

D2.1 Evaluation Plan

PP-2-3-2016 – EU-VIORMED

European Study on Risk Factors in Mental Disorder and Forensic Care: a multicenter study

WP5 – WP EVALUATION	
Lead contributor	P5 Institute of Psychiatry and Neurology (IPIN)
	Email: heizman@ipin.edu.pl ;
Other contributors	P1 – IRCCS P2 – KCL P3 – MANN P4 – MUW P6 – UDUS P7 – EUFAMI P8 - UNIMIB

Due date	31.01.2018
Delivery date	31.01.2018
Deliverable type	R
Dissemination level	CO

Document History

Version	Date	Description
V1.1	22.01.2018	Draft
V1.2	24.02.2018	Comments
V2.0	31.01.2018	Final Version

Publishable Summary

Methods

The evaluation of the project will consider evaluation of each separate evaluation point, such as official deliverables and milestones and other crucial indicators of the project course, pointed out by the leaders of work packages. Two evaluators from P5 IPIN will independently perform the evaluation of each evaluation point in quantitative, qualitative and descriptive aspect. The evaluators will meet monthly to discuss the progress of the project and to update the project evaluation charts. In case of critical deviations the evaluators will provide the WP2 Leader and Project Coordinator an early warning of activities and processes that need corrective action. To each project work package (with the exception of WP2 Evaluation) two evaluators from IPIN will be assigned. In case of disagreement of opinions between the evaluators, the differences will be discussed and described in details in the final evaluation report. Qualitative evaluation will be performed based on the accomplishment of the means of verification of each separate deliverable and milestone, pointed out in the project proposal. The evaluation tasks will be documented in the Evaluation Charts (Annex 1) and enclosed in the final evaluation report. Quantitative evaluation of the project will be performed using monitoring of mailing list activities, official publications, minutes from the meetings and project teleconferences, monitoring of the project website content and if needed, by direct mailing with Work Package Leaders and Project Coordinator. The quantitative descriptive scales will be used for each deliverable and milestone to evaluate: timeliness, concordance with set objectives, problem making during the course of the project, requirement of the additional support actions. Qualitative and quantitative evaluation of the project will be supported by the findings from the SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats) analysis. The SWOT analysis of the each work package tasks will be performed by the WP Leader in M03-06 (predictive) and M30-36 (retrospectively) and will concern only the tasks allocated to the each separate WP. The aim of SWOT analysis is to evaluate how anticipated course of the project and possible difficulties (SWOT M03-06) have been worked out in the reality (SWOT M30-36). Remarks and clarification of the deviations will be discussed with in the final report.

As the project Consortium believes that an effective and reliable feedback of stakeholders is fundamental for the project success, key figures were identified for each type of stakeholders and were invited to be part of a project Advisory Board (AB). At the time of the submission of this document, the following persons agreed to sit in the EU-VIORMED Advisory Board

- Prof. Paul Appelbaum (Columbia University College of Physicians & Surgeons, New York City)
- Prof. Graham Thornicroft (Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience of the King's College London)
- Prof. Stefano Ferracuti (University of Rome, Italy)
- Prof. Giuseppe Sartori (University of Padua, Italy),
- Prof. Vincenzo Caretti (LUMSA University, Italy),
- Christa Rados (Austrian Association for Psychiatry and Psychotherapy),
- Edwin Ladinsen (Austrian Caregiver Association)
- Toon Walravens (ex-user of forensic psychiatric services)

AB members will be involved in the project development, implementation and review. Whenever appropriate, it will consult the Consortium and make recommendations to improve their performance. The AB will review the main governance, scientific and ethical issues facing the various research projects in the Consortium, advising on the high standard of research and monitoring the main progress of the project. The project AB will meet periodically via telephone call. Minutes from AB meetings will be incorporated into the final evaluation report.

Results

The evaluation plan will guide the evaluation process to ensure that the project activities are implemented and delivered as planned and meets the project specific objectives. During the development process, partners have been made aware of the evaluation procedures and methodology.

Discussion

The Consortium decided to implement a structured process to evaluate the project activities, in order to verify that the project is being implemented as planned and reaches the objectives. For this reason, an evaluation strategy has been developed that includes a clear description of the methods for the evaluation, indicators and measures of verification (which take-up the indicators listed before with the specific objectives and explain how they will be measured).

This evaluative process will enable the Consortium to systematically appraise of the quality of the action (e.g., whether the project outcomes are useful and meet the user needs), and its effects (e.g., whether the project achieved its objectives and had an impact on the target group).

We believe that the implemented evaluation methodology adequately describes specific evaluation questions and, for each of them, methods to collect data, specifying purpose, questions, study design, method, measurement instruments, and the task, responsibilities and timing of the evaluation.

Having considered the evaluation process as an opportunity to develop internal skills and knowledges, the Consortium has opted for internal evaluation.

Conclusion

A project evaluation plan has been developed, tailored to the nature of the project itself.

Repository for primary data

The results of the SWOT analysis will be shared with the whole consortium via email and the document report will be made permanently available on the reserved area of the project website. The access to the area will be restricted only to the project members, as well as to the European Commission' Officers and the Project Evaluators.

Annex 1 – Evaluation Charts

Evaluation chart for work package: 1 – Management of the project

Evaluators of WP1:

Evaluator 1 name..... (IPIN).

Evaluator 2 name..... (IPIN).

	Qualitative evaluation	Factors of qualitative evaluation of deliverables (D) and milestones (M) (0-3)				Findings from the SWOT analysis	Remarks, clarification of the deviations
		Timeliness.	Concordance with set objectives.	Problem making during the course of the project.	Requirement of the additional support actions.		
	Achieved 1, Not achieved 0.	0 – failed to achieved 1 – a severe delay causing the delay of the others D or M 2 – a slight delay not causing the delay of the others D or M 3 – in line with the schedule	0 – failed to achieved 1 – severe deviations, limiting the expected project outcomes 2 – minimal deviations, not limiting the expected outcomes 3 – full concordance	0 – critical problems impacting the overall project feasibility 1 – severe problems going beyond work package. 2 – notable problems limited to specific work package 3 – not causing problems during the course of the project	0 – critical, required an EU / regulatory bodies intervention 1 – severe - required an support action from the external institutions 2 – notable - required an support action from the consortium members 3 – did not require any support action		
Deliverables and milestones							
D1.1 Publication Policy (M6)							
D1.2 – Periodic reports (MD.1) (M12, M24)							

D1.3 – Final report (MD.2) (M36)							
M1.1 – Kick-off project meeting (M1)							
M1.2 – Mid-term project meeting (M18)							
M1.3 – Final project meeting (M36)							
Other indicators of the course of the project							
Submission to Ethical Committee (M3)							
Project review meeting at M12							
Project review meeting at M24							

Project review meeting at M36							
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Evaluation chart for work package: 3 – Dissemination

Evaluators of WP3:

Evaluator 1 name..... (IPIN).

Evaluator 2 name..... (IPIN).

	Qualitative evaluation	Factors of qualitative evaluation of deliverables (D) and milestones (M) (0-3)				Findings from the SWOT analysis	Remarks, clarification of the deviations
		Timeliness.	Concordance with set objectives.	Problem making during the course of the project.	Requirement of the additional support actions.		
	Achieved 1, Not achieved 0.	0 – failed to achieved 1 – a severe delay causing the delay of the others D or M 2 – a slight delay not causing the delay of the others D or M 3 – in line with the schedule	0 – failed to achieved 1 – severe deviations, limiting the expected project outcomes 2 – minimal deviations, not limiting the expected outcomes 3 – full concordance	0 – critical problems impacting the overall project feasibility 1 – severe problems going beyond work package. 2 – notable problems limited to specific work package 3 – not causing problems during the course of the project	0 – critical, required an EU / regulatory bodies intervention 1 – severe - required an support action from the external institutions 2 – notable - required an support action from the consortium members 3 – did not require any support action		
Deliverables and milestones							
D3.1 – Dissemination plan (M3)							
D3.2 – Leaflet (MD.3) (M3)							
D3.3 – Web-site (MD.5) (M3)							
D3.4 – Layman’s version of the							

final report (MD.4) (M36)							
M3.1 – Dissemination materials ready (M3)							
M3.2 – Final project conference (M36)							
Other indicators of the course of the project							

Evaluation chart for work package: 4 – Risk factors for violence and risk assessment tools

Evaluators of WP4:

Evaluator 1 name (IPIN).

Evaluator 2 name (IPIN).

	Qualitative evaluation	Factors of qualitative evaluation of deliverables (D) and milestones (M) (0-3)				Findings from the SWOT analysis	Remarks, clarification of the deviations
		Timeliness.	Concordance with set objectives.	Problem making during the course of the project.	Requirement of the additional support actions.		
	Achieved 1, Not achieved 0.	0 – failed to achieved 1 – a severe delay causing the delay of the others D or M 2 – a slight delay not causing the delay of the others D or M 3 – in line with the schedule	0 – failed to achieved 1 – severe deviations, limiting the expected project outcomes 2 – minimal deviations, not limiting the expected outcomes 3 – full concordance	0 – critical problems impacting the overall project feasibility 1 – severe problems going beyond work package. 2 – notable problems limited to specific work package 3 – not causing problems during the course of the project	0 – critical, required an EU / regulatory bodies intervention 1 – severe - required an support action from the external institutions 2 – notable - required an support action from the consortium members 3 – did not require any support action		
Deliverables and milestones							
D4.1 – Study protocols (M6)							
D4.2 – Report of Study 1 and Study 2 (M30)							
D4.3 – Guidelines for the training on prevention and treatment of							

violent behaviour (M36)							
M4.1 – Approval from Coordinator’s Ethical Committee (M7)							
M4.2 – Beginning of recruitment and of baseline assessment (M8)							
M4.3 – End of data collection for Study 1 (M23)							
M4.4 – End of follow-up rating for Study 2 (M29)							
Other indicators of the course of the project							

Evaluation chart for work package: 5 – Evaluation of treatment effectiveness

Evaluators of WP5:

Evaluator 1 name (IPIN).

Evaluator 2 name (IPIN).

	Qualitative evaluation	Factors of qualitative evaluation of deliverables (D) and milestones (M) (0-3)				Findings from the SWOT analysis	Remarks, clarification of the deviations
		Timeliness.	Concordance with set objectives.	Problem making during the course of the project.	Requirement of the additional support actions.		
	Achieved 1, Not achieved 0.	0 – failed to achieved 1 – a severe delay causing the delay of the others D or M 2 – a slight delay not causing the delay of the others D or M 3 – in line with the schedule	0 – failed to achieved 1 – severe deviations, limiting the expected project outcomes 2 – minimal deviations, not limiting the expected outcomes 3 – full concordance	0 – critical problems impacting the overall project feasibility 1 – severe problems going beyond work package. 2 – notable problems limited to specific work package 3 – not causing problems during the course of the project	0 – critical, required an EU / regulatory bodies intervention 1 – severe - required an support action from the external institutions 2 – notable - required an support action from the consortium members 3 – did not require any support action		
Deliverables and milestones							
D5.1 – Study protocol for systematic review 1 and 2 (M6)							
D5.2 – Systematic review 1 (M15)							

D5.3 – Systematic review 2 (M15)							
M5.1 - Study protocols for systematic review 1 and 2 developed and registered on PROSPERO (M3)							
M5.2 – Approval from Coordinator’s Ethical Committee (M7)							
Other indicators of the course of the project							

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Evaluation chart for work package: 6 - Comparison of national variations in pathways into and out of care

Evaluators of WP6:

Evaluator 1 name (IPIN).

Evaluator 2 name (IPIN).

	Qualitative evaluation	Factors of qualitative evaluation of deliverables (D) and milestones (M) (0-3)				Findings from the SWOT analysis	Remarks, clarification of the deviations
		Timeliness.	Concordance with set objectives.	Problem making during the course of the project.	Requirement of the additional support actions.		
	Achieved 1, Not achieved 0.	0 – failed to achieved 1 – a severe delay causing the delay of the others D or M 2 – a slight delay not causing the delay of the others D or M 3 – in line with the schedule	0 – failed to achieved 1 – severe deviations, limiting the expected project outcomes 2 – minimal deviations, not limiting the expected outcomes 3 – full concordance	0 – critical problems impacting the overall project feasibility 1 – severe problems going beyond work package. 2 – notable problems limited to specific work package 3 – not causing problems during the course of the project	0 – critical, required an EU / regulatory bodies intervention 1 – severe - required an support action from the external institutions 2 – notable - required an support action from the consortium members 3 – did not require any support action		
Deliverables and milestones							
D6.1 - Legal framework-questionnaire (M6)							
D6.2 - Procedures and practices-questionnaire (M8)							
D6.3 - Data collection method for forensic service (M10)							
D6.4 - Recommendations and criteria for models of							

good practice in forensic psychiatric care (M36)							
M6.1 - Legal frameworks, procedures, practice, and epidemiological data collection completed (M28)							
M6.2 - Standardized and comparative description of international service provision, practices and prevalence completed (M32)							
Other indicators of the course of the project							

Evaluation chart for work package: 7 - Data Analysis

Evaluators of WP7:

Evaluator 1 name (IPIN).

Evaluator 2 name (IPIN).

	Qualitative evaluation	Factors of qualitative evaluation of deliverables (D) and milestones (M) (0-3)				Findings from the SWOT analysis	Remarks, clarification of the deviations.
		Timeliness.	Concordance with set objectives.	Problem making during the course of the project.	Requirement of the additional support actions.		
	Achieved 1, Not achieved 0.	0 – failed to achieved 1 – a severe delay causing the delay of the others D or M 2 – a slight delay not causing the delay of the others D or M 3 – in line with the schedule	0 – failed to achieved 1 – severe deviations, limiting the expected project outcomes 2 – minimal deviations, not limiting the expected outcomes 3 – full concordance	0 – critical problems impacting the overall project feasibility 1 – severe problems going beyond work package. 2 – notable problems limited to specific work package 3 – not causing problems during the course of the project	0 – critical, required an EU / regulatory bodies intervention 1 – severe - required an support action from the external institutions 2 – notable - required an support action from the consortium members 3 – did not require any support action		
Deliverables and milestones							
D7.1 - Data Management Plan (M8)							
D7.2 – Data monitoring and quality control report (M12)							
D7.3 – Second quality control and preliminary data analysis (M17)							

D7.4 – Database (M25)							
D7.5 - Data evaluation and data analysis report (M34)							
M7.1 – Online set-up of the Project DB and beginning of data upload (M7)							
M7.2 – Quality control on random drawn data sample completed (M17)							
Other indicators of the course of the project							

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--