

Project SILVER

Qualitative Aggregate Project Evaluation Report

Lucienne.Suiker@inholland.nl

Donald.Ropes@inholland.nl

Inholland University of Applied Sciences

Haarlem, The Netherlands

Language version (EN)

SILVER is a project of the European Union coordinated by Inholland University of Applied Sciences (The Netherlands) in cooperation with Oulu University of Applied Sciences (Finland), Brandenburg University of Technology Cottbus (Germany), South East European Research Centre (Greece), Academy of Economic Studies of Bucharest (Romania), University of Strathclyde (UK). www.intergenerationallearning.eu

inholland
university of
applied sciences

SEERC
SOUTH EAST
EUROPEAN
RESEARCH
CENTRE

**OULU UNIVERSITY OF
APPLIED SCIENCES**



**THE BUCHAREST
ACADEMY OF
ECONOMIC STUDIES**

b.tu Brandenburgische
Technische Universität
Cottbus

**University of
Strathclyde
Glasgow**



Agreement N° 2011-3527 ** Project N° 512557ALP-1-2011-1-NL-GRUNETVIG-GMP
This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views of only the author and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

1 Management summary

This document is the qualitative evaluation report for the project SILVER. It is a result of an analysis of individual partner formative and summative reports.

From the individual partner evaluations we can conclude that project SILVER as a whole was implemented effectively as the aims of the project have been accomplished to its fullest potential and even beyond. For example:

- 43 organisations took part in the testing
- 30 presentations or workshops (other than testing) about the project were given
- Nine scientific papers were written and published (or accepted for publication)
- Five interviews about the project were published in professional journals
- Our contact data base has 500+ members
- Six Bachelor and two Master theses were written using the project as a subject
- Two PhD students are using parts of the Toolkit in their research
- A management consultancy (<http://www.koffie-bubbels.nl>) and several other organisations use the toolkit in their work or internally.

Furthermore, all partners actively contributed to the project, most deadlines were met and all project meetings were evaluated as productive and useful. The project kept within a reasonable margin of the budget, considering all the extra deliverables that were developed. The toolbox was developed and tested in participating organisations in all countries, resulting in an increased awareness about IGL as a method of transferring critical knowledge and improving innovation. After the design process all partners participated by contextualizing, testing and evaluating the tools. Where needed tasks were re-divided among the partners, which caused a temporary delay, but did not have any major impact on the progress of the project. In general the tools were evaluated as useful and valuable methods to raise awareness and to implement IGL within organisations. The testing phase was very time consuming and more time would be needed in order to measure long term effects.

2 Contents

1	Management summary.....	2
2	Introduction	3
3	Macro level of evaluation	3
3.1	Results of aggregate evaluation – macro level	4
4	Meso level of evaluation.....	5
4.1	Results of aggregate evaluation – meso level.....	6
5	Micro level of evaluation	10
5.1	Results of aggregate evaluation – micro level	11
6	Conclusion.....	15

3 Introduction

Evaluation is an important and recognizable common thread in this project and was done both formatively and summative. We consider that evaluation has two elements. One concerns implementation and as such answers the question, ‘Did we do it right?’ The other element of evaluation concerns outcomes and answers the question, ‘Did we achieve what we wanted to?’ These two elements form the basis for evaluation at the macro, meso and micro level of the project. The methodology we use is based on a Realist framework (c.f. http://www.communitymatters.com.au/RE_chapter.pdf). We present each level with the framework and methodology in the tables below. For a detailed look at our evaluation strategy and instruments, please see the documentation on our website www.intergenerationallearning.eu

4 Macro level of evaluation

‘Macro’ level refers here to the evaluation of the project as a whole and is done by looking at the broader picture and so includes different levels of stakeholders at the organisational, sector, national or international level.

Table 1. Macro level of evaluation framework

Implementation		Outcomes	
<i>Framework</i>	<i>Methodology</i>	<i>Framework</i>	<i>Methodology</i>
1. Did you effectively implement the project?	Budget analysis, review of meeting notes; reflection exercise with partners (internal and external);	3. Did you help to diminish or solve the problem of an ageing workforce in respect to organisations losing critical knowledge, skills	We sum the results of the micro and meso-level testing .

	judgement of EU.	or innovative capacity?	
2. Why was the project implemented effectively (or not)?	Reflection on and analysis of process using 'Critical Incidents' method with partners(internal and external);	4. How were the results achieved?	Analysis of mechanisms and context.

4.1 Results of aggregate evaluation – macro level

The project as a whole was completed successfully as all partners actively contributed to the work packages and cooperated effectively during both internal and external meetings, resulting in a toolkit that was developed and tested by all partners in 43 participating organisations, within budget.

Table 2. Aggregate macro level evaluation results

Question	Answer from data analysis	Comments
Did individual partners effectively implement the project?	Yes. The project was implemented effectively in terms of relevant outcomes produced in relation to the work packages. Based on internal meetings with the partners the aims of project have been accomplished to it's fullest potential and within budget.	We have conducted SWOT analysis in meetings to investigate needs, strengths and weakness. In addition, Inholland focussed their research agenda on the project and approached it in a systematic and scientific way. Most partners had bi-weekly or weekly internal project meetings and also informal meetings in between.
Was the project as a whole effectively implemented? What could have been improved?	Yes. The project meetings were useful and valued according to the evaluation forms. Everyone co-operated effectively and were dedicated to the project	More work meetings as a means of experience exchange could have had a better fluidity effect of the communication between the partners, but was too expensive. Monthly Skype meetings with the partners might have been useful as well, but were technically difficult to organize. Minor improvements involve developing shorter reports to avoid increasing load in reading and writing materials.
Did you help to diminish or solve the problem addressed in	Yes. We have successfully designed and developed tools	Feedback from participating organisations, both during

the project?	that will diminish problems in the ageing workforce in relation to these aspects. We used and tested the IKC tool in several organizations. We also stimulated many organisations to consider the problems around ageing workers. This definitely raised awareness and in some cases will diminish the risks related to IGL.	evaluations and based on the awareness scan (STAP), was that IGL can be a good method of transferring critical knowledge and encouraging innovation within the organisation.
How were these problems diminished or solved?	Without the testing of the tools, organisations would not have been made (as) aware of the problems and consequently not have gone through the processes. In the selected organizations for implementation there were no other similar projects with similar objectives. Most of the participating organisations plan to continue activities regarding IGL in the future, which were initiated by the Silver project.	
Miscellaneous		

5 Meso level of evaluation

'Meso' level refers to the evaluation of the individual work packages and includes different levels of stakeholders; management, organisational, sector, national or international level, depending on the work package.

Table 3. Meso level of evaluation framework

Implementation		Outcomes	
<i>Framework</i>	<i>Methodology</i>	<i>Framework</i>	<i>Methodology</i>
1. Did we effectively implement the work package?	Interviews and quantitative surveys; reflection exercise with partners (internal and external);	3. Did the work packages help to diminish or solve the problem each one addressed?	Interviews and quantitative surveys.

2. Why was the work package implemented effectively (or not)?	Reflection on and analysis of process using 'Critical Incidents' method with partners (internal and external);	4. How were the results achieved?	Interviews and quantitative surveys; cross-case analysis of mechanisms and contexts.
---	--	-----------------------------------	--

5.1 Results of aggregate evaluation – meso level

All work packages were implemented as planned, some with minor delays due to the complexity of a project that was both scientific and practical in its approach. All partners contributed effectively to the assigned work packages and in addition to the testing of the toolkit, 30 presentations or workshops and 9 papers were produced, resulting in positive feedback from participating organisations and other interested parties and a contact database of 500+ members.

1. Did partners effectively implement the work packages? How do we know this?

Table 4. Aggregate level evaluation results

Work Package	Answer from data analysis	Comments
WP1 (Management)	Yes.	We kept to the budget and project management was experienced as good by the partners, according to the evaluations. The partners contributed to the reports as needed and participated actively during the meetings.
WP2 (Stakeholder Awareness Programme)	Yes and no.	Cottbus was too detailed in their approach, but it was also a way to deal with the complexity. We needed to be more practical and less scientific. Other partners contributed to STAP design by contextualising, testing and evaluating (relevant inputs are provided in the reports first page of the authors).
WP3 (Doing IGL)	Yes and no.	Inholland should have led this (and eventually did). But again we might have been too detailed in our approach, but it was also a way to deal with the complexity. Strathclyde contributed to the design and helped

Work Package	Answer from data analysis	Comments
		develop the train-the-trainer manual. All partners contributed to the testing of the DIGL toolkit.
WP4 (Gaming for (IGL)	Yes.	SEERC and OUAS have, in collaboration with the other partners, successfully designed and developed the GIGL – online web-based game designed to facilitate and increase awareness regarding IGL. This tool has also been tested by all partners.
WP5 (Quality control)	Yes	This was a combined effort that gave each member a clear idea of what was expected. Strathclyde successfully lead WP5.
WP6 (Dissemination)	Yes. We have used dissemination charts to identify stakeholders at all tiers identified by the project manager.	For example: ASE presented 6 papers to international conferences, papers published in the conference Proceedings, SEERC submitted a relevant paper in a special issue in the journal Education and Information Technologies (accepted at initial stage, subject to revisions), Inholland used the synergy of the Silver project as part of their research agenda in general and all partners organised symposia.
WP7 (exploitation)	Not really sure	We do have some organisations that will continue to use and implement our toolkit and we have the website that will be kept updated for at least one year.

2. *Why* was the work package implemented effectively (or not)? How do we know this?

Work Package	Answer from data analysis	Comments
WP1 (Management)	Meetings took place as planned, reports were delivered on time.	More communication would have been useful.
WP2	Report was completed on time, but could	For example, OUAS found less testing

Work Package	Answer from data analysis	Comments
(Stakeholder Awareness Programme)	have been less detailed. Finding testing partners was a lot more time consuming than anticipated at the start of the project.	partners due to how much time was needed to get organisations to participate and to test STAP
WP3 (Doing IGL)	All partners contributed effectively to the development of the testing methods and approaches and these results have been used in the design of the IGL tools.	More testing was desired, but process to involve testing partners (organisations) was very time consuming.
WP4 (Gaming for IGL)	The success of the design and development of the GIGL is largely attributed to the scientific approach that we implemented	We created questionnaires addressed to experts in the field to provide us with input on how to design a game for IGL. We have done desk research on the topic. We have used data from the state-of –the-art-report on learning through serious games. However, OUAS experienced that, due to a limited budget for the procurement, they had to do a lot of work together with the game company in the development process.
WP5 (Quality control)	N/A	
WP6 (Dissemination)	The dissemination process has been done on all levels with different impacts. Also, by presenting a series of papers in international conferences we could reach other potential users of our results.	
WP7 (Exploitation)	Continuation of the project results are guaranteed by: the scientific papers (knowledge will be developed using these works); the website will be maintained for at least two years; organisations (SMEs) from both private and public sectors have starting using the toolkit; the network developed around the project is still growing and will be a source for new collaboration, for example in a new Erasmus+ knowledge alliance project.	

3. Did the work packages help to diminish or solve the problem each one addressed? How do we know this?

Work Package	Answer from data analysis	Comments
WP1 (Management)	N/A	
WP2 (Stakeholder Awareness Programme)	Yes. All of participating organisations were very interested in the benefits of IGL and awareness has increased.	For example, Cottbus worked with 4 partner companies, Inholland had contact with more than 16 organizations and within 2 of them 4 departments during the testing phase.
WP3 (Doing IGL)	Yes. Based on the evaluation questionnaires, participants stated that they have increased their understanding on IGL.	For example, Strathclyde found that organisations were interested in IGL as a means of transferring knowledge and encouraging innovation.
WP4 (Gaming for IGL)	Yes.	For example, employers at symposium in Scotland found that GIGL was a fun method of introducing the IGL concept to staff and also at the symposium in Greece the participants' feedback was very positive in terms of providing solutions to the problem of IGL and to use it to facilitate IGL in conjunction with the other tools.
WP5 (Quality control)	N/A	
WP6 (Dissemination)	Yes, but indirectly.	We raised awareness of many actors at all different levels.
WP7 (exploitation)	Yes.	Organisations are using the tools we developed.

4. How were the results achieved? How do we know this?

Work Package	Answer from data analysis	Comments
WP1	We followed the project plan as closely as	The results of the project were

Work Package	Answer from data analysis	Comments
(Management)	possible	achieved with very good communication and cooperation of all partner countries; everyone contributed to the reports and attended the meetings.
WP2 (Stakeholder Awareness Programme)	We tested in many different organisations	All partners contributed to the STAP design by contextualising, testing and evaluating.
WP3 (Doing IGL)	We don't know yet, except for IKC	
WP4 (Gaming for (IGL)	By testing the final products and improving them during our working meetings. OUAS finished the game on time.	
WP5 (Quality control)	N/A	
WP6 (Dissemination)	Inholland made the project a part of their research agenda. Strathclyde expanded their contact database for the UK. Symposia by several partners were received positively.	
WP7 (exploitation)	Inholland made the project a part of their research agenda.	

6 Micro level of evaluation

Micro level of evaluation means 'at the level of the individual tools or interventions'. The stakeholders involved are managers, trainers and employees. For this we developed the framework based on our adaptation of Kirkpatrick's model of four levels (see <http://www.mindtools.com/pages/article/kirkpatrick.htm> for details).

Table 5. Micro level evaluation framework

Implementation		Outcomes	
<i>Framework</i>	<i>Methodology</i>	<i>Framework</i>	<i>Methodology</i>
1. How well did the learners like the learning process?	Quantitative surveys; reflection exercise with employees.	3. What did participants learn? (the extent to which the learners gain knowledge and skills)	Quantitative surveys with open questions.
2. How well did the trainers like the tools?	Interviews and quantitative surveys.	What changes in job performance resulted from the learning process?	Quantitative surveys with open questions.
		4. What are the tangible results of the learning process in terms of reduced cost, improved quality, increased production, efficiency, etc.?	Quantitative surveys with open questions.
		Sustainability – Are there any far-reaching effects that might be observed, i.e. spill-overs used in society (i.e. lowered levels of ageism spill over from the organisation to society, improving intergenerational relations outside the workplace).	Quantitative surveys with open questions.

6.1 Results of aggregate evaluation – micro level

Both the STAP tools as the DIGL tools were evaluated as positive ways of increasing awareness about IGL and implementing IGL in the participating organisations. Especially the scan was experienced as useful and valuable by managers and HR consultants in raising awareness and the game (GIGL) as a good supporting tool to introduce IGL within organisations. In general organisations reported back that the tools were helpful in transferring critical knowledge between generations, identifying ways of working together more effectively and increasing their capacity to innovate. Trainers were able to

adapt several tools to the context of the individual organisation and their feedback was very useful in finalizing the toolbox. Further research, beyond the scope of this project, would be needed to measure long term effects within the participating organisations.

1. How well did the learners like the learning process?

Table 6. Micro level evaluation results

Tool	Reflection on individual tool
StAP	
Level of awareness scan	This was the way we gained entry into the organisations. It was a valuable tool for starting the discussion. CSF: this is to be used by management and not employees. The scan is best used in a workshop/meeting or interview setting (filling out individually proved to be more difficult)
Stereotypes workshop	Valued and experienced as useful according to evaluation forms.
Broad organisational scan	Managers like quantitative results and this served that purpose well, although sometimes experienced as time consuming.
Other	
DIGL	
Tool	IG Mentoring: Younger learners found tool beneficial, older learners were more familiar with tools.
Tool	IKC: Needs further testing, but is rather complicated.
	IGL Trainings and workshops: Participants of workshop “Visualizing innovations” needed more time. Other workshops: the workshops during the testing phase of the DIGL were done with workers identified by the top management. Formal feedback and the evaluation questionnaire all showed increased engagement and successful implementation of the aims of the workshop. Participants found the workshops very stimulating.
GIGL	Everyone who has tested the game is positive about the effect of raising awareness of IGL. It is more difficult to say if any learning results from playing the game in regards to IGL. Game should mainly be used as a fun way of introducing the concept of IGL. In addition SEERC has tested the tool for readability, usability in a sample of 10 students and used a pilot in older adults to check for usability. The game was found to be easy to use once the person was accustomed to the relevant buttons.

Table 7. How well did the trainers like the tools?

Tool	Reflection on individual tool
StAP	
Level of awareness scan	Trainers needed to adjust the tools to their contexts, but basically it served its purpose well and resulted in a better understanding of the age structure of their staff. Multiple-choice answers would be easier to answer and analyse. For example, feedback from trainer in Greece: overall, positive impression on the tools with some comments that related to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The length of the background reading (we reduced this based on this and other comments from other partners) 2. The resources that are needed from the trainer (in terms of preparation for implementing the tools). 3. Very positive feedback on the quality of the reports. Very positive feedback on the game (GIGL) as part of STAP in testing phase.
Stereotypes workshop	Trainers needed to adjust the tools to their contexts, but basically it served its purpose well.
Broad organisational scan	The overall tool is easy enough to use and received positive feedback. For example, trainers in Romania like the scan very much due to new insights concerning the barriers to an effective implementation of IGL at the level of departments, faculties and universities. In general analysis of the answers could be improved.
Other	
DIGL	
Tool	IG Mentoring: Some of the language needs to be adapted and the tools need to be more integrated into “one package”, instead of separate tools.
Tool	IKC; complicated and needed adjustments
Tool	IGL Trainings and workshops: Workshop “Visualizing innovations” was easy to adapt in different circumstances and trainers liked the tool.
GIGL	The game is easy to use and once the players master the basics, can be finished by every player, regardless of their age.

**Table 8. What did participants learn? (the extent to which the learners gain knowledge and skills)
What changes in job performance resulted from the learning process?**

Tool	Reflection on individual tool
-------------	--------------------------------------

Tool	Reflection on individual tool
StAP	
Level of awareness scan	The learned foremost that there is an issue of ageing (workforce) and that IGL is one way of dealing with it. Scan allowed participants to question their knowledge of IGL and it increased their level of awareness.
Stereotypes workshop	Raised awareness about stereotypes
Broad organisational scan	They gained insight into employee attitudes regarding IGL and increased their awareness
Other	
DIGL	
Tool	IG Mentoring: Facilitated knowledge transfer between generations successfully. Participants reported back that they identified ways of working together more effectively and increased their capacity to innovate.
Tool	IKC: Awareness increased about critical knowledge transfer
Tool	IGL Trainings and workshops: Workshop “Visualizing innovations” – level of awareness increased.
GIGL	Participants gained knowledge about the importance of IGL and about the role it can play in organisations. We have no specific outcomes in terms of job performance because we did not follow-up the participants at a later stage due to time restrictions of the project.

Table 9. What are the tangible results of the learning process in terms of reduced cost, improved quality, increased production, efficiency, etc.?

(Sustainability – Are there any far-reaching effects that might be observed, i.e. spill-overs used in society (i.e. lowered levels of ageism spill over from the organisation to society, improving intergenerational relations outside the workplace.)

Tool	Reflection on individual tool
StAP	
Level of awareness scan	We do not have such information at this point; due to the project’s time restrictions we are not able to follow-up on the learning process.
Stereotypes	See above.

<i>Tool</i>	<i>Reflection on individual tool</i>
workshop	
Broad organisational scan	See above.
DIGL	
Tool	<p>IG Mentoring: We did not measure any tangible results. However, it was reported that the following results took place :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff developed a mutual trust and cooperation – both personally and professionally • Company benefits in terms of knowledge transfer • An increased capacity to innovate <p>Reverse mentoring took place</p>
Tool	IGL Trainings and workshops: Workshop “Visualizing innovations” – no long term effects were measured.
GIGL	Survey would need to be done a few months later to measure the effects.

7 Conclusion

The project was executed well in all regards. Some room for improvement could be in the communication between consortium members. Another improvement could be to find a way that assured the same people would work on the project entirely. Personnel shifts were a threat, but we kept them under control.