



National report on the  
Lifelong Learning Programme (LLP)  
implementation 2007-2009  
in Denmark

INTERIM EVALUATION

May 2010

**NIRAS**

# Index

Executive summary.....	3
1. Context and methodology.....	5
1.1 Introduction.....	5
1.2 Context and objectives of the report.....	5
1.3 Methodology.....	6
2. Relevance, effectiveness and efficiency.....	9
2.1 Relevance.....	9
2.1.1 Contribution to national policy priorities.....	9
2.1.2 Added value for target groups.....	10
2.1.3 Added value for organisations.....	12
2.1.4 Long-term effects.....	13
2.2 Effectiveness.....	14
2.2.1 Integration of previous programmes into one LLP.....	14
2.2.2 Information and consultation procedures.....	15
2.2.3 Application and reporting procedures.....	15
2.2.4 Recruitment of participants.....	17
2.2.5 Participant profiles.....	18
2.2.6 Dissemination of LLP results.....	19
2.2.7 Visibility of the LLP in the education and training community.....	20
2.3 Efficiency.....	20
2.3.1 Cooperation between authorities.....	20
2.3.2 Management supporting tools.....	22
2.3.3 The level of financial support.....	22
3. Conclusions and suggestions for future developments.....	24
3.1 Conclusions.....	24
3.2 Suggestions for LLP 2010-2013.....	25
3.2.1 Flexibility and synergies.....	25
3.2.2 Administrative cohesion.....	26
3.2.3 Systemic impact.....	27
3.2.4 Information and dissemination.....	27
3.2.5 Inclusion.....	28
3.2.6 Quality and qualifications.....	28

Table 1: Survey respondents' distribution on programme and sectoral programme. Percent of responses .	8
Table 2: To which extent do you find that the young people have improved their qualifications within the following areas through the Programme? .....	11
Table 3: To which extent do you believe that the participation of the institution/organisation in the project in which you have participated ... ..	13
Table 4: How satisfied have you been with the administrative procedure in connection with the following? .....	16
Table 5: From which region do the participants primarily come? .....	18
Table 6: Which special needs have there been? .....	19
Table 7: To which extent do you find it likely that the activities completed in the project would have been completed, had there been no grant schemes under EU educational programmes? .....	23

## Executive summary

This report sums up the conclusions of the interim evaluation of the Lifelong Learning Programme from 2007 to 2009. The evaluation was requested by the National Authority for the Programme, the Danish Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation, which by the European Commission was commissioned to complete an interim evaluation according to the guidelines offered by the Commission. The evaluation has been conducted by NIRAS A/S from February to May 2010.

The evaluation shows that a vast majority of project managers judge the activities for which support can be applied through the LLP to **be relevant in respect of the requirements of their organisation/association**. Almost eight out of ten project managers assess the LLP Programme to be **complementary with Danish national activities and policies in the area**. Most of the target groups (70 %) have had aspects of mobility, such as study, traineeship or exchange visit included in the activities. Most project managers and project participants assessed these mobility activities to have the appropriate length, and the vast majority of the project managers are also satisfied with the contents and outcome of the mobility activities. The results further show that the LLP Programme creates considerable added value – both at target group level and organisational level.

At target group level project managers as well as project participants assess that the LLP activities to a **great extent improve the professional and personal qualifications of project participants**. Especially ‘intercultural competence’ is emphasised at participant level as well as personal maturity/development, communication, language, cooperation and networking skills. Furthermore, the vast majority of both project managers and project participants assess that the target group will benefit from the experience in their future education and/or profession.

At organisational level the evaluation shows that the Programme to a high extent has **added a European dimension to the institution/organisation**. For instance, eight out of ten project managers believe that the Programme has contributed to the establishment of new partnerships with other institutions/organisations. This is the general picture across sectoral programmes; however, especially project managers within Erasmus and Leonardo have this conviction. Partnerships contribute to an exchange of experiences with other institutions or organisations across borders, e.g. in relation to work methods, development of education modules, courses across borders etc. What should also be stressed is that almost nine out of ten project managers **believe their international cooperation relations to endure after project termination**. Thus, the results indicate that the Programme has a positive international outcome by increasing cooperation with other institutions and adding international dimensions and perspectives to the organisations/institutions. Equally important, the study shows that in general it is possible for project managers to adapt LLP project activities to other activities of the institution/organisation.

The overall relevance of the LLP is closely connected to the long-term effects of the programme. The survey indeed shows that project managers in general judge the LLP to provide also long-term positive effects on the institutions/organisation. For instance, most project managers believe that project participation will encourage increased participation in other international activities/projects under the EU educational programmes as well as increased participation in other international activities/projects in general. Long-term effects in terms of increased participation in national activities and projects seem to be slightly less common. The study outlines a number of important factors in order to claim maximum benefit from the Programme. Particularly, project managers address the need of experience, that is, experience to fill in the forms of application as well as experience in managing international projects and partnerships. Further, the importance of having continuance in the staff handling the projects is underlined as well as the importance of staff driven by determination and inclination.

The survey shows that the creation of a single LLP Programme, with sectoral programmes targeting the different sectors of the educational world has not had any noticeable impact on the target group. Most project managers seem not to have noticed the merger and/or have not felt a difference at all. However, the dialogue meeting and the qualitative interviews indicate that beneficiaries across the sectoral programmes would like more interaction and more possibilities to bridge the sectoral programmes. Seen from the perspective of the NA staff the integration of sectoral programmes into one

LLP has been positive. It has led to more cooperation and the opportunity to relocate funds to better achieve the goals. Furthermore, some judge the integration to have a positive effect on the activity level within the sectoral programmes (especially Erasmus). However, some representatives from the Danish Agency for International Education (IU) underscore that adequate funds have not followed the increased activity level (especially within Grundtvig). The evaluators point to the fact that the integration could be taken further in the organisation of the IU and in the way the sectoral programmes are implemented.

The IU provides information about the Programme, sectoral programmes and specific actions of the decentralised parts of the Programme, gives advice to potential applicants, administers the grants and controls and financially manages the granted projects. The information effort in general and the support and guidance provided by the IU to project managers is highly praised. Especially the very helpful, flexible and solution-oriented personal approach is pinned out to be very valuable. The information by the IU through websites and written and electronic material is also seen as helpful, in so far as it is used.

The administration and reporting procedures are some of the issues always brought up in connection with EU programmes, and despite quite a high level of satisfaction among project managers with the application process as well as with administrative procedures in general, there seems to be a clear potential for improvement in some areas. Mainly the time span between the deadline for the application and the time of approval is stressed as problematic. This specific dissatisfaction is mostly pronounced for Comenius project managers. The results also indicate that there is still a huge potential for improvements in terms of facilitating less bureaucratic and more flexible administrative procedures as far as the EU regulations permit.

Even though participants with special needs are not dominant in the projects, IU representatives and project managers (based on the qualitative interviews) seem to be very aware of the horizontal policies, that is, the LLP's overriding purpose to increase cultural and linguistic diversity, counteract racism, etc. there are also evidence that the international activities are starting to become a more integrated part of the institutional strategy across the educational sectors.

The strengthened focus in the LLP Programme on dissemination and exploitation seem to have had an impact on project managers. The qualitative interviews show examples of how project results are disseminated through evaluation forms, letters and presentations by students etc. and the IU has also done a more focused effort for dissemination of project results, through the production of a book on creativity and innovation together with the Youth in Action Programme. The evaluation suggests that more is done, if the necessary resources are available, to use the IU web more in presentation of project results and products, examples of dissemination activities and FAQs about dissemination – and about the programme in general. Finally, the evaluation points to the fact that **dissemination of the Programme and the results of the projects could be accentuated in more cross-sectorial** events such as the dialogue meeting arranged in connection with the evaluation.

The recommendations and suggestions for the LLP 2010-2013 and for the future programmes point to the following aspects: Firstly, there are potential synergies in the establishment of the LLP Programme that have not yet been realised, at the same time as there seems to be a need or a wish for more flexibility among the users of the programme. Secondly, the administrative burden is addressed, although this is mainly an issue with no national solution. There should, however, be a constant awareness of this to ensure the relevance of the administration and control to the participants. At the same time the IU should uphold the good level of guidance and service to the applicants and projects. Thirdly, the evaluators point to the need for a strengthened focus on special needs and inclusion. Finally, the suggestions and recommendations address teacher mobility as a key area, both in stimulating student mobility and as a means to bringing internationalisation to the non-mobile.

# 1. Context and methodology

## 1.1 Introduction

This report sums up the conclusions of the interim evaluation of the Lifelong Learning Programme from 2007 to 2009. It was requested by the National Authority for the Programme, the Danish Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation, which by the European Commission was commissioned to complete an interim evaluation according to the guidelines offered by the Commission.

NIRAS has conducted the interim evaluation during the period February to May 2010.

The European Commission has provided a set of guidelines for the report, and in order to make the results comparable across Europe these guidelines have been followed closely. The mandate from the Danish Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation is a report of no more than 30 pages, which means that not all questions have been elaborated on to the same extent. In the Annex Report the reader will find evidence for the many conclusions in this report.

The Danish National Agency for LLP has been very helpful in providing information on the programme, and the participants, and the staff working with the LLP Programme have also participated in interviews and given their view on the implementation of the programme.

The evaluators would like to express our gratitude towards all participants who at very short notice made themselves available for the evaluation. Without their support it would have been impossible to solve the task.

The report is structured as follows:

**Chapter 1** outlines context and methodology of the evaluation.

**Chapter 2** presents the key aspects in relation to the evaluation criteria; relevance, effectiveness and efficiency

**Chapter 3** holds the conclusions and suggestions for future development of the LLP Programme, and future programmes.

The **Annex Report** contains:

- An overview of the survey data in terms of frequencies and significant cross tabulations.
- An account of the activities implemented within the LLP in terms of a) the number of applications and approved projects, b) the granted funds, c) the nature of coordinating organisations and project participants, and finally d) the nature of granted projects. It should be noticed that the available data is limited for the various sectoral programmes.

## 1.2 Context and objectives of the report

The purpose of this interim evaluation is to see whether the objectives of the European educational Lifelong Learning Programme are on course to being achieved. The Lifelong Learning Programme seeks to give the participants the possibilities to experience Europe and learn

on all levels of education regardless of age, gender, role or race. The LLP focuses on formal (contrary to the Youth in Action Programme) as well as informal education for students as well as teachers in several institutions as for example primary schools, secondary schools, vocational education, universities etc.

The aim of this interim evaluation is to identify 'best practice' and 'lessons learned' in this context. The evaluation is drawn up based on three evaluation criteria outlined by the EU guidelines; relevance, effectiveness and efficiency.

The relevance section investigates how the effort impacts on the main target groups and organisations and whether the LLP's objectives are seen to be relevant for the participants in the programme.

In the efficiency section the cooperation between authorities is discussed, as well as the management supporting tools and the level of financial support.

The section on effectiveness explores the effect of the integration of prior programmes into one LLP, the implementation of the programme, experiences with reaching the target groups, measures to disseminate LLP results, and finally, LLP visibility within the educational community.

Finally, recommendations for the rest of the programme period are drawn up, as well as ideas and suggestions for future programmes.

### 1.3 Methodology

The evaluation is based on several different data sources. This way it has been possible to triangulate data so that the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the Programme can be evaluated on the best possible basis.

The report is based on data from:

- Desk research on existing material provided by the Agency for International Education (IU), e.g. data on applications and grants, data on projects and financial data etc. These data have been categorised, organised and divided into sectoral programmes in order to answer the questions of the evaluation
- A quantitative survey among LLP project managers and project participants (from the Comenius Training, Grundtvig Training and Comenius Assistantship programmes)
- Qualitative telephone interviews with seven LLP project managers and five managers of organisations involved in LLP<sup>1</sup>
- Two focus group interviews with project participants, one focus group interview with project managers, and one focus group interview with programme responsible at the IU
- Input from the dialogue meeting where almost 100 beneficiaries from all over Denmark met and discussed the LLP Programme in sector groups and across the programme

---

<sup>1</sup> A principal or manager of the organisation or institution that supply the participants and/or the project manager of the activity.

Regarding the quantitative survey, the data was collected between March 11 and April 5 2010. To avoid the same respondents being asked to answer more than one questionnaire (e.g. if the respondent was project manager in a large institution with many different projects), one project per project manager was randomly selected before sending the questionnaire. The project managers were then asked to answer the questionnaire in the context of the specific randomly selected project.

As a result, regarding the project managers in LLP the questionnaire was sent to 745 different projects. Of these, 361 have filled out the questionnaire resulting in a response rate of 48.5.

With respect to the participants (Comenius Training, Grundtvig Training and Comenius Assistantship) the questionnaire was sent to 557 and with 289 filling out the questionnaire the response rate is 51.9.

In total, 650 respondents have filled out the questionnaire. Of these 361 are project managers (55 %) and 289 participants (45 %) from either Comenius Training, Grundtvig Training or Comenius Assistantship. Throughout the report a distinction will be made between project managers and participants.

The Comenius Programme constitutes the majority in the sample with more than 60 % of the respondents.

As illustrated below, approximately 15 % of the respondents are Leonardo project managers and around 10 % are administrators of Erasmus activities. The project managers of the Grundtvig Programmes constitute 9 % of the sample and the LLP Study Visits constitute approximately 5 %.



**Table 1: Survey respondents' distribution on programme and sectoral programme. Percent of responses**

	Percent
<b>Comenius</b>	<b>61.5%</b>
Regio	0.2%
Multilateral Partnerships	14.8%
Host Schools	5.4%
Training	38.3%
Assistantships	2.9%
<b>Leonardo</b>	<b>14.8%</b>
Partnerships	4.3%
Transfer of Innovation	1.7%
Mobility	8.8%
<b>Erasmus</b>	<b>9.8%</b>
Intensive Programmes	0.9%
EILC	0.8%
Mobility	8.2%
<b>Grundtvig</b>	<b>9%</b>
Visits and exchanges	1.5%
Learning Partnerships	4%
Training	3.2%
Workshops	0.6%
<b>LLP Study Visits Programme</b>	<b>4.9%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>

Note: n = 650 project managers and project participants.

For all frequencies NIRAS have analysed whether significant differences between sectoral programmes exist. Throughout the report the most interesting significant differences are explained and commented. All frequencies and significant cross tabulations are found in the Annex Report.

## 2. Relevance, effectiveness and efficiency

This chapter highlights the key findings related to the three evaluation criteria; relevance, effectiveness and efficiency.

However, prior to this a very brief outline of the activities implemented in relation to the LLP Programme is presented. A more thorough presentation of the activities implemented is to be found in the Annex Report, section 3.

In total, 1,440 project applications were granted during the period 2007-2009. These were followed by financial grants of 9.5 million EURO in 2007, 10.5 million EURO in 2008 and 11.3 million EURO in 2009.

There is a considerable variation among sectoral programme and actions in terms of the percentage of applicants who are granted financial funding and the total amount of granted funding for each sectoral programme. For instance, within some Comenius actions around 70 % of the applicants receive funding each year, while within Leonardo mobility projects only almost 100 % of applications were granted in 2008. The number of grants varies over the years, just as in some years, no projects have received funding within specific actions.

Especially for Leonardo mobility, Erasmus and Comenius it is possible to provide a further analysis based on background data from the IU. The analysis of Leonardo shows that there is a fair regional distribution of the participants. (Based on the survey data this is also the case for the other sectoral programmes, cf. Table 5 in section 2.2.5 )

The majority of the participants in the programme come from vocational training schools, centres or organisations. However, a lot of different organisations are represented, from large enterprises to non-profit associations. For the Comenius programme it is primarily schools that get funding from the Comenius programme, whereas no non-profit associations or NFOs or NGOs have received funding in the three years.

Furthermore, when it comes to gender distribution, the numbers for Leonardo mobility are the only ones available. The analysis shows there is a fairly equal distribution of men and women in the Leonardo mobility programme with a few variations within some of the sectoral programmes.

### 2.1 Relevance

The below sections describes the relevance of the LLP, more specifically its contribution to national policy priorities, added value for participants, added value for organisations, and, finally, project managers' assessment of long-term effects.

#### 2.1.1 Contribution to national policy priorities

Almost eight out of ten project managers assess that the LLP Programme either to a great extent (49 %) or to some extent (29 %) is complementary to Danish national activities and policies in the area. Only 3 % believe that the Programme is only to a low extent complementary to national policies (table 16 in the Annex Report).

In addition, 50 % believe that the activities to a great extent give the target group some educational and development opportunities that they did not otherwise have, and 36 % believe this to be the case to some extent. This again indicates that the Programme is complementary to national programmes.

In general, IU representatives believe the Commission's goals match the goals in Denmark. As they see it, the EU and the national level prioritise the same themes within the educational field.

Also project managers and managers of organisations involved in LLP consider the LLP sectoral programmes to interact well with the Danish government's priorities. For instance, project managers within Comenius and Leonardo highlight the fact that LLP supports the current Danish priority to have 95 % of the cohort complete a youth education. A project manager working with Leonardo projects says:

*“It is these kinds of cultural experiences that motivate wavering students.”*

A project manager working with Grundtvig projects does not disagree, but emphasises that the overall LLP (Grundtvig) educational purpose is and should be broader than the current highly labour-market-oriented educational focus in Denmark.

### **2.1.2 Added value for target groups**

A vast majority of project managers assess that the target group either to a great extent (60 %) or to some extent (36 %) have benefited professionally from the activities (table 16 in the Annex Report). Likewise, also project participants<sup>2</sup> indicate in the survey that they either to a great extent (66 %) or to some extent (28 %) have benefited professionally from the activities (table 22 in the Annex Report).

More specifically, Table 2 below provides an overview of different aspects in which the project managers' have assessed the participants' benefits from participating in the activities. The results show that especially 'intercultural competence' is emphasised as the aspect in which the target group to a great extent have improved their qualifications.

Also personal maturity/development, communication, language, cooperation and networking are to a great extent seen as qualifications improved by the LLP activities. Only conflict handling is assessed to be improved only to a low extent.

---

<sup>2</sup> The survey included only project participants from Comenius/Grundtvig Training and Comenius Assistantship

**Table 2: To which extent do you find that the young people have improved their qualifications within the following areas through the Programme?**

	To a great extent	To some extent	To a low extent	Not at all	Do not know / N/A	Total
Language	50 %	37 %	7 %	0 %	6 %	100 %
Communication	51 %	40 %	4 %	0 %	6 %	100 %
Intercultural competence	68 %	26 %	2 %	0 %	4 %	100 %
Conflict handling	9 %	32 %	26 %	6 %	27 %	100 %
Cooperation	46 %	43 %	5 %	0 %	6 %	100 %
Network formation	43 %	37 %	11 %	0 %	9 %	100 %
Personal maturity/development	54 %	31 %	6 %	0 %	9 %	100 %

Project participants themselves also stress intercultural competences to be the qualification mostly improved, followed by language and communication skills (table 23 in the Annex Report).

Furthermore, 92 % of the project managers assess that the target group either to a great extent (52 %) or to some extent (40 %) will benefit from the experience in their future education and/or profession.

The picture is similar across the various sectoral programmes; however project managers within Erasmus, Study Visits and Leonardo are most convinced that the participants will benefit from their experiences in their future career.

The survey among project participants shows that the target group itself is even more convinced that they will benefit from the experience in their future education and/or profession (Table 24 in the Annex Report).

Finally, 62 % of project managers and 49 % of project participants assess that the activities to a great extent have added a European dimension to the target group's development and education (Tables 18 and 24 in the Annex Report).

The quantitative survey thus shows that both project managers and project participants assess that the LLP activities to a great extent improve the target group's professional and personal qualifications. This indicates a high relevance of the programme.

Most of the target group (70 %) has had aspects of mobility, such as study, traineeship or exchange visit included in the activities. These mobility activities are by project managers and project participants assessed to have the appropriate length; 90 % of project managers and 86 % of project participants are of that opinion. Only 7 % of project managers and 10 % of project participants deem the Mobility activity to be too short.

The vast majority of the project managers are also satisfied with the content and outcome of the mobility activities. All in all, 95 % of project managers are satisfied with the target group's LLP activities – either to a great extent (77 %) or to some extent (18 %).

Further analysis shows high satisfaction across all sectoral programmes. However, project managers within Grundtvig and Comenius are even more satisfied with the activities than project managers within the other sectoral programmes. 16 % of project managers within Study Visits are either not at all satisfied (5 %) or only to a low extent satisfied (11 %).

The assessment of the Europass Mobility certification is rather varied. 44 % of project managers find that the certification is applicable as documentation for a traineeship or educational visit abroad either to a great extent (23 %) or to some extent (21 %). 16 % only to a limited extent (9 %) or not at all (7%) find the certification applicable. A fairly large share of project managers, however, have no specific knowledge/opinion on this aspect (they answer 'Do not know / NA' to the question) (Table 20 in the Annex Report).

Also, 50 % of project participants have no knowledge/opinion of the Europass Mobility certificate (Table 24 in the Annex Report).

### 2.1.3 Added value for organisations

One important aspect to encounter when assessing the relevance of the Programme is to which extent project managers believe the activities to be relevant to their own organisation or institution. Here, the study shows that a vast majority of project managers (95 %) judge the activities for which support can be applied through the LLP to be relevant in respect of the requirements of their organisation/association. This either to a great extent (74 %) or to some extent (21 %) (Table 14 in the Annex Report).

Furthermore, 92 % of project managers assess that their experience from the project either to a great extent (56 %) or to some extent (36 %) has a *positive impact* on their own institution/organisation. Only 7 % judge their LLP experience not at all to have a positive impact (2 %) or only to a low extent (5 %) to have a positive impact. (Table 27 in the Annex Report)

Regarding the specific impact of the LLP on organisations, the survey illustrates that the programme in particular has a motivational and promotional effect on the development and implementation of new ideas and projects. Furthermore, the programme has a positive impact on the professional environment and the study environment, and finally, it improves the profile and image of the institution/organisation at a national level (Table 31 in the Annex Report).

Another aspect of the organisational impact of the LLP relates to international cooperation between partners. The survey shows that most project managers experience that project participation indeed contributes to an exchange of experience with other institutions or organisations across borders.

Exchange of experience with *work methods* (e.g. educational materials, educational theory and practice, etc.) is seen as the aspect which to the greatest extent has been influenced by participation in the programme. However, also a significant number of project managers have experienced that their project activities have resulted in *development of education modules or courses across borders* in the institution or organisation (Table 28 in the Annex Report).

A majority also assess that the programme to a great extent (47 %) or to some extent (42 %) has added a European dimension to the institution/organisation (Table 31 in the Annex Report).

Furthermore, eight out of ten project managers believe that the programme either to a great extent (44 %) or to some extent (36 %) has contributed to the establishment of new partnerships with other institutions/organisations. This is the general picture across sectoral programmes; however, *especially* project managers within Erasmus and Leonardo have this conviction.

Almost as many, 76 %, assess that the programme either to a great extent (33 %) or to some

extent (43 %) has improved the profile and image of the institution/organisation at an international level (Table 31 in the Annex Report). Again, project managers within Erasmus and Leonardo judge the ‘image effect’ to be even greater than project managers within the other sectoral programmes.

Thus, the results indicate that the Programme has a positive international outcome by increasing cooperation with other institutions and adding international dimensions and perspectives to the organisations/institutions.

Furthermore, the study shows that in general it is possible for project managers to adapt LLP project activities to other activities of the institution/organisation (Table 29 in the Annex Report).

### 2.1.4 Long-term effects

The overall relevance of the LLP is closely connected to the long-term effects of the programme. The survey indeed shows that project managers in general judge the LLP to provide long-term positive effects on the institutions/organisations.

Table 3 below illustrates first of all, that 92 % of project managers believe that their project participation either to a great extent (53 %) or to some extent (39 %) will encourage increased participation in other international activities/projects *under the EU educational programmes*. And almost as many believe that it will encourage increased participation in other international activities/projects *in general*. Long-term effects in terms of increased participation in *national* activities and projects seem to be slightly less common.

Further, 88 % of project managers believe that their LLP experience either to a great extent (59 %) or to some extent (30 %) will create *permanent cooperation relations* with persons in other countries which would otherwise not exist.

**Table 3: To which extent do you believe that the participation of the institution/organisation in the project in which you have participated ...**

	To a large extent	To some extent	To a low extent	Not at all	Do not know/ N/A	Total
... will have a long-term positive effect on the institution/organisation? (n = 274)	24%	47%	14%	4%	10%	100%
... will create permanent cooperation relations with persons in other countries which would otherwise not exist? (n = 273)	23%	40%	21%	8%	10%	100%
... to a higher degree than before will mean that Europe and the European cooperation will be incorporated in the work of the institution/organisation? (n = 272)	21%	49%	14%	4%	11%	100%
... will encourage increased participation in national activities/projects? (n = 273)	23%	41%	17%	4%	15%	100%
... will encourage increased participation in other international activities/projects in general? (n = 272)	36%	46%	8%	2%	8%	100%
... will encourage increased participation in other international activities/projects under the EU educational programmes? (n = 272)	43%	43%	7%	2%	5%	100%

All in all, the quantitative survey among project managers and project participants indicates significant added values of the LLP Programme. However, in order to gain the most from project activities also in the future it is relevant to discern the key lessons learned among project managers.

When asked about which factors were most important with a view to claiming the greatest benefit from the programme, the project managers address the need of experience. Particularly, they address the need of experience to fill in the application forms (knowledge of the specific terminology etc.) but also experience in managing international projects and partnerships.

Further, the importance of having continuance in the staff handling the projects is underlined as well as the importance of staff driven by determination and inclination.

Some organisations make great efforts to improve their foundation for managing international projects. Below an example;

*"We have pointed out a number of 'globalisation agents' at each college. We train them in guidance and at being inspirational. Some places that works really well."* (Manager of organisation involved in LLP, Leonardo)

Summing up, the long-term effects seem especially pronounced in relation to the potential participation in further EU projects and in relation to the creation of permanent cooperation relations. Particularly, the benefits and long-term effects tend to appear in organisations that are experienced in terms of applications and characterized by staff continuance.

## **2.2 Effectiveness**

The below sections describe the effectiveness of the LLP, more specifically the effect of the integration of prior programmes into one LLP, the implementation of the programme (including assessment of administrative procedures), experiences with reaching the target groups, measures to disseminate LLP results and finally LLP visibility within the educational community.

### **2.2.1 Integration of previous programmes into one LLP**

The IU staff agrees that it is a good thing that sectoral programmes have been integrated within the LLP. It means more cooperation and the opportunity to relocate funds across the different sectoral programmes in order to ensure better budget absorption.

Furthermore, some judge the integration to have a positive effect on the activity level within the sectoral programmes (especially Erasmus). However, some IU representatives underscore that adequate funds have not followed the increased activity level (especially within Grundtvig).

Most project managers (based on the qualitative interviews) say that they have not noticed the merger and/or that they have not felt a difference at all. That is evident for the specific project managers within Erasmus, Comenius, Leonardo and Grundtvig. Only a few project managers have noticed a change. One of them says:

*“The application processes and administrative work in general are faster now...At least for Grundtvig.”* (Project manager, Grundtvig)

The dialogue meeting gave the impression that beneficiaries across sectoral programmes would like to see more interaction and have more possibilities to bridge the sectoral programmes in the future.

### 2.2.2 Information and consultation procedures

Most project managers have their knowledge about the programme from the IU – the Danish Agency for International Education (64 %). Many also have their knowledge from previous experience with applications (49 %) or from more informal sources of information such as colleagues (33 %) and friends/network (16 %). The least relevant source of information is the EU Commission (9 %) and the media, including specialist journals (3 %).

Thus, the IU is the most important source of information about the Programme and a vast majority of project managers (94 %) have indeed used their website, [www.iu.dk](http://www.iu.dk). Most of the users are furthermore satisfied with the usability of the website – 95 % are either very satisfied (31 %) or satisfied (64 %) with the website. Only 3 % are dissatisfied.

The IU website is, however, not the only source of information that the IU provides. Besides personal support, the IU offers project managers a number of services, e.g. information meetings, information material/brochures, electronic newsletters, and the [www.udiverden.dk](http://www.udiverden.dk) and [www.skoleniverden.dk](http://www.skoleniverden.dk) homepages.

The survey shows that not all of the services are used by project managers. For instance, more than half of the project managers are not familiar with the two websites. Instead most project managers have their knowledge of the programme from written material (brochures etc.) or from participation in meetings and/or because they receive an electronic newsletter from the Agency.

Of the various information services that the IU provides, the information meetings are assessed most positively followed by the written material (electronic newsletter and brochures). Those who use the two websites also announce a fair amount of satisfaction (Table 6 in the Annex Report).

In general, the evaluation shows that project managers are very satisfied with the personal support and guidance provided by the IU. It concerns the application process as well as the completion of the activities.

*“They have been excellent and helpful all through the project. Five out of five stars.”* (Manager of organisation involved in LLP about the IU service level)

### 2.2.3 Application and reporting procedures

Two thirds of the project managers used an electronic application form and one third used a paper-based application form (Table 8 in the Annex Report).

71 % of the project managers received support from the IU in connection with the application process and the implementation of the activities. Of those receiving support there is a great amount of satisfaction with the support given, as mentioned above.

All together there is a fairly high level of satisfaction with the application process. 27 % are very satisfied and 66 % are satisfied. 7 % are dissatisfied with the process. This might be due



to the support and guidance available in relation to the application process. Almost three out of four are very satisfied with the IU support in this respect.

The same pattern is apparent regarding the support in connection with the *implementation* of the activities; 62 % are very satisfied, 23 % are satisfied and only 1 % are dissatisfied<sup>3</sup> (Table 10 in the Annex Report).

Table 4 provides an overview of the level of satisfaction among the project managers regarding the various administrative procedures. Compared to the general level of satisfaction with the application process the table gives a more varied picture. For example, a relatively high percentage –22 % – are dissatisfied with the time span between the deadline for the application and the time of approval. Further analysis documents that this specific dissatisfaction is most pronounced for Comenius project managers. Among these 39 % are either dissatisfied (31 %) or very dissatisfied (8 %) with the time span between the deadline for the application and the time of approval. This could be due to the fact that pre-schools, primary and secondary schools (the Comenius target groups) traditionally plan for the coming school year rather early and therefore also have a more urgent need to know if their application is approved or if other activities should be planned instead.

Also, the application form in itself is somewhat criticised as 13 % announce their dissatisfaction with it. The level of satisfaction with these two aspects is, however, still substantial, ranging from 72 % satisfied ('very satisfied' and 'satisfied' combined) to 84 % satisfied.

**Table 4: How satisfied have you been with the administrative procedure in connection with the following?**

	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Do not know / N/A	Total
The application form (n = 330)	20%	64%	13%	2%	1%	100%
The time span between the deadline for applications and approval (n = 330)	13%	59%	22%	3%	2%	100%
Final reporting of exchange/project activities (n = 329)	13%	60%	7%	2%	18%	100%
Requirements of the financial reporting (n = 329)	22%	57%	8%	2%	10%	100%
Requirements of the reporting as regards contents (n = 329)	17%	63%	9%	2%	9%	100%
Payment of the grant (n = 328)	32%	56%	4%	1%	7%	100%

The survey shows a high level of satisfaction with administrative procedures in connection with financial issues. 88 % are either very satisfied (32 %) or satisfied (56%) with the administrative procedure in connection with the payment of the grant. 79 % are either very satisfied (22 %) or satisfied (57 %) with the requirements of the financial reporting.

In general, project managers with prior experience with EU educational programmes explain that they experience the administrative procedures to have become easier, more flexible and less bureaucratic during the last years.

Further, an important indicator of the assessment of the level of administrative burdens is the degree to which the project managers think that the resources invested in the administrative procedures have been worth while, which seems to be the case. 79 % of project managers

<sup>3</sup> 14 % answer 'Do not know / not applicable' to the question.

assess this to be the case either to a large extent (23 %) or to some extent (56 %). However, one out of five project managers believe that the administrative workload only to a low extent (16 %) or 'not at all' (4 %) is reasonable when looking at the level of the grant given (Table 44 in the Annex Report).

On the basis of the above results it therefore seems safe to conclude that the administrative procedures are relatively well constructed in that there is an overall satisfaction with the procedures. However, the results also indicate that there is still a huge potential for improvements in terms of facilitating less bureaucratic and more flexible administrative procedures.

In the survey, project managers were asked to indicate up to three factors which have impeded the completion of project activities. The most dominant factors in this respect are lack of resources (35 %), the administrative requirements (31 %), lack of support and/or interest from colleagues (28 %), lack of interest from the target group (15 %) and lack of support from the faculty or the management (11 %) (Table 46 in the Annex Report).

Thus, even though the relevance and added value of the programme is assessed to be positive, the above factors seem to make the implementation more difficult. Only few (10 %) list the lack of guidance and even fewer list the lack of interesting possibilities as obstacles to the implementation of project activities.

#### **2.2.4 Recruitment of participants**

Central to the effectiveness of the Lifelong Learning Programmes is the ability to recruit participants. The survey shows that 38 % of project managers either to a great extent (4 %) or to some extent (34 %) faced problems in the recruiting process (Table 41 in the Annex Report).

Further analysis highlights significant differences between sectoral programmes in relation to recruitment difficulties. Project managers within Erasmus experience the highest degree of recruitment difficulties (17 % to a high extent and 52 % to some extent), followed by project managers within Grundtvig (no one to a high extent but 52 % to some extent), and Leonardo (3 % to a high extent and 40 % to some extent). Within the Comenius sectoral programme one third of project managers experience problems either to a high extent (3 %) or to some extent (33 %) with the recruitment of participants.

On the contrary, only few project managers within LLP Study Visit experience recruitment difficulties (14% to some extent) (Table 41a in the Annex Report).

The qualitative studies highlight an important aspect of the recruitment difficulties in relation to teachers in specific. Thus, many explain that it requires some extra planning to cover the lost schedules of teachers going abroad. Furthermore, some stress that it can be hard motivating the teachers and getting them to sacrifice their weekends voluntarily.

The survey does not specifically address the difficulties of recruiting young people, but the interviews point to the fact that many students are very 'established' at a young age. They have partners, flats, jobs outside school, and this makes it hard for them to choose to go abroad for three weeks, or a semester.

In the case of Leonardo, there seems to be another obstacle, and that is the employers of the young people, who do not always see the benefit of an international experience. For instance, when it comes to the trades, the standards and methods differ, and employees have not always realised that internationalisation is affecting them too, according to some of the interviewed project managers etc.

*“The difficult part is to get the employees, for instance an electrician, to realize that it is relevant [read: to go abroad]. They seem to think that learning languages is not important.”*  
 (Manager at organisation involved in LLP, Leonardo)

### 2.2.5 Participant profiles

A total of 61 % of LLP participants are pupils, students or course participants, and they can be all ages. 27 % are teachers who participate in training or competence development. They are all usually providers of knowledge but through the programme they get the opportunity to learn more (Table 39 in the Annex Report).

Table 5 indicates a fair level of geographical representativeness among the participants in the Lifelong Learning Programme. Compared to the proportions of the population living in the different regions of Denmark the participants’ distribution seems very representative. Approximately a quarter of the participants live in Southern Denmark. Northern Jutland, which is the most sparsely populated area, has the fewest participants with 12 %. Copenhagen – the capital of Denmark –surprisingly has only 19 % of the participants.

**Table 5: From which region do the participants primarily come?**

	Percent of participants	Percent in population
Copenhagen	19%	30%
Zealand	15%	15%
Southern Denmark	27%	22%
Central Jutland	23%	23%
Northern Jutland	12%	11%
Do not know / the project has not included Danish participants	0%	--

Note: n=311

The table shows that the effectiveness of reaching the target groups geographically is accomplished to a high degree. There are participants of all regions of Denmark in the Lifelong Learning Programme and the participation is fairly representative compared with the distribution of the population in the regions in general.

Table 6 reports that only few participants have special needs. Very few (3 % and 5 %) have physical or mental disabilities. The most common special needs are needs related to school education such as reading difficulties, language difficulties and learning disabilities. 10-15 % of the participants have these special needs.

The table thus shows that the programme to a lesser extent reaches the target group with special needs.

**Table 6: Which special needs have there been?**

	Percent
Reading difficulties	15%
Language difficulties	13%
Learning disabilities	10%
Mental disability	5%
Physical disability	3%
Other special needs	4%
Do not know / the project has not included participants with special needs	0%

Note: n = 311

Even though participants with special needs are not dominant in the projects, IU representatives and project managers (based on the qualitative interviews) seem to be very aware of the horizontal policies, that is, the LLP's overriding purpose to increase cultural and linguistic diversity, counteract racism etc.

Project managers have incorporated the goals in their projects and all agree that it has been implemented very successfully. For example, some highlight their efforts to help those students who have few financial means, others emphasise that the target groups of their projects specifically include children with special needs, people with other ethnic backgrounds than Danish, etc. Finally, some also mention that only organisations specifically oriented towards the horizontal policies are considered partners in these EU projects.

Summing up, when it comes to participant profiles the evaluation shows that there is a fair level of geographical representativeness, whereas the representation of persons with special needs seems more limited. However, the analysis also shows that the horizontal policies in relation to cultural and linguistic diversity etc. are supported via the nature of the specific projects.

### 2.2.6 Dissemination of LLP results

Based on the qualitative interviews it seems that the dissemination and exploitation of LLP activities is a point of division for project managers. Some (project managers within Leonardo, Grundtvig and Comenius) explain that they have evaluation forms, write letters during travelling, produce brochures when returning, write articles on the school website and require all participants to give a verbal presentation of their experiences to other students or pupils.

*“Students, who have been on trips, are there to tell the new students about their experiences. We have only heard positive stories.”* (Manager of organisation involved in LLP, talking about Leonardo and Comenius)

Others tell a different story. For instance, project managers within Erasmus seem to work less goal-oriented with the dissemination of LLP results and student experiences. Thus, they tend to agree that they could benefit from more activities within this area and explain that they are working on that.

The National Agency in Denmark also contributes to the focus on dissemination and exploitation. The IU staff explains how the dissemination and exploitation has a much stronger focus in the applications for the LLP Programme than in previous programmes and how it is a recurrent theme when project managers are brought together for training or information purposes.

The IU has used both their website and written material to disseminate results and has produced a number of publications to that end. An interesting example is the book on creativity and innovation, produced in collaboration with the Youth in Action Programme, presenting ten projects focusing on creativity and innovation. The book is the output from a Conference held in relation to the European Year of Creativity and Innovation in 2009. Each year a thematic conference has been held and publications have been drawn up subsequently.

This has proved a very good way of getting the message about the LLP – and the YiA , as well as results from projects – out to a larger audience, and it could be followed up by other initiatives that bridge the programme.

The dissemination channels used today are relevant, but more could be done, if the necessary resources were available. For instance, the qualitative interviews suggest ways to use the web more actively, with more reports from projects, frequently asked questions regarding dissemination and exploitation and good advice from project managers to other project managers on these issues. And, finally, the dissemination of the programme and the results of the projects could be accentuated in more cross-sectorial events such as the dialogue meeting arranged in connection with the evaluation.

### **2.2.7 Visibility of the LLP in the education and training community**

Based on the qualitative interview, the awareness of LLP seems to be quite high among potential target groups. Generally, the IU staff and most project managers agree that most educational institutions know about the LLP Programmes; however maybe with the exception of very new target groups.

The fact that the name – LLP – is new, and the ‘old’ names Leonardo, Comenius etc. still exist, create an interesting schism. On the one hand LLP is perhaps not very well established as a brand, while the sectoral programmes are. From both the IU and the beneficiaries this calls for a suggestion to not change the names of the sectoral programmes again, because it takes time to incorporate a new name in the mind of the target group.

Several project managers point to the fact that there seems to be a potential in addressing the student level more directly with LLP marketing, to attempt to create a further pull factor.

## **2.3 Efficiency**

This section describes the efficiency of the LLP, more specifically the cooperation between authorities, the management supporting tools and the level of financial support.

### **2.3.1 Cooperation between authorities**

The Danish Agency for International Education implements the LLP Programme under the authority of the Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation. Acting as NA the IU provides information about the programme, sectoral programmes and specific actions of the

decentralised parts of the programme, gives advice to potential applicants, administers the grants and controls and financially manages the granted projects.

This structure seems logical and clear and works well to enable a successful implementation of the LLP Programme in Denmark. Regarding the division of the programme into decentralised and centralised actions it seems to be working well enough, especially for those who are well informed and know the difference. The decision taken by the European Commission and the Executive Agency that NA's are not entitled to provide counselling on centralised activities is however creating some frustrations within the NA. They feel that they let the applicants down when they have to turn them away to the Executive Agency for advice on the centralised activities, because they know that this does not function as well as it could for Danish applicants.

*“The division in central and de-central doesn't work well for us. We cannot advise users properly on that area.”* (NA staff, focus group)

The workload and the control have increased seen from the IU perspective, both nationally and centrally. But there is a general understanding that control is necessary. The Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation is responsible for the monitoring and control procedure. This ministry however cooperates with the Ministry of Education who is responsible for a number of the educational areas included by the LLP. The IU staff expresses their general satisfaction with the way in which the cooperation and the coordination between the two ministries work.

From the interview with the staff of the Agency the impression is, furthermore, that the cooperation with the Commission has been good throughout the period, and that the communication and coordination structures set up for the programme work well.

However, a major criticism regards the reporting requirements, especially the financial reporting, from the NA to the Commission, which seemingly continues to grow. The IU staff address the shift from earlier having to report more 'contents' to now having to report more financial aspects. They also stress the point that they now have to report on a lot more parameters and that their narrative descriptions have increased in extent. The fact that all the data collected by the NA does not seem to be used in any visible way adds to the dissatisfaction.

Seen in the light of the fact that the LLP is now one programme the staff also seem to experience a large variety in the way that the reporting requirements are handled centrally, which does not help the streamlining of the processes of sectoral programmes in Denmark.

The IU staff expresses that the workload has grown in the first years of the LLP compared to the former programme but tentatively explains this as the adjustment to new forms, new actions etc. both internally and for the participants.

The system of divided responsibilities has been implemented. It is seen as a natural consequence of the enhanced control by the Commission, and the system is upheld, although it has some practical consequences and strains on the staff for a relatively small NA like the Danish, when the same person cannot advise on and control the same project.

### 2.3.2 Management supporting tools

There is a number of different management supporting tools, e.g. LLP Link, EST, ADAM and Circa (replacing NETY), developed in order to facilitate an efficient management and implementation of the programme.

Among the people responsible for the implementation of the LLP at the IU there seems to be modest satisfaction with the new administrative tool LLP Link. The main gain seems to be that the EC can pull data from it directly, but as a national supporting tool it is not considered to be very user friendly.

The IU representatives explain that they have to do less typing with the introduction of LLP Link. However, they experience that the technological requirements to operate the systems have increased. This calls for more training, but also better technical support, both nationally and on a European level.

IU representatives furthermore stress the point that even though the new administrative system might be easier to operate, it is not seen as a relief for users (project managers). They still have to mail in application forms in paper as well as fill out the electronic form, which confuses them. There seems to be still room for improvement in the development of systems to handle applications and reporting using modern technologies.

The system Circa, is considered to be helpful. An IU representative explains: *"You get the idea of it all. Once we got the hang of the system, it's really smart."*

### 2.3.3 The level of financial support

Among project managers there is a high degree of satisfaction with the level of financial support. 37 % assess that the level of financial support has been adequate to a great extent in respect of meeting the original objectives of the activities, and 54 % assess this to be the case to some extent. Only 8 % believe that the amount of financial support has been adequate to a low extent and 2 % assess that the grant is 'not at all' adequate.

The qualitative interviews with project managers support this information. The project managers generally find that the students/participants receive reasonable financial support – in particular as regards travel expenses. However, they believe that in some cases more money could be allocated for administrative support to the coordinating partner, and for instance to the hosting partner in order to make it possible for hosts to be paid for their extra time.

Furthermore, the survey illustrates that only few projects are not totally dependent on the level of support from the EU. Table 7 documents that, according to project managers, almost two in three projects could not have been executed without EU funding, and only 9 % of the project managers find it likely that their projects would be carried out without financial support from the EU.

**Table 7: To which extent do you find it likely that the activities completed in the project would have been completed, had there been no grant schemes under EU educational programmes?**

	Percent
To a great extent	3%
To some extent	6%
To a low extent	28%
Not at all	64%
Total	100%

Note: n = 305

On average, 14 % of project managers have received financial support for the activities from elsewhere than the EU (table 12 in the Annex Report). Behind this number, though, lie significant differences between sectoral programmes, as 34 % of Erasmus project managers have received other kinds of support against only 8-12 % of other project managers (Table 12a in the Annex Report).

However, most of the project managers who have received support also from elsewhere judge that the assurance of financial support from the EU has been an advantage in this respect (Table 13 in the Annex Report). Thus, the award of Community funds serves to some extent as a catalyst for obtaining other financing.



## 3. Conclusions and suggestions for future developments

### 3.1 Conclusions

This chapter sums up the main conclusions of the interim evaluation.

Based on the survey and the interviews and the analysis of the statistical data available, the LLP Programme implementation 2007-2009 is assessed to be relevant as well as quite effective and efficient.

The LLP Programme is considered to be complementary to Danish national activities and policies, and the evaluation points towards significant added value for target groups as well as organisations. At target group level the LLP activities to a great extent improve the professional and personal qualifications of project participants. At organisational level the evaluation shows that the programme to a high extent has added a European dimension to the institution/organisation in terms of enduring international partnerships in many cases.

The study outlines a number of important factors (lessons learned) in order to claim maximum benefit from the programme. Particularly, project managers address the importance of experience, that is, experience to fill out the forms of application as well as experience in managing international projects and partnerships. Further, the importance of having continuance in the staff handling the projects is underlined as well as the importance of staff driven by determination and good will.

This interim evaluation shows some important changes from the previous programmes: Firstly, the recommendation to ensure more organisational rooting of projects seems to have been met in the new projects under LLP. Based on the interviews there is evidence of LLP projects being more a part of a strategic focus, an internationalisation strategy, than previously. Secondly it seems as if dissemination has grown into an integrated part of the project 'make-up', and project managers are very focused on how to disseminate – and the importance of disseminating – and this is also a clear improvement from the previous programme.

Efforts among project participants to disseminate programme experiences seem to be quite diverse. In general, there seems to be a potential connected to a more coordinated approach among projects. At national level there also seems to be a potential for further active use of the web, with more examples of projects, frequently asked questions and good advice from project managers to other project managers. And, finally, the dissemination of the programme and the results of the projects could be accentuated in more cross-sectorial events such as the dialogue meeting arranged in connection with the evaluation.

Despite quite a high level of satisfaction among project managers with administrative procedures in general there seems to be a clear potential for improvement in some respects. Mainly the time span between the deadline for the application and the time of approval is stressed as problematic. The results also indicate that there is still a huge potential for improvements in terms of facilitating less bureaucratic and more flexible administrative procedures.

The focus on financial aspects in the reporting tends to shift the focus from the contents and the real value of the projects to more quantitative aspects, and this counteracts the emphasis on dissemination of results, exploitation and transfer of knowledge, innovation and experiences, that runs parallel in the LLP Programme.

Also in relation to the recruitment process there seems to be room for improvement. Almost four out of ten project managers to some extent face problems in the recruiting process. Especially regarding teacher mobility there tends to be some barriers that have not yet been overcome

The survey illustrates that only few projects are not totally dependent on the level of support from the EU. According to project managers, almost two in three projects could not have been executed without EU funding. Finally, the award of Community funds serves to some extent as a catalyst for obtaining other financing.

## 3.2 Suggestions for LLP 2010-2013

Based on the current evaluation results the evaluators suggest the following points for LLP 2010-2013, and for future programmes.

### 3.2.1 Flexibility and synergies

The integration of the previous educational programmes into one LLP Programme launched in 2007 was a political statement from the EU Commission rather than a wish from the educational sectors across Europe. Traditionally the sectors have lived their separate lives, been under separate laws and regulations, and their interfaces have been limited. The LLP Programme was designed to create more interfaces – more interaction and more synergy between them, in order to, as it is stated in the decision of the Commission in 2006<sup>4</sup> “contribute through lifelong learning to the development of the European Union as an advanced knowledge society, with sustainable economic development, more and better jobs and greater social cohesion”.

The integration of the sectoral programmes into one LLP is judged positively by IU staff, because, as mentioned above, it enables them to cooperate more and gives the opportunity to relocate funds across the different actions and sectoral programmes. There is no doubt that the LLP Programme has meant some changes in their way of working. However, the survey shows that interestingly enough, most project managers seem not to have noticed the integration and/or have not felt any difference. And what is more important, the interviews and the dialogue meeting show that they see a much larger potential in cooperation across programmes than what is happening today. Therefore, the evaluators conclude that the full potential in terms of maximum synergies has not yet been realised. In spite of improved communication and coordination across sectoral programmes, these still tend to live quite separate lives. This is not least apparent from the very dissimilar and often incomplete statistics provided by each sectoral programme (as presented in the Annex Report).

*“If the boundaries were fluent it would be an advantage (for the operation). There is a joint office, but it is different people administrating. It’s not actually merged.”* (Project manager, dialogue meeting)

The evaluators recommend that a further effort be made to **ensure and realise the synergies of the LLP Programme** – internally in the NA, but equally important towards the benefici-

---

<sup>4</sup> COM DECISION No 1720/2006/EC

aries who should be supported and inspired to find ways of combining activities also across to the Youth in Action Programme or centralised measures, where applicable. In order to visualise the synergies to the participants the IU could provide thematic seminars across sectoral programmes, or in other ways bring people together to share experiences. The dialogue meeting in connection with this interim evaluation was a good example of how fruitful discussions could take place across sectors.

The evaluators further stress that there is a need for a general overarching LLP focus on the beneficiaries and the overall project idea more than what box to tick in the application. More concretely, the wall between sectoral programmes and actions must be torn down in order to meet the overall objective of the LLP. This runs as a strong undercurrent in the qualitative interviews and in the dialogue meeting. Other restraints such as length of stays, participants with other nationalities, participants on public support etc. are also seen as irritants – and should, if possible be eradicated to enable the free flow of participants in lifelong learning.

### 3.2.2 Administrative cohesion

The bureaucracy surrounding the LLP Programme is evaluated in the report. The main conclusion to that is that the project managers are not very unhappy with the application process. It should be noted however, that this is a study among those who had their projects granted, and that there is a rather high satisfaction – three out of four are very satisfied with the support. Though, when investigating the qualitative responses and the comments added to the questionnaire, a different picture emerges.

The bureaucratic requirements are seen as a great – but apparently not insurmountable – barrier to the LLP Programme, and many requests are made to remedy this: ensuring that application forms are not changed repeatedly and that reporting requirements are available at the time of the launch of the programme, more wide-spread use of new technologies, less repeating of factual information etc.

Another aspect concerning the administrative burden of LLP is the fact that the applications and reporting forms are filled with EU words. The survey and interviews suggest that for some project managers – especially those who do not have a long experience in the area to draw from – the EU terminology is in danger of becoming empty and disconnected from the reality of their project. Consequently the evaluators stress that it is important to work with this constantly to secure the relevance – and the understanding of relevance across the whole programme.

Many of these things have to be solved at an EU level, but there are also aspects that could be addressed nationally.

The evaluators recommend that further effort be made at EU level to **decrease the administrative burden** on projects. The control is necessary, and this is not a question of abolishing all control measures, but a constant focus has to be on the questions asked and the requirements put up to be eligible for LLP funding. It should be clearer what all the information is used for at a European level.

At national level the evaluators would like to stress that it is important that the IU staff continues the good work and are given the resources to keep this up. As is shown in the evaluation the support of the IU staff is seen as indispensable to both new and experienced applicants, and this cannot be underestimated. The evaluators recommend that the possibility of obtaining guidance for potential applicants is made even more visible, so that it does not exclude anyone. Furthermore, the evaluators recommend that the IU could work even more with the website in order to give more good examples of project ideas, applications, dissemination activities, types of cooperation, partners, FAQ etc.

### 3.2.3 Systemic impact

The link to the national priorities for the LLP Programme is evident: internationalisation, formal education, development of competencies, lifelong learning. There are also examples of how these aspects, especially the internationalisation, have gained a foothold in the institutions involved in the LLP, and there is definitely an improvement on this aspect as compared to the previous programmes, but there is still room for improvement.

On the basis of the evaluation the evaluators therefore recommend that the LLP further stresses the requirements for project design and project implementation to give the programme better chances of **realising a systemic impact** on the educational system in Denmark. There should be more focus on involving for instance municipalities, regions, and the Ministry of Education in projects to develop the education of the future. It is also recommended that more systematic use be made of the experiences of mobility, and closer connection should be established between mobility activities and development projects to promote the institutional innovation through the involvement of teacher groups, mid-level management etc.

### 3.2.4 Information and dissemination

The IU does a very fine job in **informing about the LLP Programme** in Denmark as shown above. This is an indispensable activity and one that has to be maintained constantly. The use of websites is well established, and the survey shows a high level of satisfaction with these aspects. The evaluators recommend that the information activity for LLP is maintained, and the website developed as mentioned above.

The evaluators furthermore recommend that more effort be put into information to reach those who are not yet involved in the programme. More information to pupils and students focusing on ways to overcome the barriers to mobility could be one way of helping the organisations break down these barriers, as well as more broadly based campaigns on internationalisation, or a road show with young people who tell about their international experience in schools, or teachers telling about their experience when and where teachers are gathered. Another way of reaching new actors or new target groups is a more structured development of areas where there are 'black holes' – be that geographically, in terms of organisation types, etc.

Dissemination of project results and experiences is also very important and in the LLP Programme the focus on DEOR (dissemination and exploitation of results) has been growing with the strengthened emphasis centrally. The focus on dissemination means that participating organisations/institutions/schools at all levels should allocate means and time to disseminate results internally and externally to spread the experiences obtained throughout the organisation. The interviews especially show that this is happening to a certain degree, and the projects experiment with different ways of living up to their dissemination obligations.

The evaluators recommend that the focus on dissemination is kept in the reporting procedures and in the control visits. However, it is important that the focus on dissemination is not just quantitative, i.e. number of dissemination events, but also with has focus on contents and methodology. This could be gathered and made available to other projects as a good practise guide to dissemination. Regarding dissemination the evaluators furthermore recommend that the Agency should continue the support to dissemination initiatives in the projects separately, but even more importantly create more joint dissemination channels, like the book on creativity and innovation produced with YiA or other such initiatives

Further among project managers there is strong wish to exchange experience with other project managers, and in that respect the evaluators suggest that the IU consider establishing

networks among project managers in order to provide the possibility to share knowledge and experience with like-minded people at national level during project implementation, and not just virtual networks, but more possibilities of meeting, perhaps even regionally.

*“I’ve missed having contact with project leaders in other municipalities. I’ve missed cooperation or talks with other project leaders. Some knowledge sharing on a Danish level.”*

(Project manager, interviews)

### 3.2.5 Inclusion

The evaluators recommend that there be strengthened **focus on special needs and inclusion** in the LLP Programme. It should be considered if central demands in relation to inclusion factors in projects should be enhanced. Further, it should be considered if the IU could provide financial assistance to people with only few means and/or personal resources, e.g. single mothers, disabled persons, etc.

In this respect the evaluators stress that it is important that the inclusion concept is seen as broadly as possible, to also include projects or activities in other languages than English, and to include people outside Europe in projects or activities and make sure that people with disabilities, blind people or hearing impaired persons can participate in all training activities. It is also recommended that the Commission thinks inclusivity when planning the new programmes and their administrative procedures.

### 3.2.6 Quality and qualifications

Focus on quality and qualification is one area that has been underlying the LLP Programme as such, but on the basis of the interviews and the dialogue meeting the evaluators recommend that it be given even more focus in the coming years. These issues are, furthermore, sector-independent and could be used to gain more integration and synergy between sectors.

Teacher mobility – both outgoing and incoming – is another area that according to the evaluators could be given even more focus as it can be a push factor for increased student mobility. However, by giving the teachers an international experience they can bring this back in the classroom and thereby add to the impact on all the pupils/students they teach and create a major added value. In the light of the fact that the survey reports on some difficulties in recruiting teachers, it should be investigated whether certificates and/or financial incentives could be applied in order to motivate teachers, and the IU could be the motor behind finding these good examples in Denmark.

*“It is important to have an exchange of teachers: To have teachers from abroad coming to the school. It would be nice with more of that.”* (Manager of organisation with LLP projects, Leonardo)

The involvement of companies in projects is also an area where the evaluators see that more synergy and more relevance could be built up. A large part of the companies are becoming more and more internationally oriented and they have seen the need for employees with an international dimension in the education. This could be used to influence those groups of young people who are still not very convinced. This pull factor could be a way of ensuring that mobility be spread more evenly and not just considered a concept relevant for students in higher education institutions.