is transmitting educational values through sport and fostering social inclusion of beneficiaries. Secondly, we find increasing group cohesion and strengthening healthy habits. This tells us that the didactic units and teaching-learning activities have been adequately designed and put placed in the context of the Play Sports general goals.

**Graph 25. Main educational aspects being developed by local partners through the project.**

### **3.2.9. Challenges experienced by local partners during the implementation of the second pilot test.**

As for the most mentioned challenges met by local educational partners we should mention the difficulty in maintaining the same didactic and pedagogical lines during this first year and keeping up the level of commitment by the YAGs. Also, local educational partners that did not organize the sports event this year mention its implementation during the second year as a challenge. Finally, one of the most commented challenges is maintaining contact with the international partners once the project ends.

### **3.2.10. Overall satisfaction of local educational partners with the project.**

As for the level of satisfaction of local educational entities with the Play Sports project, 45% said it was excellent; 45% said it was really good and 9% said it was good or fair. The conclusion is that according to the responses given by local educational partners, the first pilot was a success. The pilot also helped local educational partners to give a qualitative leap forward regarding the implementation of innovative didactic methodologies and to strengthen positive values through

sport. Finally, thanks to the sports event they were able to gain more social recognition and show a greater commitment towards least-favoured social groups.

# **4.INITIAL AND INTERMEDIATE ASSESSMENT REPORT BY YAGs.**

In this section of the report will be shown the responses of young people who have been participating in the project by programming and dynamizing the different sports sessions, as well as the activities concerning the preparation and realization of the different Sports events. This section only consists of a large block.

On the other hand, this is evaluated aspects related with the operation and implementation of the project, the challenges and difficulties that have been faced in their day to day, the opportunities that have been presented throughout the project, the Methodology implemented in each country, the strengths and weaknesses of the project, as well as the communication with the international and local entities, in addition to its degree of satisfaction towards the project.

## **4.1. List of YAGs and countries where they carry out their educational task.**

As for the countries of origin of volunteers, from the responses received we see that 50% are Slovenian, 23% are Spanish, 18% are Italian and 9% are Fins.

**Graph 26. List of YAGs and countries where they carry out their educational task.**

## 

## **4.2. Gender of YAGs participating in the project.**

From all volunteers participating in the first pilot of the Play Sports project, 59% were female and 41% were male.

**Graph 27. Gender of YAGs participating in the project.**

## **4.3. Tasks done by YAGs during the first pilot test.**

As for the tasks performed by the YAGs during the first pilot of the Play Sports project, the most relevant one was to face the planning and facilitation of the sports sessions at their sports/educational institutions. The second most relevant task was helping the project beneficiaries during the creation of the sports event and the third most important task was coordinating and facilitating communication among the group of YAGs at each sports/educational institution. Finally, the fourth most relevant task, although to a lesser extent, was organizing a sports event.

**Graph 28. Tasks done by YAGs during the first pilot test.**

## **4.4. Difficulties experienced by YAGs during the first pilot test.**

Regarding the difficulties experienced by the YAGs during the first pilot, the most common was learning and implementing new didactic methodologies relating to physical activity and sport to facilitate the inclusion of children and teenagers at risk of social exclusion. The second most frequent difficulty was combining their current job with the project, and teaching children and teenagers who don’t speak or fully understand the languages of the countries where the projects took place. Third, YAGs mentioned the difficulty to communicate and coordinate with local partners and learning tools and resources to encourage the inclusion of children and teenagers with special educational needs in sports sessions.

**Graph 29. Difficulties experienced by YAGs during the first pilot test.**

## **4.5. Lessons learnt by YAGs from participating in the project.**

In relation to the lessons learnt through participating in the Play Sports first pilot, most YAGs mention they learnt to prepare and implement sports-related didactic units that are adequately designed and put in context. The second most significant lesson was learning about new didactic resources and tools. The third enriching experience was being able to exchange opinions, experiences and knowledge with YAGs from other European countries, as well as learning methodologies and techniques to foster inclusion of groups at risk of social exclusion.

**Graph 30. Lessons learnt by YAGs from participating in the project.**

**4.6. Assessment of the achievement of the project’s main goals.**

For the question on whether the main goals of the project were achieved during the first pilot, 100% of the YAGs responded affirmative.

**Graph 31. Assessment of the achievement of the project’s main goals.**

**4.7. YAGs’ assessment of the communication established with local partners where they carried out their educational task.**

Regarding the communication established by YAGs with the local educational/sports institutions during the first pilot, a vast majority said it was excellent or really good. Only two said it was fair or bad. We can therefore say that YAGs felt welcomed at the sports and educational institutions where they performed their tasks.

**Graph 32. YAGs’ assessment of the communication established with local partners where they carried out their educational task.**

## **4.8. Adequacy of teaching methodologies to the development of the project’s main goals.**

50% of YAGs responding to the questionnaire said the educational methodologies used during the first pilot in terms of achieving the main goals of the project were excellent. Also, 27% of YAGs said the methodologies were really good, and 23% said they were good. With this information we can say that the teaching and educational methodologies used so far are really appropriate for the main goals of the project.

**Graph 33. Adequacy of teaching methodologies to the development of the project’s main goals.**

## **4.9. Usefulness of knowledge, skills and values learnt by children and youths during the project.**

As for the usefulness of the teaching contents and lessons learnt by the project’s beneficiaries, 57% of YAGs believe the lessons learnt will be very useful for the future of the project’s beneficiaries (children and teenagers); 37% said they were really good and 5% considered they were good. This means that, according to the opinions of YAG’s, the goals in terms of lessons learnt and teaching contents were adequately designed and met the educational needs of each group of children and teenagers.

**Graph 34. Usefulness of knowledge, skills and values learnt by children and youths during the project.**

## **4.10. Usefulness of knowledge learnt by YAGs during the project relating to their professional future.**

For the learning of significant lessons by the YAGs during their participation in the project, most of them said they were really or very useful. This means that the training activities developed by international partners and the experiences learnt from their educational tasks were extremely significant and enriching. Furthermore, virtually all YAGs think that what they have learnt will be useful for their professional development.

**Graph 35. Usefulness of knowledge learnt by YAGs during the project relating to their professional future.**

## **4.11. Strengths of the project according to YAGs.**

The most relevant strengths identified by YAGs through several questionnaires are the following:

* Using sport as a tool for inclusion.
* Increasing the self-esteem of children and teenagers through planned sports activities.
* Increasing cooperation among the project’s beneficiaries as a consequence of well-planned teaching methodologies geared towards meeting values in education.
* Improving communication and inter-personal relationships among the groups of children and teenagers using sport as a universal language.
* Developing and implementing innovative sports-teaching methodologies.
* Exchanging opinions and experiences with YAGs from other European countries.
* Fostering equal opportunities among children and teenagers.

## **4.12. Proposed improvements by YAGs for the second pilot test.**

The most relevant improvement proposals expressed by YAGs in the questionnaires are the following:

* Creating a digital platform to share and exchange information among YAGs from the participating countries and share best practices.
* Providing more tools and resources for YAGs to make sessions with children and teenagers with specific educational support needs and special education needs more dynamic.
* Including body language and dance in teaching units.
* Look for and create more spaces so that YAGs from different countries can meet and exchange experiences and information, as well as establishing joint and cross-cutting work streams.
* In some countries they didn’t organise the sports event.
* In Catalonia, the most commented improvement proposal is to further engage community actors in the next sports event.

## **4.13. Level of satisfaction of YAGs with the project.**

Regarding the general satisfaction of YAGs with the Play Sports project, 55% said it was excellent; 41% said it was really good and only 5% said it was good. We can therefore say that the vast majority of YAGs participating in the project enjoyed it and were able to develop many teaching skills, as well as engage in the project and support the inclusion of groups at risk of social exclusion.

**Graph 36. Level of satisfaction of YAGs with the project.**