EUROPEANS
FOR
PEACE
LOOKING BACK  MOVING FORWARD

EVZ FOUNDATION
REMEMBRANCE
RESPONSIBILITY
FUTURE

# METHOD BOOKLET FOR

# SELF-EVALUATION

# OF INTERNATIONAL

# YOUTH ENCOUNTERS

in the framework of the funding programme EUROPEANS FOR PEACE
of the Foundation "Remembrance, Responsibility and Future"

**Table of contents**

# INTRODUCTION

The present method booklet serves as a practical tool for the self-evaluation of international youth encounters in the framework of the funding programme EUROPEANS FOR PEACE.

It illustrates the benefit of self-evaluations and encourages the project facilitators to perform self-evaluations. The guide is meant to reduce fears with respect to the scientific requirements for an evaluation and to convey practical methods that fulfil universal quality standards for evaluations. The emphasis is therefore on the methodology and not on the theoretical background, which is treated in the online texts given in the appendix.

The proposed methods were developed on the basis of two workshops on self-evaluation with project facilitators and participants. The methods are thus tailored to the format of international youth encounters and can be flexibly applied without change or with minor adaptations.

In the first step, an assessment raster was developed that specifies relevant project aspects and guiding questions for their assessment. The most important method is a survey using questionnaires: They allow the views of the project stakeholders to be determined in a quick, simple and anonymous manner and yield indications which project areas are going well, what requires more attention and what should be talked about again. These questions are discussed in an analysis workshop, solutions are sought, and agreements are formed.

The booklet also contains suggestions for the process of self-evaluation: procedure and responsible team, stakeholders, selected content-related aspects, and timing, each accompanied by a selection of tools and methods. What's important it not so much how information is collected, but how this information is interpreted and which consequences for the further design of the project are drawn. A final section describes how the results can be documented.

*Aim oft this booklet: provide useful advice to conduct evaluations*

# PROCEDURE AND RESPONSIBLE TEAM

A self-evaluation takes time. This must be taken into account, though the method booklet is meant to facilitate the procedure and contains a number of proposals in standardised form. The aim is to compile a timetable for the self-evaluation, to distribute questionnaires, to analyse and possibly to conduct analysis workshops.

For implementation, a team should be assembled that is responsible for the evaluation. This does not necessarily have to be a project team. In fact it is better to give this task to someone else, in order to distribute the work load. It is conceivable to task a group of participants with the self-evaluation, which allows for a multiple learning effect and stronger involvement.

*An evaluation needs to be scheduled*

*Entrust a team with the evaluation*

*Participatory approach: young participants as evaluaters*

# STAKEHOLDERS

Ideally, all stakeholder groups of a project should be involved in the self-evaluation, in order to trigger an issue-oriented conversation and subsequent change processes. Moreover, integrating diverse view points renders the subjective assessment of each individual more objective.

*Try to involve all stakeholders*

Three different stakeholder groups constitute the projects:

► **Project team:** all persons involved in the conception and implementation of the project (teachers, educators, young people);
► **Participants:** all young people participating in the encounters;
► **Third parties:** Persons in the surroundings who are not directly involved in the project but have sufficient insight in order to assess the project (e.g. interviewed historical witnesses, headmasters, accompanying teachers, parents, mayors etc.).

**Overview 1: Who assesses which project aspect?**

|  | Partnership (is assessed in all project phases) | Implementation (during the project) | Results (at the end of the project) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Project team** | ✕ | ✕ | ✕ |
| **Participants** |  | ✕ | ✕ |
| **Third parties** |  |  | ✕ |

# CONTENT AREAS OF THE SELF-EVALUATION

In order to facilitate the implementation, the content areas of the self-evaluation are determined in advance. This considerably simplifies the procedure and reduces the effort, but at the same time also reduces the flexibility.

Three content areas are particularly relevant for EUROPEANS FOR PEACE projects:

(1) the partnership,
(2) the project implementation and
(3) the results of the project.

*Determine content areas of the self-evaluation advance*

# PARTNERSHIP

A regular assessment of the cooperation can be decisive for the success of the project. Project stakeholders have mentioned equality of the project partners as the most important criterion of cooperation, but also smooth communication and a common interest in the project. On this basis, the following aspects of partnership were selected for the self-evaluation: motivation, work load, responsibilities, implementation, communication/language, work climate.

*Assess cooperation*

# PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

Both those responsible for the project and participants showed an interest in questions on project implementation: Did the cooperation work out? Were the participants involved? How did the  communication work? The following aspects of project implementation were selected for the evaluation: preparation, choice of topic, planned implementation, resistance and support, participation of the participants.

*Evaluate encounters and project work*

# RESULTS AND SUCCESS OF THE PROJECT

Evaluations should measure the results and effects of a project and thus also the project's success. This occurs here via the assessment of the following aspects and possible project results: satisfaction, utility/benefit for the participants, personal significance of the project, contribution to international understanding, sustainability in the sense of longer-term effects, public visibility of the project.

*Evaluate project results*

**Overview 2: Assessment raster**

| Subject | Criterion | Indicator/guiding question |
|---|---|---|
| **Partnership** | Motivation | The interests and motives of the team members involved were communicated clearly and do not contradict each other. |
| | Work load | The team members' work load is balanced. |
| | Responsibilities | Responsibilities and tasks of the team members are specified unambiguously and clearly. |
| | Equality | All partners are equally involved in the planning, implementation and product creation. |
| | Communication/ Language | There is a regular exchange on the state of the project; there are no communication problems. |
| | Work climate | The work climate is good. |
| **Implementation** | Planned | The planning is realistic. The schedule was kept. |
| | Resistance | The project does not encounter significant resistance. |
| | Support | The project receives diverse support from school, executing organisation, city, public and others. |
| | Preparation | The participants are well prepared for the topic and the encounter. The preparation is fun and engenders motivation for the project. |
| | Organisation (visit) | The encounter is well organised. |
| | Contents (visit) | The subjects, workshops, excursions and activities carried out were exciting, interesting and instructive. |
| | Participation | The project is orientated towards the interests and possibilities of the young people taking part. The young people are involved in the planning and implementation of the project. |
| **Results and effects** | Satisfaction | I am/We are very satisfied with the project's result. It is something to be proud of. |
| | Utility/benefit for participants | My/Our understanding of and interest in the subject was deepened. The results are current and relevant to my/our own life. |
| | Personal significance | The project was very significant for me personally. |
| | International under-standing | Prejudices were reduced. The understanding for the respective other country was deepened. |
| | Sustainability | I/We want to continue to deal with the subject. Ideas/plans for further projects emerged. |
| | Public visibility | The project had an impact on the executing institutions (school, educational establishment) in Germany. The project had an impact on the executing institutions (school, educational establishment) in the partner country. The developed product will continue to be used. It raised public interest. The project was noticed by the public. |

# TIMING OF THE SELF-EVALUATION

A self-evaluation can be carried out in different phases of the project, depending on the aim of the investigation: before the project begins (ex ante), after the preparation phase (on-going) and / or after the project is completed (ex post). Specific methods are used according to the timing.

For EUROPEANS FOR PEACE projects, three points in time lend themselves to a continuous assessment of the project:

(1)  After completion of the preparation phase: Do the participants feel well prepared for the subject and the encounter? Was the preparation fun? Are they looking forward to the encounter?
(2)  After the first encounter: Were the expectations fulfilled? Were there disappointments? What should be kept in mind in the run-up to the return encounter?
(3)  After completion of the return encounter: Were the encounters well organised? Were they exciting and instructive? Was it possible to approach the subject without problems?

At the end of the project, the aim is to record results and effects of the project and to draw conclusions for future projects. What benefits did the project yield for the participants, the project team and the surroundings? A timing at the end of the return encounter allows for a joint assessment of the implementation and the results of the work. However, it is preferable to let some weeks pass, since the assessment of the results is then less affected by the euphoric impression of the encounter, is more neutral and can also take into account later effects. On the other hand, it involves more effort to conduct surveys after the event.

The results of the survey should be presented to the stakeholders in written or oral form.

**Overview 3: Timing, aims, questions and methods of self-evaluation**

| Timing | Aim | Questions | Methods |
|---|---|---|---|
| (ex-ante) | Recognise obstacles as early as possible; collect information for project planning | What is the project's significance for stakeholders and the surroundings? Where does it meet with support, where with resistance? | Assessment of the current situation |
| After the preparation phase (on-going) | Discover opportunities for improvement; monitor the course of the project | Do the participants feel well prepared for the subject and the encounter? Have they already started to learn? Was the preparation fun? Are they now looking forward to the encounter? | Questionnaire or open feedback methods |
| After the encounter (on-going) | | Were the encounters well organised? Were they exciting and instructive? Could the subject be approached well? | |
| After the return encounter (on-going) | | | |
| After the project ends (ex post) | Documentation of the project's success and results; self-affirmation; legitimisation | What benefits did the project yield for the participants, the project team, the surroundings? What is its significance for the stakeholders? | Questionnaire |

*Three possible points in time for an evaluation*

*Draw conclusions from the results*

*Make conclusions available*

# METHOD SUGGESTIONS

The main tools of the proposed self-evaluation are questionnaires, in which the guiding questions of the assessment raster are formulated such that the individual statements can simply be agreed or disagreed with. If a statement is rejected, a reason should be provided in a comment field. This procedure is not suitable for collecting data that can be analysed scientifically. Rather, the aim is to find out where there is a need for discussion, in order to potentially initiate changes.

Aspects that are rejected by more than 25 per cent of the respondents are considered subject to debate and problematic. They are compiled and discussed either by the project team or in a joint workshop together with the participants. The causes for the problems should be analysed and suggestions for improvement developed.

Depending on when the project is evaluated and which stakeholder groups carry out the assessment, different questions are posed. The appendix contains questionnaires adapted accordingly and ordered according to the project phases.

# BEGINNING OF THE PROJECT

Before the project begins, it is recommended to carry out an assessment of the current situation in order to make the various ideas, interests and motivations visible. If they are too different, conflicts may arise. If possible, representatives of all project stakeholder groups should take part in the assessment of the situation (young people/students, project partners, other stakeholders).

Two alternative methods of assessment of the situation are presented:

(1) **standardised questionnaire** based on the assessment raster with check boxes and comment fields or
(2) **open questionnaire.**

In both cases, the questions are first answered individually; then the answers are compared and discussed. It is important to discuss what the individual aspects mean for the project. Is it natural that different people have different interests in the project, or could this result in a conflict? How can support be enhanced, how can resistance, if any, be reduced?

# COURSE OF THE PROJECT

During the project, the project team assesses partnership and implementation, while the participants assess the course of the project. This can occur at the end of a project section, but the questionnaires have to be slightly adapted for this purpose. The state of the project implementation can be captured in a quick and simple manner using the standardised questionnaire. It becomes apparent which project aspects are viewed as problematic. One can then exchange views on these aspects and think of improvements.

*Fast and reliable: questionnaires*

*Potential for conflict needs to be addressed*

*Position-fixing: make attitudes and motivations visible*

*Two well-tried methods*

*Accompanying evaluation of the participatory project execution*

The questionnaires are distributed to everyone and are completed individually. The evaluation group analyses them and summarises the results. How many respondents agreed with a statement? How many disagreed? Which comments were offered? It makes sense to analyse the questionnaires of the individual stakeholder groups separately and then compare them. Do the project team and the participants have common or different assessments of individual aspects?

The results are subsequently presented and discussed in an analysis workshop.

## DESIGN OF AN ANALYSIS WORKSHOP

Independent of whether the results are analysed and discussed in a small group like the project team or in a large circle with all stakeholders, it is advisable to structure the discussion and to agree in advance on certain questions that are discussed consecutively. One person is determined to be the moderator, whose task is to lead the discussion, to keep an eye on the time, and if necessary to mediate or interrupt fruitless discussions or back-and-forth. However, moderators should not take a stance with respect to content.

*Appoint a moderator to structure the discussion*

**Procedure:**

– Presentation of the results (separately by groups: project team, participants).
  The results are made visible for all on large posters / flip charts.

– Discussion of the positively assessed aspects. This should not take up too much time.

– Discussion of the aspects that were negatively assessed by more than 25 per cent of the respondents.
  ▶ It is important to explain using examples and comments why the aspects were assessed negatively. Why don't the respondents agree? What exactly bothers them?
  ▶ An attempt should be made to elucidate the causes. Subsequently, it can be stated how the situation should be, and what is to be done to improve it (see sample analysis below).
  ▶ If many aspects were negatively assessed, one should agree on the most important points and discuss only these. Here it is advisable to let the participants vote with points, with each participant of the workshop having three points that are distributed over two aspects.

*How to respond to negative results?*

– Consequences and proposed solutions

– Conclusion: How satisfied are the stakeholders with the process?

**Overview 4: Sample analysis**

| Negatively assessed aspect | Explanation | Causes | Desired situation | Solution |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| The young people do not feel included in the project planning and implementation. | The young people were not able to have a formative influence, neither on the project planning nor during the preparation phase. | The application process is taking place under time pressure. The preparation phase was very short. | The young people should be included more extensively. | A group of participants is formed which develops proposals for the design of the encounter and presents them to the project team. |

If the proposed solution is very complex, as in the above example, an action plan is re-commended that specifies concretely who is to complete which tasks by when.

| What? | Who? | With whom? | By when? | Remarks |
|-------|------|-----------|----------|---------|
| Forming a group of participants | XY | XYZ | Date | Good coordination with the project team is required. |

## ALTERNATIVE METHODS

As an alternative to a standardised questionnaire, partnership and project implementation can also be assessed using open questionnaires and a plethora of feedback methods, some of which are presented here. Further methods can be found in a method handbook for multinational seminars of the Theodor Heuss Kolleg of the Robert Bosch Stiftung (see the list of literature and links).

*Further methods for evaluation*

The feedback methods are particularly suitable for assessing the encounters. Feedback methods usually only collect suggestions, praise and criticism. They do not analyse this information. Also, the assessment criteria according to which the respondents provide their feedback are not known. It is up to the project team and the seminar facilitator to interpret the feedback and to draw consequences as appropriate.

**Open questionnaire for assessment of the partnership by the project team**

→ What is going very well? What should we retain?
→ What can be improved?
→ What should we do differently in future?

**Flash feedback**

All participants successively answer a question. Examples: How do I feel? What did I get out of the day, the seminar, the event? Which aspect was particularly important for me? What would I have preferred differently? There is no discussion during the flash feedback. The statements are not commented or criticised. A flash feedback need not be processed any further. It is a snapshot of the atmosphere and the opinions in the group.

*Flash feedback: Spontaneous mood feedback*

**Packing suitcases**

In this method, the opinions of the participants are collected anonymously. There are suitcases to the right and left of the exit of the venue, one that says "What I'm taking along" (I got something out of this, I liked this) and one that says "What I'm leaving here" (I didn't like this so much). The participants write their praise and their criticism on cards and put them into the appropriate suitcase.

*Packing Suitcases: Anonymous feedback*

**Shooting target/crosshairs/yardstick**

The yardstick, the crosshairs and the shooting target assess one, two or more aspects of an event on a predefined scale (very good to bad; "I liked this" to "could have been better"; +/– or laughing/crying face etc.). On the shooting target, the centre (the "bull's eye") represents the best assessment. Either a yardstick or crosshairs or a shooting target are painted onto a pin board, and the individual marks are labelled (e.g. successful learning,

*Evaluation Scale: Evaluate defined aspects of a project*

fun factor, atmosphere, competence of the seminar facilitators etc.). A yardstick can measure only one aspect, crosshairs can measure two, and a shooting target can measure up to eight aspects. The participants provide their assessment using points. The resulting point sets usually allow the group assessment of an aspect to be seen at a glance.

Choose appropriate method jointly:

→ project diary
→ feedback wall,
→ individual weather report

*See also list of literature and links for more ideas on page 16*

# COMPLETION OF THE PROJECT

At the end of the project, the most important results of the project are summarized. For this purpose, the project team and the participants are surveyed, but also third parties who gained insight into the project and its results (headmaster, other students, municipal administration, historical witnesses etc.).

*Assess the success of the project jointly*

The questionnaire regarding the project's results differs from the previous questionnaires. At the end of the project, the aim is no longer the identification of problematic areas in order to discuss opportunities for improvement, but rather a precise description of the project's results. The assessment scale was therefore enlarged, and the comment fields were replaced by three open questions at the end of the questionnaire.

The fact that different people complete the same questionnaire poses a difficulty. Thus, the formulations of the questions differ slightly, depending on whether the questionnaire addresses participants, the project team or others. (Who is meant to answer which questions is specified in italics.) The evaluation team should point this out to the respondents. It may also make sense to adapt the questionnaire to the various groups of people and distribute it in three different versions.

*Tailor your questionnaires*

The questionnaires are subsequently analysed by the evaluation team. Here, too, an initially separate analysis of the different stakeholder groups is recommended. The results of the analysis should ideally be presented to all stakeholders – either together at the end of the activity, or at a later stage separately in each partner country.

*Make evaluation results available*

# DOCUMENTATION OF THE SELF-EVALUATION

The results of the self-evaluation are documented through the questionnaires, the analysis of the questionnaires and the results of the analysis workshop. For reasons of confidentiality and privacy, the collected data remain within the project and are destroyed after its completion.

*Great secondary effect: Evaluations may lead to new ideas for projects*

This does not apply to the final evaluation of the project. It may be of interest to publicise the documented, anonymised results beyond the scope of the project stakeholders. Moreover, the project facilitators are invited to briefly comment on the self-evaluation process in the report for the Foundation EVZ.

# APPENDIX

**QUESTIONNAIRE 1: ASSESSMENT OF THE SITUATION AT THE BEGINNING OF THE PROJECT**

| | Agree ☺ | Don't agree ☹ | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Partnership** | | | |
| Motivation | ☺ | ☹ | |
| The interests and motives of the participating team members were clearly communicated and do not contradict each other. | ☐ | ☐ | |
| Responsibilities | ☺ | ☹ | |
| Responsibilities and tasks of the team members are specified unambiguously and clearly. | ☐ | ☐ | |
| **Implementation** | | | |
| Inhibiting/Promoting factors | ☺ | ☹ | |
| The project does not encounter significant resistance. | ☐ | ☐ | |
| The project receives diverse support from school, executing organisation, city, public and others. | ☐ | ☐ | |
| Participation | ☺ | ☹ | |
| The project is orientated towards the interests and possibilities of the young people taking part. | ☐ | ☐ | |
| The young people are involved in the planning and implementation of the project. | ☐ | ☐ | |

**Questionnaire for assessment of the situation (open procedure)**

→ What are the surroundings of the project? Who is involved in it, who is affected by it (also indirectly)?
→ Which motives, interests and expectations do we associate with the project?
→ How important is the project for us?
→ Who supports the project?
→ Whom does the project directly depend on?
→ Is there resistance against the project?
→ What do we want to achieve? What should be different after the project (aims)?
→ When is the project a success (criteria)?
→ How can the positions of the groups involved in the project be represented graphically?

## QUESTIONNAIRE 2: ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION AND PARTNERSHIP OVER THE COURSE OF THE PROJECT (PROJECT TEAM)

| | Agree | Don't agree | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Partnership** | | | |
| Work load, responsibilities | ☺ | ☹ | |
| The team members' work load is balanced. | ☐ | ☐ | |
| Responsibilities and tasks of the team members are specified unambiguously and clearly. | ☐ | ☐ | |
| All partners are equally involved in the planning, implementation and product creation. | ☐ | ☐ | |
| Communication/Language | ☺ | ☹ | |
| There is a regular exchange on the state of the project. | ☐ | ☐ | |
| There are no communication problems. | ☐ | ☐ | |
| The work climate is good. | ☐ | ☐ | |
| **Implementation** | | | |
| Planning | ☺ | ☹ | |
| The planning is realistic. The schedule was kept. | ☐ | ☐ | |
| Inhibiting/Promoting factors | ☺ | ☹ | |
| The project does not encounter significant resistance. | ☐ | ☐ | |
| The project receives diverse support from school, executing organisation, city, public and others. | ☐ | ☐ | |
| Preparation | ☺ | ☹ | |
| The participants are well prepared for the topic and the encounter. | ☐ | ☐ | |
| The preparation is fun and engenders motivation for the project. | ☐ | ☐ | |
| Encounter | ☺ | ☹ | |
| The encounter is well organised. | ☐ | ☐ | |
| The subjects, workshops, excursions and activities carried out were exciting, interesting and instructive. | ☐ | ☐ | |
| Participation | ☺ | ☹ | |
| The project is orientated towards the interests and possibilities of the young people taking part. | ☐ | ☐ | |
| The young people are involved in the planning and implementation of the project. | ☐ | ☐ | |

## QUESTIONNAIRE 3: ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OVER THE COURSE OF THE PROJECT (PARTICIPANTS)

|  | Agree | Don't agree | Comments |
|---|---|---|---|
| Planning | ☺ | ☹ | |
| The planning is realistic. The schedule was kept. | ☐ | ☐ | |
| Inhibiting/Promoting factors | ☺ | ☹ | |
| The project does not encounter significant resistance. | ☐ | ☐ | |
| The project receives diverse support from school, executing organisation, city, public and others. | ☐ | ☐ | |
| Preparation | ☺ | ☹ | |
| The participants are well prepared for the topic and the encounter. | ☐ | ☐ | |
| The preparation is fun and engenders motivation for the project. | ☐ | ☐ | |
| Encounter | ☺ | ☹ | |
| The encounter is well organised. | ☐ | ☐ | |
| The subjects, workshops, excursions and activities carried out were exciting, interesting and instructive. | ☐ | ☐ | |
| The workshops, excursions and activities provided a good approach to the subject. | ☐ | ☐ | |
| There are no communication problems. | ☐ | ☐ | |
| Participation | ☺ | ☹ | |
| The project is orientated towards the interests and possibilities of the young people taking part. | ☐ | ☐ | |
| The young people are involved in the planning and implementation of the project. | ☐ | ☐ | |

## QUESTIONNAIRE 4: ASSESSMENT OF THE PROJECT RESULTS AND EFFECTS AFTER COMPLETION OF THE PROJECT

Please check a box to indicate the extent to which you agree with the statement

1  completely agree
2  agree
3  partly agree
4  don't agree

If you cannot assess an aspect, please don't check a box in the corresponding row. Please note that the questionnaire is completed by different stakeholders in the project. Therefore some questions may be formulated several times with different formulations.

| | Completely agree ☺ | | | Don't agree ☹ |
|---|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| **Satisfaction** | | | | |
| I am/we are very satisfied with the project's result. It is something to be proud of. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| **Benefit** | | | | |
| My/Our understanding of and interest in the subject was deepened. *(Participants)* The participants' understanding of and interest in the subject was deepened. *(Project team, third parties)* | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| The subject is current and has significance also for my own life. *(Participants)* The participants drew current parallels and consequences for their own life. *(Project team, third parties)* | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| **Personal significance** | | | | |
| The project was very significant for me/for us personally. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| **International understanding** | | | | |
| Friendships across borders were formed. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Prejudices were reduced. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| **Sustainability** | | | | |
| I/We want to continue to deal with the subject. *(Participants)* The participants want to continue to deal with the subject. *(Project team, third parties)* | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Ideas/plans for further projects emerged. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| The project had an impact on the executing institution (school, educational establishment) in Germany. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| The project had an impact on the executing institution (school, educational establishment) in the partner country. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| The developed product will continue to be used. It raised public interest. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| The project was noticed by the public. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

What was the greatest effect of the project in your opinion?

What went well? What should be done the same way in similar projects?

What didn't go so well? What could have been better?

# LIST OF LITERATURE AND LINKS

**Educational Evaluation in Youth Work (T-kit 10),** Comprehensive overview of Educational Evaluation in Youth Work. Published by the Council of Europe and the European Commission, http://pjp-eu.coe.int/en/web/youth-partnership/t-kit-10-educational-evaluation-in-youth-work?inheritRedirect=true (accessed on 02.01.2016)

**CIVICUS Toolkits:** Monitoring and evaluation: http://civicus.org/index.php/en/media-centre-129/toolkits/228-monitoring-and-evaluation (accessed on 02.01.2016)

**Wikipedia:** SWOT analysis, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/SWOT_analysis (accessed on 02.01.2016)

**Academy of Central European Schools:** Handbook for international School Projects, Interkulturelles Zentrum Wien, 2014, http://www.aces.or.at/images/doku/aces_handbook_internat.schoolprojects_2014.pdf (accessed on 02.01.2016)