

Healthy Boost



The synthesis of the Model Evaluation Report

Nofer Institute of Occupational Medicine, 2021

Imprint

This publication has been developed within the European project **Healthy Boost – Urban Labs for Better Health for All in the Baltic Sea Region - boosting cross-sectoral cooperation for health and wellbeing in the cities**. The Healthy Boost consortium consisted of the following partners: City of Turku (FI), Metropolia University of Applied Sciences (FI), Lithuanian University of Health Sciences (LT), Jelgava Local Municipality (LV), Riga Stradiņš University (LV), City of Poznań (PL), Suwalki Municipality (PL), Nofer Institute of Occupational Medicine (PL), Västerbotten County Council (SE), Association "Healthy cities, districts and villages" (RU), Science Park Tehnopol (EE), Tartu City Government (EE), City of Helsinki (FI), Klaipeda City Public Health Bureau (LT).

The sole responsibility for the content of this publication lies with the authors. It does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the European Union.

Contract: **Healthy Boost – Urban Labs for Better Health for All in the Baltic Sea Region - boosting cross-sectoral cooperation for health and wellbeing in the cities** Project no. R085

Title: The synthesis of the Model Evaluation Report

Version: October 2021

Authors: Nofer Institute of Occupational Medicine: Beata Świątkowska, Eliza Goszczyńska, Kamila Knol-Michałowska, Krzysztof Puchalski, Marek Zaremba

Layout: City of Turku

Cover picture: Healthy Boost project/ krakenimages/ Ethan Hu/

This publication is subject to the copyright of the Healthy Boost consortium and its authors and contributors.

How to cite: Świątkowska B., Goszczyńska E., Knol-Michałowska K., Puchalski K., Zaremba M., Kwiatkowska Z. (2021, June). The synthesis of the Model Evaluation Report. Deliverable report of the Healthy Boost project, co-funded by the European Development Fund. Nofer Institute of Occupational Medicine.

Project note

The EU co-funded project **Healthy Boost – Urban Labs for Better Health for All in the Baltic Sea Region - boosting cross-sectoral cooperation for health and wellbeing in the cities** (2019–2021) addresses the health burden of city residents due to unhealthy lifestyles. Cities such as Poznan, Klaipeda, Jelgava Local Municipality, Tartu, and Turku experiment with different methods of community participation, health learning or cross-sectoral cooperation. The main objective of the project is to make urban policies for health and well-being more innovative, more effective, and more integrated. This includes work on cross-sectoral cooperation with potential to be used in other fields as well.

Cross-sectoral cooperation can boost health and wellbeing in the Baltic cities

The Healthy Boost project brings together fourteen partners representing different levels of governance within various sectors. Their aim is to improve the capacities of local authorities to enhance health and well-being of citizens through cross-sectoral cooperation.

Table of Contents

THE SYNTHESIS OF THE MODEL EVALUATION REPORT	1
INTRODUCTION.....	4
METHODOLOGY OF THE EVALUATION.....	4
THE GOOD SIDES OF THE PRELIMINARY VERSION OF THE MODEL.....	5
THE WEAKNESSES OF THE PRELIMINARY VERSION OF THE MODEL	6
HOW DID THE PRELIMINARY VERSION OF THE MODEL WORK IN SMALL AND BIG CITIES?	7
THE CONCLUSIONS. WHAT WAS SUPPOSED TO BE IMPROVED IN THE MODEL AND HOW?.....	7
APPENDIX.....	9
PART A. EVALUATION OF PILOT ACTIVITIES AND THE MODEL FOR CROSS-SECTORAL COOPERATION	9
PART B. THE QUESTIONNAIRE CONCERNING THE STAKEHOLDERS’ OPINIONS ON THE COLLABORATION IN THE PILOT	42

Introduction

The aim of the Healthy Boost project is to improve the capacities of local authorities to enhance health and well-being of citizens through cross-sectoral cooperation. The project is co-funded by the European Union. Its main objective is to make urban policies for health and well-being more innovative, more effective, and more integrated. This includes work on cross-sectoral cooperation with potential to be used in other fields as well. Cross-sectoral cooperation can boost health and well-being in the Baltic cities, and can effectively resolve the problems due to unhealthy lifestyles.

Achieving such goals requires an appropriate tool which provides partners of cross-sectoral cooperation guidance every time when they need to maximize the effectiveness of collaboration. The Healthy Boost project put together knowledge and experience of experts from various institutions, and as a result the model of cross-sectoral cooperation was introduced. In order to enhance the collaboration of various partners the model distinguishes domains and stages of cooperation. There are five domains included in the process: (1) risk identification, (2) leadership, (3) communication, (4) coordination, and (5) motivation. Each domain is described based on four stages: (1) mapping, (2) planning, (3) implementation or (4) assessment.

In order to provide a fully-developed version of the model, the Healthy Boost project bases on pilot activities and the process of their evaluation. Nine cities from the Baltic Region were included: Cherepovets, Helsinki, Jelgava Local Municipality, Klaipeda, Poznan, Pskov, Suwalki, Turku, Tartu. In each of these cities local authorities (municipalities) play a key role of the Pilot Coordinator. This role means that some chosen and trained representatives of the municipality animate the process of cross-sectoral collaboration in their local area, involving into actions for health and well-being partners from NGOs, SMEs, and from other sectors whose participation might be beneficial for this purpose.

The aim of this document is to synthesise “Model Evaluation Report”, written by the Nofer Institute of Occupational Medicine. The report summed up observations regarding usability of the model for cross-sectoral cooperation, underlining strengths and weaknesses of this tool and indicates areas for improvement. Results of the evaluation, summarised in “Model Evaluation Report”, contributed to finalisation of the model.

Methodology of the evaluation

The basis of information provided in the Model evaluation report are as follows:

A. The study of Pilot Coordinators responsible for managing the pilots in their cities.

The basis of this study was an online questionnaire called “Evaluation of pilot activities and the model for cross-sectoral cooperation” or “post-evaluation questionnaire” (see appendix, part A). The questionnaire consisted of five parts, each of them devoted to the separate theme: 1) overall information on the pilot; 2) process evaluation of the pilot; 3) effect evaluation of the pilot; 4) the cross-sectoral cooperation in the pilot; 5) the assessment of the model for cross-sectoral cooperation. It should be highlighted that this study gathered opinions expressed by the Pilot Coordinators on behalf of themselves as well as the pilot stakeholders, citizens/pilot target groups. It was the decision of the Pilot Coordinators on the tools/ways of gathering such an information. The study was basis of both quantitative and qualitative analyses of the (dis)advantageous of the model for cross-sectoral cooperation.

B. The study of stakeholders engaged by the Municipalities in the cross-sectoral collaboration in the pilots.

The online tool aimed at collecting data in this study was called “The questionnaire concerning the stakeholders’ opinions on the collaboration in the pilot” (see appendix, part B). The tool was constructed in such a way to collect pilot stakeholders’ assessment of the opportunities created in the pilots: to meet other stakeholders engaged in the collaboration (which reflects the stage “mapping” of the model), to develop ways of collaboration with other partners (the stage “planning”), to engage in improving the collaboration (the stage “implementation”), and to express the opinion on the cross-sectoral cooperation (the stage “assessment”). Moreover, the questionnaire was aimed at collecting data on the weaknesses and benefits stemming from collaboration, willingness to its continuation in the future as well as changes in motivation to participate in the intervention. The questionnaire was filled in anonymously by the pilot stakeholders in 9 cities (n=44). The research sample consisted of representatives of: (1) preschools, schools and universities, (2) small and medium enterprises, (3) local authorities, (4) governmental institutions, (5) non-governmental organisations (including city residents).

The good sides of the preliminary version of the model

The good sides of the model can be concluded indirectly based on the Pilot Coordinators’ assessment of the cross-sectoral collaboration in the pilot. Almost all Pilot Coordinators (8 out of 9) said that they had succeeded in overcoming problems in the cross-sectoral cooperation in the pilot and correcting it. Additionally, all of them declared that they would like to continue the cross-sectoral collaboration in the future and develop other health promotion projects or similar initiatives together. These statements can lead to the conclusion that the cooperation was perceived as rather easy-going and valuable as well as worth continuation.

As far as the direct assessment of the model was concerned, the analysis showed its rather positive appraisal. Two thirds representatives of Municipalities admitted using the model during the pilot implementation and assessed that it turned out to be useful/practical. Five respondents admitted it was easy to find in the model practical clues helpful in solving problems in the cross-sectoral cooperation. Moreover, 7 representatives of Municipalities said that they had used the model in correcting/modifying collaboration in the pilot and declared that they had found the model as a helpful tool in this process. Usability of the model was also assessed in the survey based on the question concerning Pilot Coordinators’ plans to apply the model after the Healthy Boost project termination. Five representatives of the Municipalities said that they would like to use it in the future. Simultaneously, there were 3 respondents who declared making use of the model on condition of its improvement.

Appraisal of the structure, clarity and understandability of model was also positive in most cases. Eight Pilot Coordinators said that terminology used in the model was intelligible. Five respondents assessed that the structure of the model was logic and clear. However, only representatives of 3 cities said there were not any important, practical issues ignored in the model. It displays that although the overall assessment of the model was rather positive, the Pilot Coordinators awaited some improvements in this tool.

The qualitative analysis of the data gathered based on the open questions in the post-evaluation survey deepens the quantitative picture of good sides of the model. This kind of analysis shows that the Pilot Coordinators’ positive opinions concentrated on the following areas: (1) partnership building, (2) process planning, (3) process ordering, (4) problem solving, (5) evaluation of intervention, (6) self-development.

According to the Pilot Coordinators’ perception, the model supported building good partnership in the consortium. It also gave a chance to find common motivation among stakeholders, as well as kept them motivated throughout the lifetime of the project, helped to divide roles of participants, and helped in establishing and adjusting correct communication process. The model helped in plan-

ning the process of implementation. It allowed to analyze the current situation, and to adjust plans regarding the situation. It was also emphasized that it supported the process of solving difficult situations appearing in the pilot implementation, and broke the common pattern of thinking in difficult situations. Last but not least, the model also helped in the assessment of the intervention, and it supported self-development of the consortium partners, because of its training function.

According to the pilot stakeholders' perception the model supported the consortium in difficult situations providing an opportunity to understand weaknesses of collaboration. Moreover, the model established and assessed cooperation process among cross-sectoral partners, providing mutual understanding between various partners.

The pilot stakeholders positively assessed the opportunities created in the pilot concerning all aspects of cross-sectoral cooperation specified in the questionnaire, which referred to 4 stages of cooperation indicated in the model: "mapping", "planning", "implementation", and "assessment". The respondents assessed these aspects on a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 meant lack of such opportunities, while 5 – high opportunities. Although all four rates were relatively high, which reflects the fact that positive individual rates outnumbered both negative and neutral ones, there were significant differences (gaps) between aggregated rates referring to the individual stages, which are worth pointing. The stage „assessment” was the most appreciated aspect. The most common chosen rates were 4 and 5 on the scale from 1 to 5. Thus, the average rate was high (4,38), whereas the rest aspects did not reach the level of 4,0. The stage “mapping” got a relatively lower average rate than the rest ones.

Another aspect reflecting stakeholders' appreciation of the collaboration was the dynamism of their motivation to participate in the pilot intervention. Among respondents whose motivation had changed during the intervention (which concerned 13 out of 44 respondents) all but one experienced an increase in motivation. Within the group of stakeholders whose motivation was constant during the collaboration in the pilot the majority of respondents assessed it as high (23 out of 31). For the rest ones it remained medium (7 people), whereas only one person admitted that it had been low through the whole project.

The fact that most of the stakeholders appreciated the cooperation was also reflected in their assessment of willingness to continue the established collaboration in future. None of respondents admitted that he or she did not want to cooperate or the willingness was small. Only 5 out of 44 people expressed neutral attitude to continue the collaboration. As far as a positive attitude towards the future collaboration is concerned, willingness was assessed as rather big by 23 respondents, whereas as very big by 16 stakeholders.

The weaknesses of the preliminary version of the model

Although most of the opinions on the model were rather positive, there were several critical voices. As far as the assessment of usability of the model is concerned the following findings should be emphasised. Firstly, although the model was used in the process of pilot preparation and implementation in all 9 cities, 1/3 of Pilot Coordinators did not choose an answer that it was a helpful/useful/practical tool. Among them the representative of 1 Municipality admitted that the model turned out to be rather useless. Secondly, all the Pilot Coordinators faced some problems/challenges in the cross-sectoral cooperation in the pilot. However, 2 respondents did not use the model in the process of correcting the collaboration. Thirdly, 3 out of 8 Pilot Coordinators assessing, if it was easy to find in the model practical clues worth taking into consideration while solving the problems in the cross-sectoral cooperation, answered that it was not easy. They pointed out too general approach of the model, and not enough practical suggestions. Fourthly, 4 out of 9 representatives of the Municipalities did not declare applying the model after Health Boost project termination in its original version.

As far as judgements of the structure of the model are concerned, the quantitative analysis showed that 4 out of 9 Pilot Coordinators did not assess it as logical and clear. Most opinions on this matter – described in details further – criticised organisation of the model according to the domains.

Analysis of the qualitative data concerning the weaknesses of the model showed that the Pilot Coordinators' critical opinions mainly concerned the following areas: usability of the model and its structure. In regard to that first area of criticism it was emphasized that the model was too general to help overcome very specific issues. There was a lack of practical solutions, so the questions asked in the model sometimes left its users with more questions. According to that point of view, the model might serve as a good starting package for someone who was still new in the field of creating cross-sectoral cooperation, but it was insufficient for those experienced with this matter.

In regard to the weaknesses related to the structure of the model two main issues can be pointed out. Firstly, some parts of the model were overlapping (“leadership” vs. “coordination”), which was confusing for its users. Secondly, the entire structure of the model was not logical and thus confusing. It should have been organised according to the timeline: “mapping”=> “planning”=> “implementation”=> “assessment”. In other words, the model required division into stages and within each of them division into domains.

Weaknesses of the model can be also indirectly concluded based on the stakeholders' assessment of the cross-sectoral collaboration in the pilot. Although the vast majority of stakeholders did not point out any flaws related to that, it is worth mentioning factors decreasing their satisfaction with this matter. Five out of 44 respondents claimed that they struggled with some issues caused by the epidemic of Covid-19 or insufficient funds for all planned activities. According to these stakeholders listed problems decreased the potential capacity of the project and/or the collaboration.

How did the preliminary version of the model work in small and big cities?

The general appraisal of the model was higher among smaller cities (with ≤100 000 inhabitants; this group of cities included Jelgava Local Municipality, Suwalki, Tartu). All of them declared that they used the model in correcting cross-sectoral cooperation, and easily derived there some practical clues facilitating this activity. Also the positive assessment of the structure and understandability of the model was more common among the smaller cities. All of them said that the model had understandable terminology, and 2 out of 3 appreciated logic and clarity of the structure. In case of bigger cities (with >100 000 inhabitants; the group included Cherepovets, Helsinki, Klaipeda, Poznan, Pskov, Turku) a positive appraisal of the model was given only by some Municipalities. The smallest proportion of the bigger cities in terms of positive appraisal of the model concerned ease of finding practical clues helpful in solving problems in the cross-sectoral cooperation. Satisfaction with this issue was declared only by 2 out of 5 Pilot Coordinators answering the question on this matter.

The conclusions. What was supposed to be improved in the model and how?

Although the general appraisal of the original version of the model was rather high, the Pilot Coordinators gave their suggestions concerning preferred improvements in each of the particular stages/domains of the model. These suggestions mostly concerned improvements making the model a more practical tool (by adding new questions, examples, ways/methods of operating, etc.). It was considered as an added value if methods regarding how to assess the leadership and motivation are included into the model. In other words, it would be beneficial to know not only what aspects to assess, but also how to assess and how to choose the most useful indicators to measure the internal/external communication. There seemed to be a particular need to specify how to go ahead with the evaluation, i.e. in which way to evaluate motivation in the context of leadership or other domains. Some concrete examples of the different types of evaluation and their timing were also pointed out as useful extension of the model.

As far as other improvements than those concerning the particular stages/domains are concerned, the necessary amendments to the model suggested by the Pilot Coordinators pertained to the structure of the model. Pilot Coordinators suggested reconfiguring the model in a way to enable the users start using it beginning from the stages, not the domains. The current composition was claimed to be inconvenient. According to the expressed preferences the main division should be changed into the stages (mapping, planning, etc.), and then within individual stages domains should be distinguished (risk identification, motivation, etc.).

There were also some opinions that the content of the model might be improved. Comments on this matter concerned adding to the model some new information/parts, especially those meeting the needs of more advanced users, i.e. regarding ways/methods of building relationships among stakeholders and assessing cooperation with the usage of appropriate indicators. At the stage of determining the circle of partners, it was necessary to determine the degree of influence of each partner on the result. It seemed appropriate to include these blocks of work in the model. To improve and develop cross-sectoral cooperation, it was necessary to develop a methodology for building relationships between partners, and to evaluate cross-sectoral interaction based on criteria and indicators. It was also recommended to include something for more experienced users as well, addressing maybe the most common challenge for cross-sectoral cooperation, i.e. the problem of commitment.

As long as the model was assessed in its original form, there were some opinions expressed that its length might be decreased. Such suggestions said about making the model a shorter/more concise tool. However, in contrast to such opinions, there were also suggestions that the accuracy of the model should be improved by tailoring the model more to the needs of health promotion specialists/making it a more precise tool from the public health point of view. The model should include case studies applicable for public health sector. In some stakeholders' opinion the model was too general.

There were also some important suggestions concerning production an electronic version of the model (most preferably a web one) to ease the process of using the model on regular basis. Last but not least idea, which is worth mentioning, was the concept of the introductory guidance for the users of the model. Among Pilot Coordinators there were suggestions to compile some kind of a guide for new model users to enable them benefiting the tool.

Appendix

PART A. Evaluation of pilot activities and the model for cross-sectoral cooperation

The name of the city:

The number of the city residents:

PART 1: Overall information on the pilot

1. Please describe a problem/challenge the city wanted to solve/face by implementing the pilot. Please characterise in details the following issues: who was affected by the problem/challenge, why this phenomenon was regarded as a problematic one, what was its scale (please provide quantitative description if possible).

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

(please add as many lines as you need)

2. What was the objective(s)/aim(s) of the pilot? If possible, please provide it/them in a measurable manner (i.e. the number/percentage of school children/city residents who changed diet).

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

(please add as many lines as you need)

3. What was the target group(s) of the pilot? If possible, please characterise the group(s) both in the qualitative and quantitative manners. Please describe it(them) in context of a population affected by the problem/challenge solved/faced in the pilot (i.e. the share of the target group(s) in a population affected by the problem/challenge).

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

(please add as many lines as you need)

- 4. Did the representatives of the target group(s) take part in the process of establishing the pilot aim(s)/objective(s) and ways of achieving them (the work plan)?
 - a) YES
 - b) NO – please explain why not and then go directly to the question no. 6

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

(please add as many lines as you need)

- c) ANOTHER ANSWER, please provide it

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

(please add as many lines as you need)

- 5. How did you develop such a collaboration of the pilot coordinators/consortium with the target group(s) in the process of establishing the pilot aim(s)/objective(s) and ways of achieving them (the work plan)? What kind of activities did you take in this process? How did this collaboration look like?

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

(please add as many lines as you need)

- 6. After the process of setting up the pilot goal(s)/objective(s) and the work plan did you acquaint the representatives of the target group(s) with the pilot plans?
 - a) YES
 - b) NO – please explain why not and then go directly to the question no. 10

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

(please add as many lines as you need)

- c) ANOTHER ANSWER, please provide it

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

.....
(please add as many lines as you need)

7. Did you verify whether there is a common understating of the pilot goal(s)/objective(s) and the work plan in the target group(s)?
- a) YES
 - b) NO – please explain why not and then go directly to the question no. 10

.....
.....
.....
(please add as many lines as you need)

- c) ANOTHER ANSWER, please provide it

.....
.....
.....
(please add as many lines as you need)

8. Please describe how did you communicate with the representatives of the target group(s) while acquainting them with the pilot plans and/or verifying whether there is a common understating of these issues (i.e. sending out messages with the request of their feedback, organising the meeting aimed at sharing opinions/information)?

.....
.....
.....
(please add as many lines as you need)

9. Did such consultations described in the previous question result in some changes in the pilot work plan?
- a) YES - please describe what was changed

.....
.....
.....
(please add as many lines as you need)

- b) NO – please explain why not

.....
.....

(please add as many lines as you need)

c) ANOTHER ANSWER, please provide it

.....
.....

(please add as many lines as you need)

10. Did you succeed in achieving the pilot aim(s)/objective(s)?

a) YES - please describe this in a measurable way

.....
.....

(please add as many lines as you need)

b) NO – please explain why not and if possible, describe how much did the pilot fail in achieving the pilot aim(s)/objective(s)

.....
.....

(please add as many lines as you need)

c) ANOTHER ANSWER, please provide it

.....
.....

(please add as many lines as you need)

11. What kind of activities were undertaken in the pilot to achieve its aim(s)/objective(s)? Please describe these activities in details.

.....
.....

(please add as many lines as you need)

12. How many people from the City Hall were engaged into the pilot preparation, implementation and evaluation? What are their position in the office/institution? What were their responsibilities in the pilot?

.....

(please add as many lines as you need)

13. How many partners/stakeholders were engaged in the pilot into the cross-sectoral consortium? For each of them please provide their names, types of the organisation (i.e. NGOs, SME, local authority), areas of their professional activity (i.e. IT, educational, manufacturing) and responsibilities/tasks in the pilot.

No.	The name of the organisation	The type of the organisation	The area(s) of the stakeholder activities	The responsibilities/tasks/activities/roles of the stakeholder in the pilot
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				

(please add as many lines as you need)

14. Beside pilot coordinator and his/her team did the representatives of the organisations/institutions engaged into the cross-sectoral consortium take part in the process of establishing the pilot aim(s)/objective(s) and ways of achieving them (the work plan)?

- a) YES
- b) NO – please explain why not and then go directly to the question no. 16

.....

.....
(please add as many lines as you need)

c) ANOTHER ANSWER, please provide it

.....
.....
.....
(please add as many lines as you need)

15. How did you develop such a collaboration of the pilot coordinator with organisations/institutions engaged into the cross-sectoral consortium in the process of establishing the pilot aim(s)/objective(s) and ways of achieving them (the work plan)? What kind of activities did you take in this process? How did this collaboration look like?

.....
.....
.....
(please add as many lines as you need)

16. After the process of setting up the pilot goal(s)/objective(s) and the work plan did you acquaint the representatives of the cross-sectoral consortium with the pilot plans?

- a) YES
- b) NO – please explain why not and then go directly to the question no. 20

.....
.....
.....
(please add as many lines as you need)

c) ANOTHER ANSWER, please provide it

.....
.....
.....
(please add as many lines as you need)

17. Did you verify whether there is a common understating of the pilot plans among the representatives of the cross-sectoral consortium?

- a) YES

b) NO – please explain why not

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

(please add as many lines as you need)

c) ANOTHER ANSWER, please provide it

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

(please add as many lines as you need)

18. Please describe how did you communicate with the representatives of the cross-sectoral consortium in the process of acquainting them with the pilot plans (i.e. sending out messages with the request of their feedback, organising the meeting aimed at sharing opinions/information)?

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

(please add as many lines as you need)

19. Did such consultations with the representatives of the cross-sectoral consortium result in some changes in the pilot work plan?

a) YES, please describe these changes

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

(please add as many lines as you need)

b) NO

c) ANOTHER ANSWER, please provide it

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

(please add as many lines as you need)

20. Please provide the date/term of the pilot beginning/onset.

.....
21. Please provide the planned date/term of the pilot termination.

.....
22. Do you plan to continue health promotion interventions/similar activities initiated in the pilot after the HB project termination? If yes, to which direction would you like to develop them?

.....
.....
.....
(please add as many lines as you need)

23. Have you faced any problems/challenges impeding/interfering efficient/smooth implementation of the pilot and achievement of its aim(s)/objective(s)?

- a) YES
- b) NO - go directly to the question no. 27
- c) ANOTHER ANSWER, please provide it

.....
.....
.....
(please add as many lines as you need)

24. What was the essence of these problems/challenges? Please, describe them in detail.

.....
.....
.....
(please add as many lines as you need)

25. Did you succeed in overcoming these problems/challenges?

- a) YES
- b) NO - please describe why not and go directly to the question no. 27

.....
.....

.....
(please add as many lines as you need)

c) ANOTHER ANSWER, please provide it

.....
.....
.....
(please add as many lines as you need)

26. In what way did you succeed in overcoming these problems/challenges? Please, describe this process in details.

.....
.....
.....
(please add as many lines as you need)

PART 2: Process evaluation of the pilot

Here we would like to gather information concerning the pilot process evaluation. This kind of the project assessment is also known as a monitoring. It needs to be performed right from the beginning of the project. It focuses on assessing the degree to which program has been implemented as planned and on the quality of the program implementation. The information gathered in this way may be useful in making necessary improvements in the work plan so that the project activities lead effectively to the achievement of the pilot goal(s)/objective(s).

27. Did you verify/measure the level of participation of the target group in the pilot activities?

- a) YES
- b) NO – please describe why not and go directly to the question no. 32

.....
.....
.....
(please add as many lines as you need)

c) ANOTHER ANSWER, please provide it

.....
.....

.....
 (please add as many lines as you need)

28. What kind of tools/methods did you use to verify this? Please, tick all the tools/methods used.

a)	informal interviews with respondents, talks in casual situations (i.e. telephone, face-to-face ones)	
b)	interviews based on a previously prepared list of questions or a questionnaire (i.e. telephone, face-to-face ones)	
c)	a group discussion, i.e. focus group interviews (i.e. on-line, face-to-face ones)	
d)	a questionnaire distributed among the respondents, the answers are ticked directly by them (i.e. the on-line one)	
e)	an off-line observation (the evaluator records conclusions based on his/her observation i.e. in a previously prepared form/tool)	
f)	an analysis of activities and/or opinions of the target group in the Internet (i.e. the number of downloads of a document, the number and the content of posts/comments in portals/social media devoted to the pilot)	
g)	a panel of experts (i.e. the discussion of pilot coordinators with the invited external evaluator)	
h)	other tools/methods, which ones? Please provide it/them. (please add as many lines as you need)	

29. What did you get to know/find out in this way? Please, describe in details all the collected information on the level of participation of the target group in the pilot activities.

.....

(please add as many lines as you need)

30. Did this information cause some changes/improvements in the work plan?

- a) YES
- b) NO – please describe why not and go directly to the question no. 32

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

(please add as many lines as you need)

- c) ANOTHER ANSWER, please provide it

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

(please add as many lines as you need)

31. What did you modify in the work plan due to the collected data on the level of participation of the target group in the pilot activities? What was the essence of these changes/improvements? How did you do these changes/improvements?

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

(please add as many lines as you need)

32. Did you verify the opinions of the target group(s) on the pilot activities (i.e. its/their satisfaction, approval, acceptance)?

- a) YES
- b) NO – please describe why not and go directly to the question no. 37

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

(please add as many lines as you need)

- c) ANOTHER ANSWER, please provide it

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

(please add as many lines as you need)

33. What kind of tools/methods did you use to verify the opinions of the target group(s) on the pilot activities? Please, tick all the tools/methods used.

a)	informal interviews with respondents, talks in casual situations (i.e. telephone, face-to-face ones)	
b)	interviews based on a previously prepared list of questions or a questionnaire (i.e. telephone, face-to-face ones)	
c)	a group discussion, i.e. focus group interviews (i.e. on-line, face-to-face ones)	
d)	a questionnaire distributed among the respondents, the answers are ticked directly by them (i.e. the on-line one)	
e)	an off-line observation (the evaluator records conclusions based on his/her observation i.e. in a previously prepared form/tool)	
f)	an analysis of activities and/or opinions of the target group in the Internet (i.e. the number of downloads of a document, the number and the content of posts/comments in portals/social media devoted to the pilot)	
g)	a panel of experts (i.e. the discussion of pilot coordinators with the invited external evaluator)	
h)	other tools/methods, which ones? Please provide it/them. (please add as many lines as you need)	

34. What did you get to know in this way? Please, describe in details all the collected opinions of the target group(s) on the pilot activities.

.....

(please add as many lines as you need)

35. Did the information collected in this way cause some changes/improvements in the work plan?

d) YES

e) NO – please describe why not and go directly to the question no. 37

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

(please add as many lines as you need)

f) ANOTHER ANSWER, please provide it

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

(please add as many lines as you need)

36. What did you modify in the work plan due to the collected opinions of the target group(s) on the pilot activities? What was the essence of these changes/improvements? How did you do these changes/improvements?

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

(please add as many lines as you need)

37. Did you verify the level of engagement of the stakeholders of the cross-sectoral consortium in the pilot activities?

- a) YES
- b) NO - please describe why not and go directly to the question no. 42

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

(please add as many lines as you need)

c) ANOTHER ANSWER, please provide it

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

(please add as many lines as you need)

38. What kind of tools/methods did you use to verify this? Please, tick all the tools/methods used.

a)	informal interviews with respondents, talks in casual situations (i.e. telephone, face-to-face ones)	
b)	interviews based on a previously prepared list of questions or a questionnaire (i.e. telephone, face-to-face ones)	
c)	a group discussion, i.e. focus group interviews (i.e. on-line, face-to-face ones)	
d)	a questionnaire distributed among the respondents, the answers are ticked directly by them (i.e. the on-line one)	
e)	an off-line observation (the evaluator records conclusions based on his/her observation i.e. in a previously prepared form/tool)	
f)	an analysis of activities and/or opinions of the stakeholders in the Internet (i.e. the number of downloads of a document, the number and the content of posts/comments in portals/social media devoted to the pilot)	
g)	a panel of experts (i.e. the discussion of pilot coordinators with the invited external evaluator)	
h)	other tools/methods, which ones? Please provide it/them. (please add as many lines as you need)	

39. What did you get to know in this way? Please, describe in details all the collected information on the level of engagement of the stakeholders in the pilot activities.

.....

 (please add as many lines as you need)

40. Did the information collected in this way cause some changes/improvements in the work plan?

- a) YES
- b) NO – please describe why not and go directly to the question no. 42

.....

.....
(please add as many lines as you need)

c) ANOTHER ANSWER, please provide it

.....
.....
.....
(please add as many lines as you need)

41. What did you modify in the work plan due to the collected data on the level of engagement of the stakeholders of the cross-sectoral consortium in the pilot activities? What was the essence of these changes/improvements? How did you do these changes/improvements?

.....
.....
.....
(please add as many lines as you need)

42. Did you verify compatibility of the implemented activities with the pilot work plan and the budget?

- a) YES
- b) NO – please describe why not and go directly to the question no. 46

.....
.....
.....
(please add as many lines as you need)

c) ANOTHER ANSWER, please provide it

.....
.....
.....
(please add as many lines as you need)

43. What did you get to know while verifying accordance of the implemented activities with the pilot work plan and the budget? Please, describe all the collected information in details i.e. if you had to change budget and/or work plan due to the COVID-19.

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

(please add as many lines as you need)

44. Did this information cause some changes/improvements in the pilot work plan or the budget?
- a) YES
 - b) NO – please describe why not and go directly to the question no. 46

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

(please add as many lines as you need)

- c) ANOTHER ANSWER, please provide it

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

(please add as many lines as you need)

45. What did you modify in the pilot work plan or the budget after verification of accordance of the implemented activities with them? What was the essence of these changes/improvements? How did you do these changes/improvements?

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

(please add as many lines as you need)

PART 3: Effect evaluation of the pilot

Here we would like to get to know some information about the pilot effect evaluation (also known as impact and outcome evaluation). Its aim is to assess the effectiveness of a program or identify the program`s effect on those who participated in the program. It refers to the achievement of short- and long-term aim(s)/objective(s).

46. Did you assess the degree of achievement of the pilot goal(s)/objective(s)?
- a) YES

b) NO – please describe why not and go directly to the question no. 51

.....

(please add as many lines as you need)

c) ANOTHER ANSWER, please provide it

.....

(please add as many lines as you need)

47. What kind of tools/methods did you use to verify this? Please, tick all the tools/methods used.

a)	informal interviews with respondents, talks in casual situations (i.e. telephone, face-to-face ones)	
b)	interviews based on a previously prepared list of questions or a questionnaire (i.e. telephone, face-to-face ones)	
c)	a group discussion, i.e. focus group interviews (i.e. on-line, face-to-face ones)	
d)	a questionnaire distributed among the respondents, the answers are ticked directly by them (i.e. the on-line one)	
e)	an off-line observation (the evaluator records conclusions based on his/her observations i.e. in a previously prepared form/tool)	
f)	an analysis of activities and/or opinions of the respondents (i.e. the city residents) in the Internet (i.e. the number of downloads of a document, the number and the content of posts/comments in portals/social media devoted to the pilot)	
g)	a panel of experts (i.e. the discussion of pilot coordinators with the invited external evaluator)	
h)	other tools/methods, which ones? Please provide it/them. (please add as many lines as you need)	

48. What did you get to know in this way? Please, describe in details all the collected information on the degree of achievement of the pilot goal(s)/objective(s).

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

(please add as many lines as you need)

49. Did you use this information in planning activities/interventions beyond the pilot (to implement after termination of HB project)?

- a) YES
- b) NO – please describe why not and go directly to the question no. 51

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

(please add as many lines as you need)

- c) ANOTHER ANSWER, please provide it

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

(please add as many lines as you need)

50. What kind of activities/interventions do you plan after termination of HB project on the basis of information concerning the achievement of the pilot goal(s)/objective(s)?

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

(please add as many lines as you need)

51. Did you observe/verify/consider conditions of the pilot implementation (factors conducive and impeding its realisation)?

- a) YES
- b) NO – please describe why not and go directly to the question no. 56

.....
.....

.....
 (please add as many lines as you need)

c) ANOTHER ANSWER, please provide it

.....

 (please add as many lines as you need)

52. What kind of tools/methods did you use to verify this? Please, tick all the tools/methods used.

a)	informal interviews with respondents, talks in casual situations (i.e. telephone, face-to-face ones)	
b)	interviews based on a previously prepared list of questions or a questionnaire (i.e. telephone, face-to-face ones)	
c)	a group discussion, i.e. focus group interviews (i.e. on-line, face-to-face ones)	
d)	a questionnaire distributed among the respondents, the answers are ticked directly by them (i.e. the on-line one)	
e)	an off-line observation (the evaluator records conclusions based on his/her observations i.e. in a previously prepared form/tool)	
f)	an analysis of activities and/or opinions of the respondents (i.e. the city residents) in the Internet (i.e. the number of downloads of a document, the number and the content of posts/comments in portals/social media devoted to the pilot)	
g)	a panel of experts (i.e. the discussion of pilot coordinators with the invited external evaluator)	
h)	other tools/methods, which ones? Please provide it/them. (please add as many lines as you need)	

53. What did you get to know in this way? Please, describe in details all the collected information on the conditions of the pilot implementation.

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

(please add as many lines as you need)

54. Did you use this information in planning activities/interventions beyond the pilot (to implement after termination of HB project)?

- a) YES
- b) NO – please describe why not and go directly to the question no. 56

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

(please add as many lines as you need)

- c) ANOTHER ANSWER, please provide it

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

(please add as many lines as you need)

55. What kind of activities/interventions do you plan after termination of HB project on the basis of collected information concerning factors conducive or impeding the pilot implementation?

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

(please add as many lines as you need)

56. Did you verify additional, positive pilot achievements (those outreaching the pilot aim(s)/objective(s), i.e. more recognition of the pilot coordinators/consortium among the city residents, acquaintance of the pilot products/brand among the society)?

- a) YES
- b) NO – please describe why not and go directly to the question no. 61

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

(please add as many lines as you need)

c) ANOTHER ANSWER, please provide it

.....

(please add as many lines as you need)

57. What kind of tools/methods did you use to verify these additional, positive pilot achievements?
 Please, tick all the tools/methods used.

a)	informal interviews with respondents, talks in casual situations (i.e. telephone, face-to-face ones)	
b)	interviews based on a previously prepared list of questions or a questionnaire (i.e. telephone, face-to-face ones)	
c)	a group discussion, i.e. focus group interviews (i.e. on-line, face-to-face ones)	
d)	a questionnaire distributed among the respondents, the answers are ticked directly by them (i.e. the on-line one)	
e)	an off-line observation (the evaluator records conclusions based on his/her observations i.e. in a previously prepared form/tool)	
f)	an analysis of activities and/or opinions of the respondents (i.e. the city residents) in the Internet (i.e. the number of downloads of a document, the number and the content of posts/comments in portals/social media devoted to the pilot)	
g)	a panel of experts (i.e. the discussion of pilot coordinators with the invited external evaluator)	
h)	other tools/methods, which ones? Please provide it/them. (please add as many lines as you need)	

58. What did you get to know in this way? What kind of additional, positive pilot achievements did you identify? Please, describe all the collected information in details.

.....

(please add as many lines as you need)

59. Did you use this information in planning activities/interventions beyond the pilot (to implement after termination of HB project)?

- a) YES
- b) NO – please describe why not and go directly to the question no. 61

.....

.....

.....

(please add as many lines as you need)

- c) ANOTHER ANSWER, please provide it

.....

.....

.....

(please add as many lines as you need)

60. What kind of activities/interventions do you plan after termination of HB project on the basis of collected information concerning additional, positive pilot achievements?

.....

.....

.....

(please add as many lines as you need)

PART 4: The cross-sectoral cooperation in the pilot

61. Did you cooperate with the pilot partners/stakeholders in other health promotion interventions/similar activities/projects before the onset of the HB project?

- a) YES
- b) NO
- c) ANOTHER ANSWER, please provide it

.....

.....

.....

(please add as many lines as you need)

62. During the pilot realisation have there been any ideas to continue the cross-sectoral collaboration in future (after the HB project termination) in implementation of other health promotion projects/similar activities?

- a) YES
- b) NO
- c) ANOTHER ANSWER, please provide it

.....
.....
.....
(please add as many lines as you need)

63. During the pilot implementation did you check the partners'/stakeholders' perceptions/feedback on the cross-sectoral cooperation in the pilot?

- a) YES
- b) NO – please describe why not and go directly to the question no. 66

.....
.....
.....
(please add as many lines as you need)

- c) ANOTHER ANSWER, please provide it

.....
.....
.....
(please add as many lines as you need)

64. What kind of tools/methods did you use to check these perceptions/feedback? Please, tick all the tools/methods used.

a)	informal interviews with partners/stakeholders, talks in casual situations (i.e. telephone, face-to-face ones)	
b)	interviews based on a previously prepared list of questions or a questionnaire (i.e. telephone, face-to-face ones)	
c)	a group discussion, i.e. focus group interviews (i.e. on-line, face-to-face ones)	
d)	a questionnaire distributed among the partners/stakeholders, the answers are ticked directly by them (i.e. the on-line one)	
e)	an off-line observation (the evaluator records conclusions based on his/her observations i.e. in a previously prepared form/tool)	
f)	an analysis of activities and/or opinions of the partners/stakeholders in the Internet (i.e. the number of downloads of a document, the number and the content of posts/comments in portals/social media devoted to the pilot)	
g)	a panel of experts (i.e. the discussion of pilot coordinators with the invited external evaluator)	

h)	other tools/methods, which ones? Please provide it/them.	
	
	(please add as many lines as you need)	

65. What did you get to know in this way. What was the partners'/stakeholder's perceptions/feedback? Please, describe all the collected information in details.

.....

(please add as many lines as you need)

66. Were there any problems/challenges/weaknesses in the cross-sectoral collaboration in the pilot?

- a) YES
- b) NO - go directly to the question no. 72
- c) ANOTHER ANSWER, please provide it

.....

(please add as many lines as you need)

67. Please describe these problems/challenges/weaknesses in details (what was their essence, in which circumstances did they appear?).

.....

(please add as many lines as you need)

68. Did you make use of the model for cross-sectoral cooperation in the process of correcting/modifying the cross-sectoral collaboration in the pilot?

- a) YES
- b) NO – please, describe why not and go directly to the question no. 71

.....

(please add as many lines as you need)

- c) ANOTHER ANSWER, please provide it

.....

(please add as many lines as you need)

69. Please put "V" in the appropriate field(s) in the table to show the domains/stages of the model you used in the process of correcting cross-sectoral cooperation. If you didn't use some domains/stages please put "x".

		STAGES			
		mapping	planning	implementation	assessment
DOMAINS	risk identification				
	leadership				
	communication				
	coordination				
	motivation				

70. Did you find the model for cross-sectoral cooperation helpful in overcoming the problems/challenges/weaknesses and correcting/modifying the cross-sectoral collaboration in the pilot

a) YES - please comment on the answer

.....

(please add as many lines as you need)

b) NO – please describe why not

.....

.....
(please add as many lines as you need)

c) ANOTHER ANSWER, please provide it

.....
.....
.....
(please add as many lines as you need)

71. Did you succeed in overcoming the problems/challenges/weaknesses in the cross-sectoral collaboration in the pilot and correcting/modifying it?

a) YES – please comment on the answer

.....
.....
.....
(please add as many lines as you need)

b) NO – please describe why not

.....
.....
.....
(please add as many lines as you need)

c) ANOTHER ANSWER, please provide it

.....
.....
.....
(please add as many lines as you need)

72. Did you make the pilot partners/stakeholders aware about the model for cross-sectoral cooperation?

a) YES – ALL THE CONSORTIUM PARTERS/STAKEHOLDERS

b) YES – ONLY SOME OF THEM

c) NO – please describe why not and go directly to the question no.79

.....
.....
.....
(please add as many lines as you need)

d) ANOTHER ANSWER, please provide it

.....

(please add as many lines as you need)

73. Did you collect/receive feedback from the pilot partners/stakeholders about their usage of the model for cross-sectoral cooperation?

- a) YES
- b) NO – go directly to the question no. 76
- c) ANOTHER ANSWER, please provide it

.....

(please add as many lines as you need)

74. What kind of tools/methods did you use to collect/receive this kind of feedback from the pilot partners/stakeholders? Please, tick all the tools/methods used.

a)	informal interviews with partners/stakeholders, talks in casual situations (i.e. telephone, face-to-face ones)	
b)	interviews based on a previously prepared list of questions or a questionnaire (i.e. telephone, face-to-face ones)	
c)	a group discussion, i.e. focus group interviews (i.e. on-line, face-to-face ones)	
d)	a questionnaire distributed among the partners/stakeholders, the answers are ticked directly by them (i.e. the on-line one)	
e)	an off-line observation (the evaluator records conclusions based on his/her observations i.e. in a previously prepared form/tool)	
f)	an analysis of activities and/or opinions of the partners/stakeholders in the Internet (i.e. the number of downloads of a document, the number and the content of posts/comments in portals/social media devoted to the pilot)	
g)	a panel of experts (i.e. the discussion of pilot coordinators with the invited external evaluator)	
h)	other tools/methods, which ones? Please provide it/them.	

	<p>.....</p> <p>(please add as many lines as you need)</p>	
--	--	--

75. What did you get to know in this way? What was the partners'/stakeholder's feedback on their usage of the model for cross-sectoral cooperation? Please, describe all the collected information in details.

.....

.....

.....

(please add as many lines as you need)

76. Did you collect/receive pilot partners'/stakeholders' opinions about the model for cross-sectoral cooperation?

- d) YES
- e) NO – go directly to the question no. 79
- f) ANOTHER ANSWER, please provide it

.....

.....

.....

(please add as many lines as you need)

77. What kind of tools/methods did you use to collect/receive such partners'/stakeholders' opinions? Please, tick all the tools/methods used.

a)	informal interviews with partners/stakeholders, talks in casual situations (i.e. telephone, face-to-face ones)	
b)	interviews based on a previously prepared list of questions or a questionnaire (i.e. telephone, face-to-face ones)	
c)	a group discussion, i.e. focus group interviews (i.e. on-line, face-to-face ones)	
d)	a questionnaire distributed among the partners/stakeholders, the answers are ticked directly by them (i.e. the on-line one)	
e)	an off-line observation (the evaluator records conclusions based on his/her observations i.e. in a previously prepared form/tool)	
f)	an analysis of activities and/or opinions of the partners/stakeholders in the Internet (i.e. the number of downloads of a document, the number and the content of posts/comments in portals/social media devoted to the pilot)	

g)	a panel of experts (i.e. the discussion of pilot coordinators with the invited external evaluator)	
h)	other tools/methods, which ones? Please provide it/them. (please add as many lines as you need)	

78. What did you get to know in this way? What were the partners'/stakeholder's opinions on the model for cross-sectoral cooperation? Please, describe all the collected information in details.

.....

(please add as many lines as you need)

PART 5: The assessment of the model for cross-sectoral cooperation

79. Do you think the terminology used in the model for cross-sectoral cooperation is easy to understand?

- a) YES
- b) NO, please provide some examples

.....

(please add as many lines as you need)

- c) ANOTHER ANSWER, please provide it

.....

(please add as many lines as you need)

80. Do you think the structure of the model for cross-sectoral cooperation is logical and clear?

- a) YES
- b) NO, please provide some examples

.....

.....
(please add as many lines as you need)

c) ANOTHER ANSWER, please provide it

.....
.....
.....
(please add as many lines as you need)

81. Please tick the statement concerning the model for cross-sectoral cooperation that fits you the best (please choose only one statement).

a) I HAVEN'T USED THE MODEL WHILE IMPLEMENTING THE PILOT. Please describe in details why not and go directly to question no. 84

.....
.....
.....
(please add as many lines as you need)

b) I HAVE USED THE MODEL BUT IT TURNED OUT TO BE RATHER USELESS. Please provide situations in which you couldn't find in the model practical suggestions worth taking into consideration and then go directly to question no. 84

.....
.....
.....
(please add as many lines as you need)

c) I HAVE USED THE MODEL AND IT TURNED OUT TO BE HELPFUL/USEFUL/PRACTICAL.
d) ANOTHER ANSWER, please provide it

.....
.....
.....
(please add as many lines as you need)

82. Do you think it is easy to find in the model practical clues/suggestions worth taking into consideration in solving/facing the problems/challenges in the cross-sectoral cooperation?

a) YES
b) NO, please provide some examples

.....
.....
.....
(please add as many lines as you need)

c) ANOTHER ANSWER, please provide it

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

(please add as many lines as you need)

83. Please describe in details at least 3 situations in which the model turned out to be useful/helpful/practical.

1.
2.
3.

(please add as many lines as you need)

84. Are there any practical, important issues that were left/ignored in the model for cross-sectoral cooperation?

a) YES – please comment on the answer in details

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

(please add as many lines as you need)

b) NO – please describe why not

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

(please add as many lines as you need)

c) ANOTHER ANSWER, please provide it

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

(please add as many lines as you need)

85. Please write down in the appropriate field(s) in the table information how domains/stages of the model should be improved. Please put in the appropriate fields of the table:

- “x” if you think there is no need for the improvement,
- “v” if you don’t have the opinion on the necessary changes, you don’t know that.

All fields in the table should be filled-in.

	STAGES
--	--------

		mapping	planning	implementation	assessment
DOMAINS	risk identification				
	leadership				
	communication				
	coordination				
	motivation				

If you want to make additional comments on the necessary improvements/changes in the model, please do it below.

.....

(please add as many lines as you need)

86. Do you plan to apply/use the model after the HB project termination?

a) YES – please comment on the answer

.....

(please add as many lines as you need)

b) YES, BUT THERE IS A CONDITION THAT THE MODEL OUGHT TO BE IMPROVED – please comment on the answer

.....

(please add as many lines as you need)

c) NO – please describe why not

.....

(please add as many lines as you need)

d) ANOTHER ANSWER, please provide it

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

(please add as many lines as you need)

87. Is there something else you would like to add/mention about the model that was not covered in the previous questions?

a) YES – please provide your supplement/addition

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

(please add as many lines as you need)

b) NO

Thank you very much for filling in the questionnaire

PART B. The questionnaire concerning the stakeholders’ opinions on the collaboration in the pilot

- 1) Please choose the city where the pilot/intervention is/was implemented.
- a) Cherepovets
 - b) Helsinki
 - c) Jelgava
 - d) Klaipeda
 - e) Poznan
 - f) Pskov
 - g) Suwalki
 - h) Tartu
 - i) Turku

- 2) What kind of organisation/institution do you represent?
- a) NGO
 - b) governmental institution
 - c) local authority
 - d) small or medium enterprise
 - e) preschool, school or university
 - f) another answer – PLEASE PROVIDE IT.
-

- 3) Please assess on the scale from 1 to 5 the opportunities created in the pilot/intervention for you to get to know/meet other stakeholders engaged in the collaboration.

there weren't such opportunities at all	the opportunities were rather small	the opportunities were medium	the opportunities were rather high	the opportunities were very high
1	2	3	4	5

- 4) Please assess on the scale from 1 to 5 the opportunities created in the pilot/intervention for you to develop/set up rules/ways of collaboration with other partners/stakeholders.

there weren't such opportunities at all	the opportunities were rather small	the opportunities were medium	the opportunities were rather high	the opportunities were very high
1	2	3	4	5

5) Please assess on the scale from 1 to 5 the opportunities created in the pilot/intervention for you to engage in improving the collaboration among the partners/stakeholders.

there weren't such opportunities at all	the opportunities were rather small	the opportunities were medium	the opportunities were rather high	the opportunities were very high
1	2	3	4	5

6) Please assess on the scale from 1 to 5 the opportunities created in the pilot/intervention for you to express the opinion on the collaboration among the partners/stakeholders.

there weren't such opportunities at all	the opportunities were rather small	the opportunities were medium	the opportunities were rather high	the opportunities were very high
1	2	3	4	5

7) According to your opinion, were there any problems/challenges/weaknesses in the collaboration during the pilot/intervention?

a) Yes – PLEASE DESCRIBE THEM (WHAT WAS THEIR ESSENCE, IN WHICH CIRCUMSTANCES DID THEY APPEAR?)

.....

b) No

c) Another answer - PLEASE PROVIDE IT.

.....

8) Did you receive any advantageous/benefits due to the collaboration in the pilot/intervention (i.e. new know-how/experience, improved ways/rules of functioning/operation)?

a) Yes – PLEASE, DESCRIBE IT/THEM.

.....

b) No

c) Another answer – PLEASE, PROVIDE IT.

.....

9) Please assess on the scale from 1 to 5 your willingness to continue the established collaboration in future.

There isn't willingness to continue the collaboration	The willingness to collaborate in future is small	The willingness to collaborate in future is medium	The willingness to collaborate in future is rather big	The willingness to collaborate in future is very big
1	2	3	4	5

10) Did your motivation to participate in the pilot/intervention change during the course of time?

PLEASE CHOOSE ONE ANSWER THAT FITS YOU THE BEST.

- a) It declined significantly.
 - b) It declined slightly.
 - c) It increased slightly.
 - d) It increased significantly.
 - e) It remained low through the whole project.
 - f) It remained medium through the whole project.
 - g) It remained high through the whole project.
 - h) Another answer – PLEASE PROVIDE IT.
-