

GRADES™ Mid-Term Evaluation Final Report

Report Prepared for Forward Scotland

By

IA Partnerships Limited

INTRODUCTION

Background

Forward Scotland was awarded 110,810 euro by the Leonardo da Vinci (LdV) Mobility Actions fund to deliver its GRADES™, graduate training and placement programme. The project aims to send 30 UK graduates on work experience with small to medium sized companies in Hungary and Malta. During their work placements the graduates help the host companies develop and/or implement projects with the purpose of improving or increasing sustainable business practices. This part of the GRADES™ programme has been running since January 2008 and is due to end by June 2009. It is referenced simply as GRADES™ throughout the remainder of this report.

GRADES™ sought to differentiate itself, from other similar work experience programmes, by having graduates undertake more exacting and specialist tasks around sustainable business development and corporate social responsibility. Fulfilling a role of this nature, it is believed, would provide both a valuable training to the participant and a service to the recipient company.

The national body responsible for managing the LdV programme in the UK is ECOTEC, who are tasked with ensuring that the GRADES™ programme is delivered according to the original application submitted to them. As a result ECOTEC carry out quarterly monitoring on the programme. In addition to this as part of the project evaluation, Forward Scotland is also required to commission an external evaluation to be carried out on the programme mid-term.

Purpose of the mid-term evaluation

The focus of this mid-term evaluation, as defined in the original application, is upon participant outcomes, including the company or organisational benefits derived. At participant level we would expect to see 80% of graduates in appropriate employment within six months of leaving the programme and the businesses achieving measurable outcomes such as reduced costs, improved compliance, innovation through addressing customer value, workforce awareness and development and corporate social investments.

The purpose of this evaluation then is to examine the elements of the programme that have supported or hindered the achievement of these outcomes and in particular to highlight where improvements could possibly be made. This evaluation focused on the outcomes from the seven work placements completed to date. A final evaluation is to be conducted sometime between March and June 2009, with an emphasis on overall programme outcomes.

According to the brief prepared by Forward Scotland this evaluation report should also include inter alia recommendations for improvement to the following, in so far as possible;-

- Methods used for recruitment of graduates and placement companies
- The training and pre-placement support being given to graduates
- Communication of all parties e.g. between Forward Scotland and partners
- The quality of monitoring being carried out by Forward Scotland and partners
- The quality of post-placement support
- Support received from LdV National body
- Ways to improve outcomes for graduates

As this is part of the planned evaluation of the programming cycle, the evaluation results shall be used to synthesize any learning at this stage toward helping improve various elements of the project design and the implementation of future project activities.

Methodology

There are 3 key elements to this evaluation:

- A face to face interview with Sandra Renicks the Development Programme Leader at Forward Scotland. During this interview we also agreed the aim and scope of the evaluation work.
- A review of the key project documentation; including, where available, IVT & PLM Placement Reports, Company Evaluation Reports, and any other feedback and monitoring reports.
- Telephone interviews, in so far as possible within the short timeframe for this evaluation, with the seven participants, who completed the programme, the four companies in Hungary, the three organisations in Malta, the two partner organisations, Kovet-Inem in Hungary and Future Focus in Malta and the staff at Forward Scotland. The interview used a standard topic guide or questionnaire, with slight variations to reflect the different roles of the various participants.

The results of the above processes have informed the content, conclusions and recommendations of this evaluation.

Project Outcomes - Views of the Participants

What attracted the participants to the programme initially and what did they hope to gain?

All of the participants were attracted to the programme as a good means of gaining valuable work experience, to increase their own prospects of obtaining suitable positions in a highly competitive graduate recruitment job market.

Other benefits identified by the participants at the outset were:-

- An enhanced understanding of sustainability and sustainable business practices which many saw as being increasingly valued by prospective employers in the future as this becomes a more central concern of many organisations.
- An opportunity to find a practical application for the academic theory surrounding sustainable development.
- Training in and subsequently improved levels of the generic business skills required by organisations, such as making presentations, writing reports and communications for example.
- An opportunity for personal development and to demonstrate motivation and self-reliance by working abroad
- An understanding of work cultures in other countries

On the nature of the training and pre-placement support received

All participants expressed the view that the short course in Sustainable Development taught by Dr Ian Moffat at the University of Stirling provided a solid introduction to the theoretical principles underpinning sustainable development and valuable signposting to other reference materials that could be sourced, if required, during their work placement. It also provided a glossary for the language of sustainable development in a business context that could then be shared.

However they also believed that the teaching would have been of an even higher utility if this had been tailored in some way toward their intended work placements. None of the participants had known the nature of their intended work placement at this stage and many felt that if this had been known in advance they could then have applied this knowledge to improve their own learning during the training period.

Support received during the work placement

All of the participants were satisfied with the levels of support they received from their hosts during the placement period. Everything was very well prepared especially in Hungary where pains were taken to provide English keyboards on the computers supplied. The project assignments were most challenging, involved working on innovative new initiatives and represented a considerable stretch for most participants, who were tasked with driving the assignments and really demonstrating leadership. Work colleagues were supportive and were willing to mentor the participants.

Post Placement Support

All participants commented positively on the post placement support provided by Forward Scotland and the assistance they subsequently received in job seeking. They were sanguine enough to concede that there were considerable limitations upon what Forward Scotland could realistically achieve and that the buck rested with them at the end of the day to be pro-active and to present themselves to best advantage, before, during and after interview with any prospective employer.

Participant Outcomes

All of the participants were most complimentary about the nature of the assignments and the projects that they pursued. Sustainable development is a cross-cutting issue and can impact businesses in many different ways. As a result the nature of the projects were ultimately determined, developed and tailored to match the particular business interests of each individual employer. No two placements were alike.

The best placements, from the participants' perspective, were those that offered an opportunity to deliver a clearly defined output within the relevant timescale. For example in one placement the work undertaken was cited as an example of responsible business practice which provided a case study to be used in promotional brochures for public relations and investment raising purposes. In another a process for a new service offering was developed for an environmental consultancy. Participants derived a great measure of satisfaction from such achievements. Projects that involved a number of smaller initiatives were viewed as being piecemeal and were somewhat less engaging in comparison.

Project Outcomes - Views of the Host Companies

Recruitment to the Programme by the Partner Organisations

The work experience placements in Hungary were pre-defined in advance of the arrival of the work placements in the host country. In Malta the participants were more involved in shaping their own work placements. This distinction in process did not however impact on the outcomes for either the participants or the businesses. Kovet-Inem the partner organisation in Hungary were already known to Forward Scotland prior to the inception of GRADES™ and had considerable experience in sustainable development as a membership Association for Environmentally Aware Management Organisations. Kovet-Inem then was able to recruit host companies from among their own membership. These members had a clearly identified interest in this area. This would appear to have afforded some distinct advantages in defining the projects to be undertaken and within a very short timescale.

Future Focus on the other hand designed their placement programme to be more flexible and tailor-made to the needs of the participants. It is only when the students have arrived in Malta and following a period of initial assessment and interview that placements are then sought with host companies. The benefit of this is that it offers an opportunity for the participant in tandem with the employer to design the objectives and project schedule that will be most effective for them both. Future Focus believes that the graduate obtains added value from this process. Although Future Focus had run language and internship programmes providing work experience for students from all over the world unlike Kovet-Inem they had never provided support and training to businesses on environmental sustainability and ethical performance. As a result the work placements in Malta tended to focus on working solely with environmental issues and challenges. In identifying suitable training placements, Future Focus did not demonstrate a similar understanding of the range of possible work placements that could potentially have been embraced by a wider definition of 'sustainable development'. A narrower view made it more difficult for them in arranging placements within the timescales. In one instance this led to one participant having to be very much more pro-active in defining and finding her own work placement with support and assistance from Future Focus.

The Work Placements

As noted above the nature of the projects were ultimately determined, developed and tailored to match the particular business interests of each individual employer. This helped to ensure that all of the projects had a strong emphasis on delivering benefits to the companies within the relevant timescale.

An excellent example of the benefits of this approach is Állami Autópálya Kezelő Zrt (AAK), the Hungarian state motorway management company, responsible for the upkeep of the majority of the Hungarian motorway network. The participant was charged with identifying and conducting a review of the company's activities that would help demonstrate their use of sustainable and environmentally responsible business practices.

The main activities investigated were:

- Noise prevention (arising from motorway traffic)
- Asphalt recycling (during re-surfacing work)
- Bio-remediation (following spillages arising from accidents or general maintenance work),
- Wildlife protection
- Traffic safety measures
- Reducing the fuel consumption of AAK's fleet of vehicles
- An employee cultural change programme

Two case studies on Asphalt Recycling and the Cultural Change Programme were then chosen to be developed and the participant was responsible for writing and designing brochures and leaflets to be published at a later date. The two case studies were then submitted to CSR Europe for their annual event the CSR MarketPlace, following the required guidelines. This event was held on 29 November 2007 in Brussels. At the MarketPlace, CSR practitioners from across Europe gather together to share innovative solutions to today's business challenges. In 2007 AAK's corporate initiatives were shared among 600 representatives from other companies, European policy makers and other stakeholders.

In Malta one of the participants helped the Le Meridien hotel in St Julians to achieve an eco-label from the Malta Tourism Authority under their certification scheme. This work not only improved the hotel's environmental performance but was used externally, to inform the development of their marketing, and internally to enhance levels of staff awareness and 'buy-in'.

All of the placements, examined during this evaluation, produced work that was most impressive and of a very high standard.

The Outcomes for the Organisations

The placements were evaluated by the host companies, who completed reports containing a qualitative assessment of the contribution to the sustainable development or Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) progress of the company.

The work placements were of such a high quality that they sought to deliver benefits at the value-added end of the spectrum rather than restrict themselves simply to delivering cost savings through increased compliance and a more efficient use of company resources.

Therefore the majority of the companies strongly agreed that the placement resulted in actual or potential new business opportunities that also resulted in actual or potential increases in the company profits. Other benefits seen were improved workforce awareness, new policies and initiatives leading to the engagement of other staff members with the sustainable development and CSR agenda in the company and an opportunity to contribute to this. This also extended to embrace other shareholders on occasion.

As can be seen from AAK example above there were clearly many additional ancillary benefits that were neither anticipated nor indeed captured by the Company Evaluation Reports. The kudos accruing from an opportunity to present the work of the placement at an international congress and the positive impact of this on corporate reputation and brand value cannot however be ignored.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Methods used for recruitment of graduates and placement companies

An initial target of 30 graduates was set with Forward Scotland being responsible for all recruitment. The total number of places available on this programme, are intended to be equally distributed between Hungary and Malta and spread across the three placement periods outlined below with the intention of aligning these with the relevant UK Winter and Summer graduation periods:-

- 1st training and placement period - January - June 2008
- 2nd training and placement period - June - November 2008

- 3rd training and placement period - January - June 2009

Recruitment was due to commence in August 2007 but did not begin until a little later. A phased approach was also adopted with regard to the main thrust of the recruitment drives to precede the above periods. During the initial recruitment phase the placements were advertised at only a limited number of Universities. Despite this there were 110 downloads of the application for placement form from the Forward Scotland website. Unfortunately only a limited number of these downloads led to a formal submission. The original leaflet or flyer also omitted to reference the relevant EU travel and Visa requirements applicable to either of the host countries. This meant that a large number of the initial applications received were also ineligible.

Eight graduates have been recruited in total for the first and second training and placement periods. The limited number of graduates has perhaps contributed in some way to there being a smaller portfolio of work placements delivering high quality outcomes for both the participants and the host companies. We can only speculate as to whether or not this high quality could have been maintained in delivering a larger number of projects during each training and placement period.

The total budget for graduate recruitment activities is £4,404.

Conclusions

- The recruitment process would have benefited quite significantly from wider advertisement
- There was no process in place for tracking the source or origins of any of the applications as a means of assessing the relative impact of the various recruitment activities. Greater use could perhaps have been made of the registration process to obtain further details as to the identity of those who downloaded the application form.
- Recruitment should have been pursued on a continuous basis online and applications should have been open for acceptance for future training and work placements at all times
- More information should have been obtained from graduates during any interviews to help inform the recruitment process
- Most participants expressed a desire to know the identity of their employer and details of the work placement at the earliest opportunity. Consideration should be given to how this might be achieved as this knowledge is a key driver of graduate participation and would be an invaluable aid to the recruitment process.

Recommendations

- In order to improve the recruitment process, consideration should be given to enlisting the services of the various umbrella organisations that exist to link the somewhat disparate activities of each individual university's graduate careers office. For example:

The National Council of Work Experience
(<http://www.work-experience.org/ncwe.rd/index.jsp>)

PlaceNet
(<http://www.placenet.org.uk>)

The Association of Sandwich and Education Training (ASET)
(<http://www.asetonline.org>)

- Greater use should be made of online graduate communities, fora and postings on relevant bulletin boards, such as those available on the Graduate Prospects website. This is an extremely cost effective means of achieving much greater exposure with a limited budget.
- Additional information should be sought from all applicants to help identify which of the marketing channels, among all of those used in the recruiting process, were the most effective. Therefore all applicants should be asked at some point during the process 'Where did you learn of this opportunity?' and this information should be captured. The knowledge captured from this can then be used to inform all future recruitment strategy and activities.

The training and pre-placement support being given to graduates

The participants views on the value of the training and pre-placement support received are noted above. The bulk of the preparatory work and induction activities undertaken prior to placement were delivered by Forward Scotland while the participants remained in the UK. The workshops designed, led and delivered by the staff at Forward Scotland around report writing, presentation skills and advice and guidance concerning optimising the placement opportunity and relate this to their own personal development and career goals.

Little additional further induction work was undertaken by either of the partner organisations in the host countries. It would appear that they viewed their own role as facilitating an introduction and providing liaison between the participants and the host companies as appropriate and dealing with any issues surrounding cultural assimilation. Limited language instruction was undertaken.

Conclusions

- The accredited module delivered by the University of Stirling affords the graduates a unique opportunity to gain valuable skills and knowledge of sustainable business practices.
- The somewhat limited nature of the language instruction provided did not appear to present a barrier to the participants or the companies in achieving the project outcomes.

Recommendations

- Forward Scotland should strive to encourage greater levels of partnership working and a more equal relationship with the partner organisations, where both are involved in and accountable for the overall project management.
- Forward Scotland should encourage their partner organisations in the host countries to assist in the delivery of language and cultural assimilation programmes
- If the nature of the work placements could be determined in advance as suggested above then consideration should be given to tailoring the pre-placement support to the needs of the participant and the host company.
- Forward Scotland supplied their partner organisations with details of the participants at the earliest opportunity in order that the 'match-making' with companies could begin well in advance of the work placements. However in addition to this a process is required to ensure that this knowledge is being used effectively by the partner organisations, at an early stage, to identify host companies and shape the nature of the work placements.

Communications of all parties e.g. between Forward Scotland and partners

The only impediment that a lack of communication presented to the project outcomes identified was a somewhat dilatory approach from the partner organisations in providing details of the work placements to Forward Scotland and the participants prior to the training and placement periods.

During the work placements communications occur between the parties very much on an ad hoc basis as and when required. A regular communications process was designed with a view to enabling the monitoring process described below. It was envisaged that Forward Scotland would receive regular monitoring reports from their partner organisations. We were unable to establish how much communication actually occurred between the parties toward project monitoring beyond the formal written reports that were provided to us. Communications were conducted largely by e-mail to which we were not privy.

Conclusions

- None of the interviewees identified any problems which had arisen due to a lack of communication

Recommendations

- Ensure that there was a designated project lead and go-to-person in each of the partner organisations
- Ensure that Forward Scotland have direct access to the placement companies and are not required to communicate through the partner organisations alone

The quality of monitoring being carried out by Forward Scotland and partners

Participants are allocated a mentor by the placement company who is then available at all times to assist them for the duration of their placement. Participants all confirmed that they met with their mentors on a regular basis and received plentiful support from colleagues at the placement companies. This informal interaction ensured that the work placement was succeeding in meeting the needs of both the participants and the host company as identified at the outset.

Forward Scotland also sent out a weekly e-mail to all participants to monitor progress. This process was initiated at the start of the second round of cohorts.

Further assistance, guidance and training were available to the participants if required. However recourse to these further resources proved unnecessary to the programme delivery.

Forward Scotland received regular monitoring reports from their partner organisations on an informal basis and with the participants to ensure adequate levels of support were being maintained and progress toward a successful outcome.

Log books are completed by the participants during the placement period and both company evaluation reports and assessment feedback reports using LdV's standard templates are completed at the conclusion of the placements.

ECOTEC also carry out quarterly monitoring on the programme to provide regular feedback and recommendations.

Conclusions

- An examination of the monitoring processes did not reveal any weaknesses.
- It was not clear what use was made of the monitoring processes toward adapting and improving the project design and delivery where appropriate.

Recommendations

- The relationship between the monitoring processes and subsequent project adaptations and improvements is highlighted in some way and made much more explicit
- Forward Scotland should encourage an increased involvement from their partners in the monitoring and evaluation processes.

The quality of post-placement support

The participants views on the quality of the post-placement support received are noted above. Only the comments from the participants of the first round of training and work placements, a small sample of three, are relevant at this stage as the second round participants have yet to experience this process.

At participant level we would expect to see 80% of graduates in appropriate employment within six months of leaving the programme. This six month period has only now expired for the three first round participants.

As at February 2009, of the first round participants, three of them are currently in employment (two of the positions held are at a graduate level. From the second round participants three of them are in employment at graduate level. It should also be noted that two of the participants here were offered and accepted full-time positions from their placement companies. The other participant, in employment, is currently conducting work associated with her placement for the host company on a private consultancy basis. The employment status of the remaining participant has not been established; however he has received coaching and post-placement support from Forward Scotland.

Conclusions

- It is important to capture any learning about what aids success from all participants as they undertake this process.

Recommendations

- Consideration should be given to enlisting the services of umbrella organisations, such as those cited above at the section dealing with recruitment matters and leveraging their experience here.

Appendix One: Participants surveyed for the preparation of this report

Participating Students:

- Guillem Vich-Callego
- Rasa Luzyte
- Luke James Emerton
- Oier Aristizabal
- Alice Hamling
- Peter MacLeod
- Zoe Yuill
- Carolyn Mitchell Santiago

Participating Organisations

:

- Denkstatt Budapest
- State Motorway Management Company Limited
- Deguara Farrugia Advocates
- Le Meridien, St Julians
- Malta Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energies Association (MEEREA)
- The Maltese Planning Authority
- GE C&I
- Durga-Vishnu

Partner Organisations:

- Future Focus Limited
- Kovet-Inem

Forward Scotland

- Frazer Scott
- Sandra Renicks
- Michael Cunningham
- Christine Benvie

A response rate of 68% from those identified above was achieved by our survey.

Appendix Two: Topic Sheet for Interviews

1. Forward Scotland

Methods used for recruitment of graduates and placement companies

How did you arrive at the target of 30 graduates?

What resources did you require to use to achieve this target?

How did you design the recruitment process for participants; for placement companies?

What selection criteria were used?

How effective was this process in allowing you to achieve the target of 30 graduates?

What activities did you carry out here?

Who was responsible for performing this role?

Were any inputs required from others?

How was progress monitored?

What worked well?

What was less efficient or effective?

What was supposed to happen?

What actually happened?

Why were there differences?

What can we learn from this?

The training and pre-placement support being given to graduates

How did you design this process?

Which elements were you responsible for and what activities did you perform?

Who was responsible for performing this role?

Were any inputs required from others?

How was progress to be monitored?

What was supposed to happen – What was this support designed to achieve?

What actually happened – How well did it meet these objectives?

Why were there differences?

What can we learn from this?

Communication of all parties e.g. between Forward Scotland and partners

What communications were supposed to take place, and how?

How did you design this process?

Which elements were you responsible for and what activities did you perform?

Who was responsible for performing this role?

Were any inputs required from others?

What was supposed to happen – What was the communications process designed to achieve?

What actually happened – How well did it meet these objectives?

Why were there differences?

What can we learn from this?

The quality of monitoring being carried out by Forward Scotland and Partners

How did you design this process? What methods were used? How effective were these?

Which elements were you responsible for and what activities did you perform?

Who was responsible for performing this role?

Were any inputs required from others?

How was progress monitored?

What was supposed to happen?

What actually happened?

Why were there differences?

What can we learn from this?

The quality of post-placement support

How did you design this process?

Which elements were you responsible for and what activities did you perform?

Who was responsible for performing this role?

Were any inputs required from others?

How was progress monitored?

What was supposed to happen?

What actually happened?

Why were there differences?

What can we learn from this?

Project Management

How did you design this process?

How were the roles of the respective partners agreed? Were the roles agreed fulfilled?

What protocols were established for communication and reporting?

Which elements were you responsible for and what activities did you perform?

Who was responsible for performing this role?

Were any inputs required from others?

How was progress monitored?

What is the project status with respect to target outputs in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness?

What factors have impeded or facilitated the production of such outputs?

What was supposed to happen?

What actually happened?

Why were there differences?

What can we learn from this?

Outcomes

How was the content of the placements established?

What activities were undertaken by the participants in the host country?

What were the expected outcomes? What was supposed to happen?

What actually happened? What have been the main outcomes achieved to date by the participants involved?

Are these in line with the training and/or professional development needs identified in your application? Why were there differences?

What have been the wider impacts of the project? *e.g.* Assisting with the development of partnerships, transfer of knowledge, new product or service development

What can we learn from this?

2. Participants

Methods used for recruitment of graduates and placement companies

What were you doing prior to the programme?

How did you learn about it?

When did you first learn about it?

What attracted you to the programme?

What were your own objectives and what did you hope to gain?

What was your experience of the recruitment/assessment process?

What was supposed to happen?

What actually happened?

Why were there differences?

What can we learn from this?

The training and pre-placement support being given to graduates

What training and pre-placement support did you receive?

Who provided this?

How would you evaluate each element? Pedagogical - Sustainable development training, generic business skills training, cultural, linguistic and induction training

What was supposed to happen?

What actually happened?

Why were there differences?

What can we learn from this?

Communication of all parties e.g. between forward Scotland and partners

What communications did you receive?

How was this co-ordinated?

What was supposed to happen?

What actually happened?

Why were there differences?

What can we learn from this?

The quality of monitoring being carried out by Forward Scotland and Partners

How did you determine the work package for your placement? Who helped you with this?

What mentoring and other practical support did you receive toward achieving the objectives of your placement?

How was this co-ordinated?

How did you record your progress against these objectives?

When was this done?

What was supposed to happen?

What actually happened?

Why were there differences?

What can we learn from this?

The quality of post-placement support

What post-placement support did you receive?

Who provided this?

How would you evaluate each element of this?

Did you succeed in finding appropriate employment?

How long did this take?

In what ways did the placement assist you in this?

What was supposed to happen?

What actually happened?

Why were there differences?

What can we learn from this?

Outcomes

How was the content of your placement established? When and by whom?

What activities were undertaken by you in the host country?

What were the expected outcomes? What was supposed to happen?

What actually happened? What were the main outcomes you achieved?

Are these in line with the training and/or professional development needs identified at the outset? Why were there differences?

What have been the wider impacts of the project, if any for you?

What can we learn from this?

3. Receiving Partners

Methods used for recruitment of placement companies

What was the process used for recruiting the placement companies?

When did this start and how long did it take?

Prior to placement matching how did you ascertain the specific requirements and expectations of the placement companies and that they understood the objectives of the placement?

How was this co-ordinated?

What was supposed to happen?

What actually happened?

Why were there differences?

What can we learn from this?

The training and pre-placement support being given to graduates

What was your own contribution here?

How did you ensure continuity of the content?

What was supposed to happen?

What actually happened?

Why were there differences?

What can we learn from this?

Project Management

How did you design this process?

How were the roles of the respective partners agreed? Were the roles agreed fulfilled?

What protocols were established for communication and reporting?

Which elements were you responsible for and what activities did you perform?

Who was responsible for performing this role?

Were any inputs required from others?

How was progress monitored?

Communication of all parties e.g. between Forward Scotland and partners

Which elements were you responsible for and what activities did you perform?

Who was responsible for performing this role?

Were any inputs required from others?

How was progress monitored?

What was supposed to happen – What was the communications process designed to achieve?

What actually happened – How well did it meet these objectives?

Why were there differences?

What can we learn from this?

The quality of monitoring being carried out by Forward Scotland and Partners

Which elements were you responsible for and what activities did you perform?

Who was responsible for performing this role within your organisation?

Were any inputs required from others?

How was progress monitored?

What was supposed to happen?

What actually happened – How well did it meet these objectives?

Why were there differences?

What can we learn from this?

The quality of post-placement support

What was your input, if any here?

Outcomes

How was the content of the placements established?

What activities were undertaken by the participants in the host country?

What were the expected outcomes? What was supposed to happen?

What actually happened? What have been the main outcomes achieved to date by the participants involved?

Are these in line with the training and/or professional development needs identified in your application? Why were there differences?

What have been the wider impacts of the project? *e.g.* Assisting with the development of partnerships, transfer of knowledge, new product or service development

What can we learn from this?

4. Placement Companies

Methods used for recruitment of graduates and placement companies

When and how did you first learn about the programme?

What attracted you to the programme?

What were your own objectives and what did you hope to gain?

What was your experience of the recruitment/assessment process?

What was supposed to happen?

What actually happened?

Why were there differences?

What can we learn from this?

The training and pre-placement support being given to graduates

What was your own contribution here?

How did you ensure continuity of the content?

How did you determine the work package for your placement? Who helped you with this?

What mentoring and other practical support did you receive toward achieving the objectives of your placement?

How was this co-ordinated?

How did you record your progress against these objectives?

When was this done?

What was supposed to happen?

What actually happened?

Why were there differences?

What can we learn from this?

Communication of all parties e.g. between forward Scotland and partners

Which elements were you responsible for and what activities did you perform?

Who was responsible for performing this role?

Were any inputs required from others?

How was progress monitored?

What was supposed to happen – What was the communications process designed to achieve?

What actually happened – How well did it meet these objectives?

Why were there differences?

What can we learn from this?

The quality of monitoring being carried out by Forward Scotland and Partners

Which elements were you responsible for and what activities did you perform?

Who was responsible for performing this role within your organisation?

Were any inputs required from others?

How was progress monitored?

What was supposed to happen?

What actually happened – How well did it meet these objectives?

Why were there differences?

What can we learn from this?

The quality of post-placement support

Which elements were you responsible for and what activities did you perform?

Who was responsible for performing this role within your organisation?

Were any inputs required from others?

How was progress monitored?

What was supposed to happen?

What actually happened – How well did it meet these objectives?

Why were there differences?

What can we learn from this?

Outcomes

How was the content of the placements established?

What activities were undertaken by the participants?

What were the expected outcomes? What was supposed to happen?

What actually happened? What have been the main outcomes achieved to date by both you and the participants involved?

Are these in line with the training and/or professional development, business needs identified in your application? Why were there differences?

GRADES™ Mid-Term Evaluation Final Report

What have been the wider impacts of the project for you? *e.g.* Assisting with the development of partnerships, transfer of knowledge, new product or service development

What can we learn from this?