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| Strengths | * Idea of the project; * Production of the different instruments; * Consortium always ready to find solutions together to keep the project moving; * Meet new people; * Comparative PE; * Aims of the project – comparison; * Implementation of the monitoring system and the webpage; * IO3 and IO4; * Multinational capacity of the team; * Project conceptually-rooted in ecological framework; * Big effort in formulating the IOs; * Constructive and vital debates on the instruments during the formulation; * Leadership and passion from the coordination; * Data from teachers and students; * Team quality; * Quality of the idea and the project; * Possibility to promote change in PE; * Capacity to adapt to the circumstances; * Common ground all of the times, even during the disagreement moments; * Placing at the fore the value of the project for the stakeholders; * Value of prolonged and sustained shared experience; * Building of critical mass for QPE; * UNESCO Meeting. |
| Weaknesses | * Disruption and uncertainty arising from corona; * Difference of the aspirations – coordination too much focused on the process development and needed a stronger orientation on the output; * Project timeline vs Educational timeline; * Balance between ambition and exhaustiveness of the elements to compile; * Communication; * With minimal resources there is low potential for national follow-up; * Not a complete European representation; * More research-based outputs to gather more attention from other countries; * Project management difficulties – more effective and pleasant communication; * Survey Burden – more from a complexity perspective than the length; * Need for a statistician support; * More support with the use of the funding; * Overly ambitious project; * Coordination took too much during many times in critical stages and found challenges in managing the meeting environment to a less work-intensive one * Too much repetition of previously discussed and decided ideas; * Challenge in managing different feedback and proposals within the consortium; * Coordination could have engaged better and clearer the partners; * Different levels of engagement between scientific and professional associations. |
| Suggestions of Improvement | * National network to start structuring a National Observatory; * Reduce the IOs 3 and 4 towards a sustainable process; * Detailed and clear idea based on the project application; * Clearer instructions; * More frequent meetings; * Include more countries in 2.0; * Better solution for feedback from youth; * More research outputs; * More statistical data-driven decisions; * Discuss how to implement the EuPEO; * More moments of contact between the consortium mixing face-to-face with online meetings; * Ensure that all partners understand all tasks/objectives at all stages; * Prepare the delivery to EUPEA. |