

Bordernetwork WP 9 meeting 21./22.2.2011, Vienna (Aids Hilfe Wien)

Participants

Associated Partners	Collaborating Partners	Experts from NON-EU Countries
SPI: Christiane Firnges AHW: Isabell Eibl, Deborah Klingler-Katschnig, Rene Eichinger NIHD: Aire Trummal AHP: Alexander Leffers LAFPSH: Lasma Lidaka, Alise Krumina SPWSZ: Patryk Kapa POMOST: Kristof Kuleczycki ARAS: Mihai Lixandru	UNZG: Joanna Rogowska	Ug Proi: Samir Ibisevic SALUS: Maryana Sluzhinska JAZAS: Dragan Ilic CREDINTA: Denis Maruha

The Expert Meeting took place on the 21st and 22nd of February 2011 in the Aids Hilfe Wien in Vienna. 16 partners from ten countries participated. The goal of the meeting was to improve the online version of the QUIET (Quality Improvement and Evaluation Tool). Beforehand the partners had been asked to fill out the print version of the QUIET and to share their experiences at the meeting.

Monday 21st of February 2011

Due to travel arrangements the meeting started the first day at 1 pm.

As some of the participants were new to Bordernetwork an introduction round was held where everybody was asked to present themselves, their organization and a specific program optional.

The next step was that all organizations described their operating experiences with the QUIET, how they filled in the questionnaire (one or more persons), where they had difficulties and how beneficial the tool was for their work. It became obvious that most participants needed several hours to fill it in (appr. 3 hrs), some even more. Almost everybody stated that the tool was helpful to see the successes and weaknesses of their own project but still needed more and more detailed information on specific topics.

The QUIET was commonly seen as helpful for different projects (even for preparing a new proposal) and as a good tool for evaluating all steps of the project, as a reflection of the own work. It also shows what is possible and what is still needed in terms of conducting a successful project.

Most participants agreed that it was mostly a tool for group evaluation although it takes longer the more people are involved. Therefore the motivation must be very high especially because some questions are a little redundant towards the end. Altogether the QUIET was seen as a useful tool to estimate the own work and helpful to learn from mistakes.

Most participants stated that the tool lacked some user friendliness (possibility to search certain keywords, lessons learned after each chapter) and that some boxes are missing. Some questions were not worded carefully enough, therefore not easy to answer and sometimes even misleading. Other questions would need more guidance to fill them out correctly

Some partners wished the possibility to compare their projects filled out in the QUIET with others or to have the possibility to compare their project before and after implementing the improvement suggestions.

In the evening the participants joined dinner.

Tuesday 22nd of February 2011

On the second day the meeting started at 9 o'clock and was opened with a short summary of yesterday's results, afterwards three working groups were scheduled. The three groups occupied themselves during the whole morning with the online tool and tried to find out possibilities to improve the QUIET.

The most important results were:

- Answering the questions can be difficult in terms of picking the right answer (excellent/fair...) – group work might help
- A summary of “comments on improvement” boxes is demanded: this could give a better overview of what needs to be done.
- Some scales are different, why is that so? Maybe it would be better to add different answering possibilities: “yes/partly/no” as well as “not applicable”. This should be applied to every question. Some questions need rephrasing into statements (no questions) and the answering possibilities should be the same everywhere (one scale for whole questionnaire).
- Some boxes are missing (there should be boxes everywhere)
- More user friendliness was asked for: menu should stick open and don't scroll down
- Feeling of tiredness towards the end of the questionnaire arised – maybe the tool can be shortened a little
- A glossary might be useful (like in the original document)
- Project overview: part for small description
- The QUIET should be opened to other target groups, not only youth.

At last, after a short round of comments, the participants filled out the travel- and subsistence expenses sheet, were reimbursed and the meeting ended.