RESULT 1 & QUALITY ASSURANCE

Evaluation Plan and KPIs

The G-PRO evaluation framework, with key performance indicators, data sources, responsibilities, a results table and the workshop evaluation report outline.

Co-funded by the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

G-PRO · Green Prompt · Erasmus+ KA210-ADU · Project number 2025-1-PT01-KA210-ADU-000355316 · Free open educational resource · g-pro.elnlab.eu

RESULT 1 & QUALITY ASSURANCE

Evaluation Plan and KPIs

The G-PRO evaluation framework, with key performance indicators, data sources, responsibilities, a results table and the workshop evaluation report outline.

Purpose of the evaluation

The G-PRO evaluation checks whether the project delivers what it promised and whether its activities make a real difference for senior learners and adult educators. It helps partners:

- monitor progress towards the targets in the funded application;
- measure changes in seniors' knowledge, confidence and habits;
- measure changes in educators' competencies;
- collect feedback to improve the game, handbook and training;
- report reliably to the Erasmus+ National Agency.

Associação de Melhoramentos e Bem Estar Social de Pias (AMBESP, P1), as coordinator, leads the overall evaluation and quality assurance. Fundacja Edu Active (P3) develops the assessment methodology for the educator training and the senior workshops. RRINOVA OÜ (P2) leads the focus group methodology.

NOTE

This plan contains targets, not results. Partners fill in the results table as activities take place.

Evaluation questions

1. Did the project reach the planned number and range of participants?
2. Did seniors' confidence and knowledge about AI and sustainability increase?
3. Did seniors adopt or maintain climate-friendly habits and keep their commitments?
4. Did educators gain the competencies to teach AI and sustainability to seniors?
5. Were the game, handbook, training and events relevant, accessible and of good quality?
6. Did the project reach stakeholders beyond the partnership, and are the results likely to be used after the project?

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Evaluation tools

Tool	Used with	Purpose
Focus group methodology and surveys	Seniors and educators	Needs analysis and design recommendations
Senior pre-workshop questionnaire	Seniors	Baseline knowledge, confidence and habits
Senior post-workshop questionnaire	Seniors	Change in knowledge, confidence and habits; reflection; commitments
Facilitator competency evaluation	Educators	Self and observer assessment of competencies
Feedback forms A to D	Training, workshop, multiplier event and conference participants	Satisfaction, relevance and intended use
Attendance lists	All activities	Participation counts
Website and social media analytics	Online audiences	Reach and visibility
Dissemination log	Partners	Stakeholders and organisations reached

Key performance indicators

KPIs marked "Application" are taken from the funded application. KPIs marked "Internal" are additional quality targets proposed for the partnership to confirm; they complement, and do not replace, the application KPIs.

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

No.	KPI	Target	Source of target	Data source	Who collects	When
1	Seniors taking part in focus groups	15 (5 per partner)	Application	Attendance lists, session summaries	All partners	Focus group phase
2	Educators taking part in focus groups	15 (5 per partner)	Application	Attendance lists, session summaries	All partners	Focus group phase
3	National focus group reports	3	Application	Submitted reports	All partners	After focus groups
4	Consolidated focus group report	1	Application	Submitted report	P2	After national reports
5	Adult educators trained	12+	Application	Training attendance list	P3 with all partners	Educator training
6	Senior learners taking part in workshops	30+	Application	Workshop attendance lists	All partners	Senior workshops
7	Multiplier events held	3	Application	Agendas, attendance lists	All partners	Multiplier event phase
8	Participants at multiplier events	60+ in total (20+ per event)	Application	Attendance lists	All partners	Each multiplier event
9	Participants at the final online conference	40+ from across the EU	Application	Registration and attendance records	Conference organiser	Final conference
10	Keynotes at the final conference	3	Application	Conference agenda	Conference organiser	Final conference
11	Stakeholders reached	1,500+	Application	Dissemination log, event and newsletter records	All partners	Ongoing, reported every quarter
12	Monthly website impressions	1,000+	Application	Website analytics	Platform administrator	Monthly
13	Partner and associated organisations engaged	10+	Application	Dissemination log, letters or emails of interest	All partners	Ongoing

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

No.	KPI	Target	Source of target	Data source	Who collects	When
14	Workshop evaluation reports (trainer and learners)	2 per partner (6 in total)	Application	Submitted reports	All partners	After senior workshops
15	Seniors completing both pre and post questionnaires	At least 80% of workshop participants	Internal	Matched questionnaires	All partners	Start and end of workshops
16	Seniors showing increased average confidence in AI	At least 70% of matched pairs	Internal	Pre and post questionnaires	All partners	End of workshops
17	Seniors showing increased average confidence in green living	At least 70% of matched pairs	Internal	Pre and post questionnaires	All partners	End of workshops
18	Seniors reporting that they kept a green commitment at least sometimes	At least 60%	Internal	Post questionnaire, Part 5	All partners	End of workshops
19	Educators improving their average competency score	At least 80% of trained educators	Internal	Competency evaluation before and after	P3 with all partners	Training and after workshops
20	Average satisfaction across feedback forms	At least 4 out of 5	Internal	Feedback forms A to D	Activity organisers	After each activity
21	Participants intending to use or recommend G-PRO resources	At least 75%	Internal	Feedback forms C and D	Activity organisers	Events and conference
22	Partner meetings held	At least 6 virtual meetings + 1 kick-off meeting + 1 final evaluation meeting	Application	Agendas, minutes	P1	Throughout the project
23	Improvement in AI and sustainability	At least 25% (pre and post assessment)	Application	Pre and post questionnaires, knowledge items	All partners	Start and end of workshops

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

No.	KPI	Target	Source of target	Data source	Who collects	When
	knowledge among senior learners					
24	Educators and seniors satisfied with G-PRO training sessions	80%	Application	Feedback forms A and B	Activity organisers	After the training and the workshops
25	Identified risks tracked and resolved	All, within 1 month of detection	Application	Risk management matrix	P1 with all partners	Throughout the project
26	Downloads and shares of G-PRO tools	250	Application	Website analytics, download counts, social media metrics	Platform administrator, all partners	Ongoing
27	Dissemination materials produced	18+	Application	Dissemination log	All partners	Ongoing
28	G-PRO materials that remain accessible	100%, for at least 5 years after the project	Application	Website and download checks	P1	After the project
29	Senior learning centres, libraries or NGOs that continue using G-PRO resources after the project	10+	Application	Follow-up review, dissemination log	All partners	After the project

TIP

Keep a simple shared spreadsheet with one row per KPI and one column per partner. Update it at every partner meeting.

Scoring guide for senior questionnaires

Confidence scales

- Each confidence item is scored from 1 to 5.
- Calculate an average AI confidence score (7 items) and an average green living confidence score (6 items) for each person, before and after.
- Change = post average minus pre average. A positive number shows an increase.

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Knowledge items

Award 1 point for each correct answer. "I am not sure" scores 0.

Question	Correct answer
1 What is AI?	Computer programs that can do tasks like answering questions or recognising voices
2 Which of these uses AI?	A voice assistant that answers when you speak to it
3 Is an AI answer always correct?	No, it can make mistakes, so we should check it
4 Which question will give a more useful answer?	"Give me three easy ways to use less water in my kitchen."
5 Which of these saves energy at home?	Switching off devices at the plug when not in use
6 What does "circular economy" mean?	Using things for longer, repairing, reusing and recycling them
7 (post only) Three steps for using AI in the G-PRO game	Ask, Evaluate, Decide

Compare total scores for questions 1 to 6 before and after. Report question 7 separately.

For KPI 23, calculate the improvement from the matched pairs: (average post score minus average pre score) divided by the average pre score, times 100. A result of 25 or more meets the target.

Habits

Score Never = 1, Sometimes = 2, Often = 3, Always = 4. Compare the average for each habit before and after.

REMEMBER

With small groups, report numbers and simple averages, and describe changes carefully. Do not claim statistical significance unless a proper test has been carried out.

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Data collection calendar

Phase	Tools used	Responsible
Focus groups	Focus group surveys, session summaries, attendance lists	All partners, coordinated by P2
Educator training (Poland)	Competency self-assessment before training, Feedback Form A, attendance list	P3 with all partners
Start of senior workshops	Senior pre-workshop questionnaire, consent forms	All partners
During senior workshops	Feedback Form B, observer competency evaluation	All partners
End of senior workshops	Senior post-workshop questionnaire, competency self-assessment after workshops	All partners
Multiplier events	Feedback Form C, attendance lists	All partners
Final online conference	Feedback Form D, registration data	Conference organiser
Throughout the project	Website analytics, dissemination log	All partners, platform administrator
End of project	Final evaluation meeting	P1 with all partners

Results table

Fill in as activities are completed. Leave blank until data is available.

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

No.	KPI	Target	PT result	EE result	PL result	Total result	Target met?	Comment
1	Seniors in focus groups	15						
2	Educators in focus groups	15						
3	National reports	3						
4	Consolidated report	1						
5	Educators trained	12+						
6	Seniors in workshops	30+						
7	Multiplier events	3						
8	Multiplier event participants	60+						
9	Conference participants	40+						
10	Keynotes	3						
11	Stakeholders reached	1,500+						
12	Monthly website impressions	1,000+						
13	Organisations engaged	10+						
14	Workshop evaluation reports	6						
15	Matched pre and post questionnaires	80%+						
16	Increase in AI confidence	70%+						
17	Increase in green living confidence	70%+						
18	Commitments kept at least sometimes	60%+						
19	Educators improving competency score	80%+						
20	Average satisfaction	4/5+						
21	Intention to use or recommend	75%+						
22	Partner meetings (virtual + kick-off + final evaluation)	6+ + 1 + 1						

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

No.	KPI	Target	PT result	EE result	PL result	Total result	Target met?	Comment
23	Improvement in senior knowledge	25%+						
24	Educators and seniors satisfied with training	80%						
25	Risks resolved within 1 month	All						
26	Downloads and shares	250						
27	Dissemination materials	18+						
28	Materials accessible for 5 years	100%						
29	Organisations continuing use	10+						

Workshop evaluation report: template outline

Each partner writes **two** evaluation reports about its senior workshops: one from the **trainer's** perspective and one from the **learners'** perspective. Each report is about 4 to 6 pages.

Report 1: Trainer evaluation report

1. **Cover details:** partner, country, author role, dates of workshops, number of sessions.
2. **Overview of the workshops:** aims, number of seniors taking part (counts only), venue or mode, materials used (digital game, printable game, handbook).
3. **Delivery:** what was delivered as planned, what was changed, and why.
4. **Use of the G-PRO game:** how the G-P-R-O stages and the ASK–EVALUATE–DECIDE method worked in practice; which themes worked best.
5. **Learner engagement and challenges:** observations on participation, difficulties and how they were addressed.
6. **Facilitator competencies:** summary of self-assessment and observer evaluation, with change since the training.
7. **Lessons learnt:** what worked well, what should be improved.
8. **Recommendations:** for the game, the handbook and future workshops.

Report 2: Learners' evaluation report

1. **Cover details:** partner, country, author role, dates of workshops.
2. **Participants:** number of seniors starting and completing; number of matched pre and post questionnaires.

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

3. **Change in confidence:** average AI and green living confidence before and after, with a short table.
4. **Change in knowledge:** average knowledge score before and after; results for question 7.
5. **Change in habits:** average habit scores before and after.
6. **Reflection and commitments:** summary of "Looking back" ratings; how many seniors made and kept commitments; themes of commitments (Water, Energy, Nature, Recycling, Shopping).
7. **Session feedback:** summary of Feedback Form B.
8. **Learners' voices:** a few short anonymous quotes, with participant codes, from open questions.
9. **Conclusions and recommendations.**

Suggested results table for Report 2

Measure	Pre average	Post average	Change	Number of matched pairs
AI confidence (1–5)				
Green living confidence (1–5)				
Knowledge score (0–6)				
Habits (1–4)				

NOTE

Use only anonymised data in evaluation reports. Do not include names, photos of identifiable people without consent, or personal circumstances.

Using the results

- Partners discuss KPI progress at each partner meeting and agree corrective actions if a target is at risk.
- Feedback and evaluation findings are used to improve the game, handbook and training during the project.
- The final evaluation meeting reviews all KPIs, the evaluation reports and lessons learnt, and agrees how results will be sustained after the project.
- A summary of evaluation results is included in the final report to the National Agency.

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.