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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.
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