



## **FORMALAB**

### **INTERMEDIATE EVALUATION REPORT**

<http://formalab.fr>

Author:

ITD - <http://www.e-itd.com>

Contributors:

Greta du Velay – <http://cri.velay.greta.fr>

Timelab – <http://timelab.org>

September 2012

This report aims to make a follow up of the development of the Formalab project, half way to the end of the project.

It focuses in some points that we find specially relevant:

- the concept of Fablab and its possibilities to change into Formalab;
- the possible relationship between the Formalab and the territory where it works;
- the organization and management of the project.

This report has been developed starting from a questionnaire answered by representatives of all the partners implicated in the project. The whole questionnaire can be found in annex 1.

This report includes the evaluation of 4 persons of Greta du Velay, 1 person of Time Lab and 1 person from ITD.

## Section 1: Definition of a Formalab

As a starting point, most of the partners had an idea of what a Fablab meant, or at least they declare themselves familiar with the concept. Mostly the concepts associated to a Fablab were **DESIGN** and **INNOVATION**, although there was a small reference also to learning.

At this point, the idea of adapting the methodology to a Formalab has widened the image, and now the main concepts associated to a Formalab are **INNOVATION** but also **LEARNING**. Some references to partnership, networking, mutualisation and exchanges. In this sense, the concept and methodology of a Fablab seems to be adaptable and oriented more to a training/learning area.

Even the partners that weren't close to the Fablab idea have developed a correct idea of the kind of things that can be made in a Formalab.

Regarding the perception of the project as a real developer of key competences in order to improve labor inclusion, all partners agree on it. Some important ideas were expressed regarding this point:

- it can develop key competences, but in different levels depending on the interests of the students;
- the format of the sessions allow to see competences that are difficultly identifiable in traditional training sessions;
- not only key competences can be targeted, also transversal competences needed for the labour market can be developed;
- it can work very well if the workshops are well designed and oriented to developing skills, but it has to be supervised and designed by professionals. The Fablab by itself does not necessarily develop competences. It has to have the specific support of teachers or supervisors;
- evaluation of the workshops regarding the key competences is very important. Therefore the development of the adequate way to measure them should be as important as the workshop itself.

## Section 2: Fablabs and Organisation of FORMALAB project

This part was oriented to evaluate the opinion of the partners regarding the concepts, methodologies and activities of the Formalab project.

On the one hand, partners find that the level and clearness of **information and explanations** provided **regarding the concept of Formalab** is very high (3,6/4). This has facilitated the development of the project and the understanding of the concept and implementation of activities. Even the ones that weren't close to the Fablab concept rate this very high, which means that the information and explanations were not related to previous knowledge but really oriented to understand the project itself.

Regarding the idea of the workshops bringing a **better understanding of the concept of Formalab**, the score is also positive (3,3/4). It is important to highlight that the difference between the partners and their role in the project influence this answer: in the case of Timelab, for example, they were used to making workshops and they didn't help the understanding of the concept BUT the evaluation method they worked in made the difference and helped reorient their activities.

Finally, when asked about the employed **methodologies and activities, if they facilitated** the effectiveness of the Formalab in each territory, the answer is positive (3,4/4) although the probably the territory to which we referred was not "geographical" but "organizational". The activities have helped each partner both to improve the analysis on how to evaluate the key competences targeted with the workshops and to develop activities like workshops directly with students to work and develop their key competences. Therefore, the activities developed have helped both the reflection and the action regarding the way to implement Formalab activities in different territories.

### Section 3: Formalab and Territory

At this point of the project, not all the partners are developing Formalab activities. It shall be reminded that the roles of the partners in the project are very different and therefore not all of them develop the same kind of activities.

Up to now, Greta de Velay has implemented its Formalab within its training institution, and Timelab started developing activities more oriented to education and training.

Regarding ITD, it is not developing activities (workshops) as it is neither a training centre nor a Fablab. Its implication has been more related to methodology than to implementation of activities.

The participation of the partners in the project moves between "partially meeting their expectations" and "fully meeting their expectations" (2,3/4).

The most positive reactions have to do with the effectiveness of this methodology of training regarding the kind of publics with which we work, and with the development of new activities within the subject of training and education (in the case of Timelab, who wasn't initially oriented to this kind of activities). On the other hand, the most negative have to do with the lack of time of the partners to participate more actively and to develop the local insertion of the concept beyond the own organization. We can conclude, then, that the "problems" identified do not have to do with the project itself but with personal circumstances that don't allow the participants to get more implicated.

Regarding the **main obstacles to develop a Formalab** in their own territories, the following points have been underlined.

From the partners that are building a Formalab as a part of a training centre:

1. To motivate the persons to find their own initiative in the Formalab
2. To convince other institutions about the interest of the training device, and to allow them to find their own place in the existing Formalab
3. To finance human resources related to the Formalab
4. To find the adequate premises to install the Formalab

From the partners that do not have to build a Formalab:

1. The infrastructure required
2. The dependence of a training institution as a base for the concept

Regarding the **main advantages to develop a Formalab** in their own territories, the following points appeared:

From the partners that are building a Formalab as a part of a training centre:

1. To favour the meeting between different people
2. To give knowledge to the local population
3. Accessibility and free entrance
4. Effective training device, interesting for learners but also for trainers
5. It can be used in different contexts and with different publics
6. Allows to create a good link with the environment
7. Creates new ways of learning
8. It gathers different competences in a one place
9. Developing new and different culture: DIY, recycling)

From the partners that do not have to build a Formalab:

1. The existing Fablabs do not have this orientation, and therefore is an opportunity to promote its implementation
2. The concept of learning by doing is attractive for youngsters, which makes easier the acquisition of competences.

Although there are some important obstacles, mainly infrastructural to build a Formalab and conceptual to get engaged other institutions, there are far more advantages that have been identified that may make attractive the implementation of a Formalab in the different territories.

#### Section 4: Project management

In this section, partners were asked to rate their satisfaction regarding some project management aspects, specifically related to each international meeting.

It has to be specified that not all the partners have participated in all the meetings, so each rate responds exclusively to the partners that were present in each meeting.

##### **Meeting 1, Barcelona. November 2011**

Has the internal meeting been well organized? **4/4**

Has the internal meeting been useful and clear? **3,6/4**

Has there been enough previous information to prepare the internal meeting? (agenda) **3,3/4**

Has there been minutes after the meeting to clarify the agreements and following steps? **3,6/4**

Is the follow-up of the administrative part of the project being done in time? **4/4**

##### **Meeting 2, Gent. June 2012**

Has the internal meeting been well organized? **3,75/4**

Has the internal meeting been useful and clear? **3,25/4**

Has there been enough previous information to prepare the internal meeting? (agenda) **3,25/4**

Has there been minutes after the meeting to clarify the agreements and following steps? **3,25/4**

Is the follow-up of the administrative part of the project being done in time? **3,5/4**

This specific rating shows that in general terms the project management is well perceived by the partners and that it has been well prepared and developed.

**Section 1: Definition of a Formalab**

<p>Before <b>FORMALAB</b> project, were you <b>familiar</b> with the <b>concept of Fablab</b>?</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"> <input type="radio"/> YES                      <input type="radio"/> NO         </p>
<p>Before the beginning of the project, which one of the following <b>words</b> would you <b>associate to "fablab"</b>?</p> <p>Please, tick <u>1 or 2 words maximum</u>.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="radio"/> PARTNERSHIP</li> <li><input type="radio"/> NETWORKING</li> <li><input type="radio"/> MUTUALISATION</li> <li><input type="radio"/> CAPITALISATION</li> <li><input type="radio"/> DESIGN</li> <li><input type="radio"/> EXCHANGES</li> <li><input type="radio"/> INNOVATION</li> <li><input type="radio"/> LEARNING</li> <li><input type="radio"/> OTHER (Please, specify): .....</li> </ul>
<p>At this stage of the project, which one of the following <b>word</b> would you now <b>associate to "FORMALAB"</b>?</p> <p>Please, tick <u>1 or 2 words maximum</u>.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="radio"/> PARTNERSHIP</li> <li><input type="radio"/> NETWORKING</li> <li><input type="radio"/> MUTUALISATION</li> <li><input type="radio"/> CAPITALISATION</li> <li><input type="radio"/> DESIGN</li> <li><input type="radio"/> EXCHANGES</li> <li><input type="radio"/> INNOVATION</li> <li><input type="radio"/> LEARNING</li> <li><input type="radio"/> OTHER (Please, specify): .....</li> </ul>
<p><b>Do you think the project gets to develop key competences in order to improve labor inclusion?</b></p> <p><b>If yes, how?</b></p>	
<p><b>Comments/suggestions?</b></p>	

**Section 1: Definition of a Formalab**

<p>Before <b>FORMALAB</b> project, were you <b>familiar</b> with the <b>concept of Fablab</b>?</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"> <input type="radio"/> YES                      <input type="radio"/> NO         </p>
<p>Before the beginning of the project, which one of the following <b>words</b> would you <b>associate to "fablab"</b>?</p> <p>Please, tick <u>1 or 2 words maximum</u>.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="radio"/> PARTNERSHIP</li> <li><input type="radio"/> NETWORKING</li> <li><input type="radio"/> MUTUALISATION</li> <li><input type="radio"/> CAPITALISATION</li> <li><input type="radio"/> DESIGN</li> <li><input type="radio"/> EXCHANGES</li> <li><input type="radio"/> INNOVATION</li> <li><input type="radio"/> LEARNING</li> <li><input type="radio"/> OTHER (Please, specify): .....</li> </ul>
<p>At this stage of the project, which one of the following <b>word</b> would you now <b>associate to "FORMALAB"</b>?</p> <p>Please, tick <u>1 or 2 words maximum</u>.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="radio"/> PARTNERSHIP</li> <li><input type="radio"/> NETWORKING</li> <li><input type="radio"/> MUTUALISATION</li> <li><input type="radio"/> CAPITALISATION</li> <li><input type="radio"/> DESIGN</li> <li><input type="radio"/> EXCHANGES</li> <li><input type="radio"/> INNOVATION</li> <li><input type="radio"/> LEARNING</li> <li><input type="radio"/> OTHER (Please, specify): .....</li> </ul>
<p><b>Do you think the project gets to develop key competences in order to improve labor inclusion?</b></p> <p><b>If yes, how?</b></p>	
<p><b>Comments/suggestions?</b></p>	



**Section 2: Fablabs and Organisation of FORMALAB project**

**At this stage of the project...**

<p>What is your opinion about the level and clearness of <b>information and explanations</b> provided <b>regarding the concept of formalab</b> ?</p>	😊😊	😊	😞	😞😞
<p>Have the workshops brought a <b>better understanding of the concept of formalab</b>?</p>	😊😊	😊	😞	😞😞
<p>Are the employed <b>methodologies and activities</b> <b>facilitating</b> the effectiveness of the formalab in your territory?</p>	😊😊	😊	😞	😞😞
<p><b>Comments? Suggestions?</b></p>				

**Section 3: Formalab and Territory**

*Are you or is your organisation participating to the development of a Formalab? If yes, how?*

.....  
.....  
.....

*Is your participation?*

Exceeding your expectations  Details:

---

Fully meeting your expectations

---

Partially meeting your expectations

---

Is not meeting your expectations

---

*According to you, what are the main obstacles to the development of a formalab on your territory, at local level?*

1. ....
2. ....
3. ....

*What are the main advantages of the development of a formalab on your territory, at local level?*

1. ....
2. ....
3. ....

*Comments, suggestions:*

.....  
.....  
.....

**Section 4: Project management**

**Meeting 1: Kick off. Barcelona, November 2011**

Has the internal meeting been well organized?	😊😊	😊	😞	😞😞
Has the internal meeting been useful and clear?	😊😊	😊	😞	😞😞
Has there been enough previous information to prepare the internal meeting? (agenda)	😊😊	😊	😞	😞😞
Has there been minutes after the meeting to clarify the agreements and following steps?	😊😊	😊	😞	😞😞
Is the follow-up of the administrative part of the project being done in time?	😊😊	😊	😞	😞😞
<b>Comments? Suggestions?</b>				

**Meeting 2: Ghent, June 2012**

Has the internal meeting been well organized?	😊😊	😊	😞	😞😞
Has the internal meeting been useful and clear?	😊😊	😊	😞	😞😞
Has there been enough previous information to prepare the internal meeting? (agenda)	😊😊	😊	😞	😞😞
Has there been minutes after the meeting to clarify the agreements and following steps?	😊😊	😊	😞	😞😞
Is the follow-up of the administrative part of the project being done in time?	😊😊	😊	😞	😞😞
<b>Comments? Suggestions?</b>				

**Meeting 3: Barcelona, December 2012**

Has the internal meeting been well organized?	😊😊	😊	😞	😞😞
Has the internal meeting been useful and clear?	😊😊	😊	😞	😞😞
Has there been enough previous information to prepare the internal meeting? (agenda)	😊😊	😊	😞	😞😞
Has there been minutes after the meeting to clarify the agreements and following steps?	😊😊	😊	😞	😞😞
Is the follow-up of the administrative part of the project being done in time?	😊😊	😊	😞	😞😞
<b>Comments? Suggestions?</b>				