Intelligent Euregional Emotional Exchanges IE³

(2020-1-NL01-KA202-064513)

Final Report Quality Assurance (English)

Evaluation – Final report

Evaluation is an essential measure of quality management in the IE3 project. Two evaluation methods are used, with the first focusing on learning progression and the second on session evaluation. The final report addresses both learning progression evaluation and session evaluation. The goal of learning progression evaluation is to present the learning progress of project participants regarding emotional intelligence as a competence. This competence is understood as a differentiated construct with various sub-areas, including:

1. declarative knowledge about emotional intelligence,
2. affective attitude towards emotional intelligence and the necessity for action in an educational context,
3. procedural knowledge of the methodology and technique of emotional intelligence promotion,
4. dissemination of insights and results, and
5. reflection on the self and organization in relation to emotional intelligence.

To objectively capture data within these competency domains, an evaluation form is used as a diagnostic tool. This form is designed to provide quality-related insights, with 14 questions based on the various competency domains. The relationship between competency domains and evaluation questions can be presented in a table, as follows:

domain	questions
1. declarative	1, 13, 14
2. affective	2, 3, 7, 13, 14
3. procedural	4, 8, 13, 14
4. disseminative	5, 6, 13, 14
5. reflexive	7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14

The quality analysis of the project involves the use of three identical evaluation forms at different key measurement points in the project timeline: the project launch event (entry diagnosis), during the workshop by the STEP Institute (interim survey), and at the final event (concluding diagnosis). Repeatedly assessing identical questions at different times makes it possible to make transparent the knowledge development of the participants by comparing the data collected at different times. The analysis of the results shows a positive development in the competency domains overall. The IE3 project has contributed significantly to increasing declarative and procedural knowledge. While only 37% of participants reported having sufficient theoretical knowledge within competency domain 1 at the entry diagnosis, 100% of respondents perceive their theoretical knowledge to be sound at the concluding diagnosis (question 1). Similar conclusions can be drawn from the free comments (questions 13 and 14), in which participants at the entry diagnosis identified significant deficits in declarative knowledge and specified needs in this regard, whereas these comments were no longer expressed in the concluding diagnosis. Additionally, the project has significantly deepened procedural knowledge within competency domain 3. A comparison of the entry and concluding diagnosis results shows that IE3 has expanded the material and method repertoire by 37% (question 4) and enabled over 30% of participants to pass on this knowledge to others (question 8). This trend in learning progress within

competency domains 1 and 3 was already evident in the interim diagnosis following the expert workshop by the STEP Institute. This demonstrates the effectiveness of involving an external expert in the IE3 project and underlines the importance of this decision in the project's conception.

The results also illustrate that the project significantly contributed to the dissemination of the topic, raising awareness and changing attitudes (competence areas 2, 4, and 5). IE3 brought the topic "to the schools" and created individual awareness of the phenomenon. While at the beginning of the project only individual persons were informed about the topic, at the end a large number of actors are involved, working together in an extensive network on the topic and beyond the borders of the individual partner institutions (Questions 5 and 6). The fundamental motivation seems to be the unchanged attitude throughout the entire project that emotional intelligence is strongly correlated with early school dropout (Question 2).

In addition to this significant quantitative increase, positive attitude with regard to emotional intelligence also manifest themselves qualitatively at the reflective-critical level on a personal level. Emotional intelligence, a phenomenon that was described as rather unknown for many participants at the beginning of the project, has "arrived in their minds" over the course of the project (Question 11), and in the end, 90%-100% see the need to promote the development of emotional intelligence individually (Questions 3 and 10). However, it is also clear that there is still a need for action at the level of educational institutions, as even at the end of the project, 20% of the participating partners signal further need to implement topic-specific courses concretely in their systems (Question 9) and to anchor specific goals in the curriculum (Question 12). This makes it clear that even after the end of the project, partners are faced with the task of integrating emotional intelligence into their working environment in a practical way. This is also a topic that is increasingly being discussed in the final presentations and should be facilitated and further encouraged in follow-up projects.

Intelligent Euregional Emotional Exchanges IE³

(2020-1-NL01-KA202-064513)

The second procedure is an evaluation of the individual IE3 sessions. The aim of this measurement is to ensure good organizational conditions for each project meeting. For data collection, a form is also used as an instrument for session evaluation. This is used after each session. This temporal handling enables immediate intervention and counteraction of emerging clarifications and challenges during the ongoing project, to which timely responses can be made. The subject of the session evaluation is specifically the quality of:

1. Time management,
2. Transparency of goals and content,
3. Communication and interaction,
4. Dissemination,
5. The increase in theoretical and practical knowledge.

The evaluation form is based on 20 questions designed to refer to the various subject areas. The relationship between the subject areas and the evaluation questions can be presented in a table as follows:

Areas	Questions
1. Time management	1, 2, 4
2. Transparency of goals and content	3, 5
3. Communication and interaction	6, 7, 8, 9
4. Dissemination	11, 12
5. Theoretical and practical knowledge	14, 15, 16, 17, 19
6. Open questions	18, 20

Intelligent Euregional Emotional Exchanges IE³

(2020-1-NL01-KA202-064513)

The evaluation shows that the organizational quality of the IE3 project meetings is to be rated positively throughout the entire project duration. The organization of the IE3 project meetings is characterized by a consistently high level of transparency with regards to goals and content, has continuously promoted dissemination both internally and externally, and has improved theoretical and practical knowledge on a continuous basis. However, there are noticeable issues in the areas of time management, communication, and interaction, which are further explained below.

Participants perceive time management to be successful (question 1); however, some meetings collide more frequently with other obligations (question 2), and the workload is sometimes criticized as too extensive (question 4). A closer analysis reveals that these objections are more frequently raised during periods of intense work in the school year, so the question is how to find more suitable times for the meetings in the future.

Furthermore, communication and interaction difficulties are prevalent in the IE3 project. The evaluation of the kick-off event highlights that the participants' understanding at the beginning is limited (question 8). The choice of language is cited as the reason for this. Although IE3 is a project focused on the Euregion, addressing the concerns of German-Dutch institutions, the project management acknowledges that the communicative skills of the respective neighboring language are inadequate and not self-evident. Therefore, the decision is made to use English as the project language for the remaining period, which subsequently proves to be logical and effective. In the final event (question 8), no communication problems are articulated. This also emphasizes how necessary the evaluations of the individual meetings are; they enable timely intervention in critical moments.

Intelligent Euregional Emotional Exchanges IE³

(2020-1-NL01-KA202-064513)

Furthermore, obstacles to interaction in project implementation are identified. A notable hindering factor is the perception of the partners' commitment to each other. Some perceive the participation of members as unserious and unreliable. This becomes particularly apparent in the first meetings, a phase marked by the exit of a project partner. However, the impression of non-commitment is still observable in later meeting evaluations. This may be due to the continuity of participation of some project partners and the increased fluctuation of participating persons per institution.

Herzogenrath, 1. April 2023

Stephan Schmitz