EVALUATION FORM

Evaluation of the international module life-long learning in the field of heritage preservation.

The project funded by Erasmus+, entitled: International Cooperation for Professional Training in Heritage Conservation – Heritage Train

Name of the evaluator: Dr. Renate Breuss, Art Historian, Teacher and Crafts Researcher, 6830 Rankweil, Vorarlberg

Question 1:

Does the outlined training system *correspond to the current needs, possibilities and conditions*?
Is it a *suitable tool* for the professional training in the field of monument care?

YES   **RATHER YES**   NA/not applicable   RATHER NO   NO

Comments/ recommendations of the evaluator:
Rather yes.

The outlined system builds up on the needs and conditions of the particpated neighbourstates, sharing their different competences and experiences. The undertaken surveys among potential providers show the lack of professional training possibilities in built heritage in all three countries. I recommend to complete the quanitative results with qualitative feedback given and documented in the context of existing seminars, workshops and events such as care and repair f.e. in Mauerbach.

I would like to have mentioned that the program has the potential to increase the attention for the ICH (intangible culture heritage), that tangible cultural assets cannot be viewed isolated from traditional craftsmanship to which they owe their emergence and preservation. In built heritage the skills related to craftsmanship are in danger. This point could be explained clearly.

Raise the awareness for the sustainable issues of built heritage explicitly, f.e. in the units adressing the properties of materials and facades.

Furthermore I would recommend to give a better imagination of the target groups, to give a short description of what is meant by owners (private or institutional ones), by craftsmen (professions/skills), by the staff of the monument boards and governments. We all know about the traditional professions in the cultural heritage, but many of us do not know aobut emerging professions and skills, needed and practised in CH nowadays. Such as Data and Website Managers, Community and Education Officers, 3D-Conservations experts and so on. These professions and skills might match the young staff of the monument boards.

I miss annotations, where all the recommendations and notes could be placed.

Question No. 2:
Is the outlined system arranged in a *clear and understandable* way?

YES   **RATHER YES**   NA/not applicable   RATHER NO   NO

Comments/ recommendations of the evaluator:
Rather yes.
The cross-sector program is actually predestined to bridge the gap between owners, craftsmen and academics. It connects knowledge and people in a collegiate approach. In this sense I would give the formats of workshops and groupworks more space, next to the frontal lectures.

To reach people who do not speak English, you should offer some courses in the regional language or if possible hold it bi-lingual (german/English).

Doublecheck the terminologies in order to avoid missunderstandings in the field.

The modul of „private owner", in the curricula numbered as M1 is confusing - as it is not part of the basic modules (M1 - M8). Number it sequentially, f.e. M11.

Question 3:
Does the outlined training system *support and satisfy* the professionally oriented training for the specific target groups?

YES   RATHER YES   NA/not applicable   RATHER NO   NO

Comments/ recommendations of the evaluator:

Yes.
In Slovakia the most targeted group are the employees of the monument board, specially newcomers from the emerging fields of cultural heritage professions. The basic program (modules 1-8) is laid out mainly for this target group, but it is also open for professionals with experience in built heritage. I recommend to provide the targeted groups with specific
content and learnig outcome of a selectable unit within a modul.

The basic program closes with a final workshop, in which all target groups come together. Make sure that architects, restorers and practically skilled people join this unit. In this way participants experience the multidisciplinary and complex enviroment of the built heritage. Furthermore, this closing unit in the format of an interactive workshop is predestined to build a closer link between work-based and theoretical learning, and supports the coming up of individual questions and needs.

In an advanced modul craftspeople gain an elementary understanding of historic buildings, principles and materials of built heritage. Next to the circumstance, that all different crafts work practically together they gain an awareness of the responsibility of crafts in this sector.

Private owners are adressed in an extra modul. Values and perceptive qualities of historic buildings raise awareness for built heritage in a new and potential audience. As private owners

are good multipliers of CH - this is a very innovative step in the training program.

Special moduls communicate methods of conservation and restoration in built heritage. Craftsmen with experience in heritage preservation should be adressed clearly to join, to make them familiar with the common concepts and scientific methods in this field.

Open units reflecting emerging issues and topics on site (excursions) could even be forced.

Question 4:

Are the modules and units designed in accordance with the *anticipated demands* for life long learning of the specific target groups? Do they correspond to *the needs and requests* that emerged from the questionnaire survey?

YES   **RATHER YES**   NA/not applicable   RATHER NO   NO

Comments/ recommendations of the evaluator:
Rather yes.

In the big field of non-formal activities and events (mainly NGO´s and volunteers) the proposed training program offers an interdisciplinary and professionally coordinated approach to built heritage.

To guarantee a training in a good mix of skilled practise and theoretical knowledge the wanted qualifications of teachers and educators might be listed in a profile.
The results of the questionnaire survey are taken into account, the favoured topics of materials and technologies, survey methods and documentation are main moduls and subjects in the basic program.

Question 5:

Do the outlined units in the specific education modules cover the expected needs of professional training in a *corresponding scale and amount*?

YES   RATHER YES   NA/not applicable   RATHER NO   NO

Comments/ recommendations of the evaluator:
Yes.

The program offers training units of 2 to 3 days, this covers the expected needs expressed in the questionaires.

Question 6:

Is the amount of *theoretical and practical education in balance*?

| | YES | RATHER YES | NA/not applicable | RATHER NO | NO |

Comments/ recommendations of the evaluator:
More or less.

The program consists of theoretical and practical parts. If you look at the hours of the units, the theoretical parts in seminars and lectures dominate.

A description of the difference between seminar and lecture might improve balance already. Otherwise I would increase the excersises and practical work, experiencing the learnt subjects by doing virtual and real projects, allowing and supporting work-based assessment.

Question 7:

Does the *time allocation* of outlined modules/units correspond to the expected needs and goals of life-long learning?

| | YES | RATHER YES | NA/not applicable | RATHER NO | NO |

Comments/ recommendations of the evaluator:
Hard to say.

The program does offer an opportunity in Life Long Learning, for entrants and professionals interested in continuing improving or even career-changing.

The challenge will be to convice the employers and the businesses, next to the learners about the profits and benefits obtained. If the employers recommend and pay their employees the participation of the basic program with a durage of 3 - 12 days it sounds ok.

To convince freelancers and handicraft businesses I think they need to be informed very clearly about the advantages and qualifications of the training program with its selectable units.

Core Competences that individuals or a target group gain from the training should be mentioned in the learning outcomes, as done in the paper for private owners and built heritage crafts.

Question 8:

Does the outlined training system make use of corresponding and optimal *education forms*?

YES   **RATHER YES**   NA/not applicable   RATHER NO   NO

Comments/ recommendations of the evaluator:
Rather yes.

Support interaction in lessons and seminars.
Use interactive tools in the online formats.

Question 9:

Is the outlined system *able to respond* to the new topics and needs of the specific target groups in a *flexible way*?

YES   RATHER YES   NA/not applicable   RATHER NO   NO

Comments/ recommendations of the evaluator:

Yes.
The structure in modules with freely selectable units is created as a flexible and open system.
It is open for adjustments and corrections, after pilot trainings and first experiences.

Question 10:

Could the outlined system be considered as *sustainable model*?

YES   **RATHER YES**   NA/not applicable   RATHER NO   NO

Comments/ recommendations of the evaluator:
Rather yes.

As far as I can judge this from the acutal point of view, the system allows adding and skipping units and modules and allows responding to new challenges and needs.

Any further comments?

The program offers excursions and learning on site. I recommend to think about building up a coordinated list of buildings and examples, representing different types of contents, practises, applications and ways of problem solving. In this way the regional differences and/or similarities occur on the living examples and cases.

EVALUATION FORM

Evaluation of the proposed model of life-long learning in the field of heritage conservation.

Project: International Cooperation for Professional Training in Heritage Conservation - Heritage Train

Name of the evaluator: Miloš Drdácký

Question 1:
Does the outlined training system correspond to the current needs, possibilities and conditions?
Is it a suitable tool for professional training in the field of monument care?

YES   RATHER YES   NA/not applicable   RATHER NO   NO

Evaluator's comment/recommendation:
In the introductory text, the project is presented as "Built Heritage Conservation". The word "built" is omitted from the questionnaire. If it were not a building cultural heritage, then the system would not cover the current needs, but it is probably just an error due to inconsistency. The program marginally touches on current global topics, however more time could be devoted to them. The time allocation has a somewhat schematic impression - for example, it is the same for stone as for wood, glass and metals together. Short annotations of the content of the subjects would help, which would point out duplications and missing parts. Nevertheless, the proposal meets the requirements obtained by an admirably extensive survey and is therefore a suitable tool for further education in the field of heritage conservation.

Question 2:
Is the outlined system arranged in a clear and understandable way?

YES   RATHER YES   NA/not applicable   RATHER NO   NO

Evaluator's comment/recommendation:
Potential applicants would certainly welcome short subject annotations for orientation when choosing a module.

Question 3:
Does the outlined training system support and satisfy the professionally oriented training for the specific target groups?

YES   **RATHER YES**   NA/not applicable   RATHER NO   NO

Evaluator's comment/recommendation:

The contents of the program can only be estimated from the names of the individual subjects. The program seems to be very academically designed in some parts. In my experience, preservationists would appreciate more practical information, usually presented in the form of "case studies" and practical examples.

Question 4:
Are the modules and units designed in accordance with the anticipated demands for life-long learning of the specific target groups? Do they correspond to the needs and requests that emerged from the questionnaire survey?

YES   **RATHER YES**   NA/not applicable   RATHER NO   NO

Evaluator's comment/recommendation:
The content of the program is very broad and I cannot estimate how it is in accordance with the needs of the individuals who will be included in the target groups since they are very incoherent. Those interested will consider what is beneficial for them in terms of the time they devote to education. They can of course be forced by employers, but that is probably not the right thing to do. They will certainly consider time requirements, which can be seen from the large percentage of preferences for weekend courses.

Question 5:
Do the outlined units in the specific education modules cover the expected needs of professional training in a corresponding scale and amount?

YES   **RATHER YES**   NA/not applicable   RATHER NO   NO

Evaluator's comment/recommendation:
This question is answered by my responses to previous questions.

Question 6:
Is the amount of theoretical and practical education in balance?

YES   RATHER YES   **NA/not applicable**   RATHER NO   NO

Evaluator's comment/recommendation:

I can't assess it from the program itself, where, apart from the hands-on mark, there will be any practical demonstrations, presentations or exercises. At first glance, this is more of a theoretical education. Perhaps the designation "workshop" is intended for practical exercises - the title of the course does not indicate this.

Question 7:
Does the time allocation of outlined modules/units correspond to the expected needs and goals of life-long learning?

YES   **RATHER YES**   NA/not applicable   RATHER NO   NO

Evaluator's comment/recommendation:

As I mentioned above, some time allowances can be unbalanced. There may still be duplications or, on the contrary, gaps in focus. But to sum up, these critical remarks do not lower the intent and quality of the proposed learning program.

Question 8:
Does the outlined training system make use of corresponding and optimal education forms?

YES   RATHER YES   **NA/not applicable**   RATHER NO   NO

Evaluator's comment/recommendation:

In the proposal, apart from a note about the possibility of online teaching, the form of teaching is not described in more detail. The type of learning activity (lecture, etc.) could perhaps be specified.

Question 9:
Is the outlined system able to respond to the new topics and needs of the specific target groups in a flexible way?

YES   RATHER YES   NA/not applicable   RATHER NO   NO

Evaluator's comment/recommendation:
According to the initial overview, the system should allow this. However, project management is not described in detail.

Question 10:
Could the outlined system be considered a sustainable model?

YES   RATHER YES   **NA/not applicable**   RATHER NO   NO

Evaluator's comment/recommendation:
It is very uncertain to predict anything in the education system, but the model could be sustainable. It would probably be wise to plan some kind of evaluation after about 3-5 years and propose the necessary adaptations.

Any further comments?

EVALUATION FORM

Evaluation of the proposed model of life-long learning in the field of heritage conservation.

Project: International Cooperation for Professional Training in Heritage Conservation - Heritage Train

Name of the evaluator: Ing. arch. Viera Dvořáková, PhD.

Question 1:
Does the outlined training system correspond to the current needs, possibilities and conditions?
Is it a suitable tool for professional training in the field of monument care?

YES   **RATHER YES**   NA/not applicable   RATHER NO   NO

Evaluator's comment/recommendation:
The proposed system basically covers the needs arising from the expectations of the designated target groups participating in the restoration processes of the monuments. Education system is clearly designed so that individual professions and target groups have the opportunity to familiarize themselves not only with what belongs to their sphere of activity but also with what is the task of various other disciplines which they must follow and enforce. Since such a complex system of training for the affected professions is not offered in Slovakia, the proposed system is really essential. However, when preparing it, it is necessary to pay attention to the fact that different professions have different priorities regarding the topics and therefore often have different understandings of individual goals and also often use different terminology. This is even more evident when interpreting from and into English (nowadays being a sensitive issue in Slovakia). I assume that this might affect the training system and result in corrections and modifications of the designed curriculum in the future as soon as the system is being launched.

Question 2:
Is the outlined system arranged in a clear and understandable way?

YES   RATHER YES   NA/not applicable   RATHER NO   NO

Evaluator's comment/recommendation:
Even if the system seems complicated at first glance, its construction is clear and understandable. Comprehension can be made difficult by the used English terminology - e.g. "care and protection" would perhaps be better replaced by the expressions "conservation and restoration". (e.g. U17.P2)

Question 3:
Does the outlined training system support and satisfy the professionally oriented training for the specific target groups?

YES   RATHER YES   NA/not applicable   RATHER NO   NO

Evaluator's comment/recommendation:

Yes, the system has all the prerequisites for it.
Preservationists have a strong need to become familiar with historical materials and technologies. Although they have to work with them, they have gained only a little or even no knowledge about it during their university studies.
Although the project focuses on three countries from the same Central European region, attention must be paid to regional differences not only in materials and constructions, but also in technologies. It should also be noted that nowadays the methods and methodologies of monument protection are discussed globally. It is therefore not possible for an individual to follow all substantial trends in such a way as to avoid incorrect interpretation or direction (especially with limited language skills).

Education will facilitate access to many issues and help to search for and apply scientifically proven methods and methodologies.
I also consider the need to distinguish between individual target groups when setting up individual moduls to be a problem. For example, in the case of M1, the participation of experienced craftsmen and owners is assumed, therefore too much time is calculated for some parts of the theoretical (U1) and legislative (U2) blocks. Basic information in these areas would be enough for them, they certainly do not need to go in depth. Although, on the other hand, we have such an experience that when the owners start studying the questions of the methodology of monument protection, they explain it in their own way and only look for arguments in favour of their own solution, which is rejected by the authorities. For owners, practical demonstrations focused on specific maintenance and damage prevention are certainly more important since today one of the advertising slogans in the construction industry is "maintenance-free". In this respect, the special M1 module is a suitable basis designed especially for them.

Question 4:
Are the modules and units designed in accordance with the anticipated demands for life-long learning of the specific target groups? Do they correspond to the needs and requests that emerged from the questionnaire survey?

YES   **RATHER YES**   NA/not applicable   RATHER NO   NO

Evaluator's comment/recommendation:
It will be necessary to take into account the different special training needs of some target groups - e.g. preservationists (civil servants in Slovakia) undoubtedly need a greater volume of training in legislation, not only in monument legislation, but also in the Act on Administrative Procedure, the Construction Act, etc. On the other hand, in case of owners, it will be necessary to focus on understanding those values of the property they manage, which are not initially evident, or in their understanding, there are no values. I did not notice this aspect in the program.

Question 5:
Do the outlined units in the specific education modules cover the expected needs of professional training in a corresponding scale and amount?

YES   **RATHER YES**   NA/not applicable   RATHER NO   NO

Evaluator's comment/recommendation:
Following the previous comments, it will be necessary to think about time modifications in some cases, in simple terms, less theory especially for owners and more practical demonstrations and workshops.

Question 6:
Is the amount of theoretical and practical education in balance?

YES   **RATHER YES**   NA/not applicable   RATHER NO   NO

Evaluator's comment/recommendation:
In general, yes. When examining in more detail from the position of individual target groups, I consider it necessary (as I mentioned above) in some areas to apply less theory in favour of practical demonstrations and exercises.

Question 7:
Does the time allocation of outlined modules/units correspond to the expected needs and goals of life-long learning?

YES   **RATHER YES**   NA/not applicable   RATHER NO   NO

Evaluator's comment/recommendation:
At this stage it seems appropriate, but it should be assumed that corrections will be necessary in the future.

Question 8:
Does the outlined training system make use of corresponding and optimal education forms?

YES   **RATHER YES**   NA/not applicable   RATHER NO   NO
Komentář / doporučení hodnotitele:

Question 9:
Is the outlined system able to respond to the new topics and needs of the specific target groups in a flexible way?

YES   RATHER YES   **NA/not applicable**   RATHER NO   NO

Evaluator's comment/recommendation:
However, I suppose it is possible. Competent and experienced lecturers will be a crucial factor.

Question 10:
Could the outlined system be considered a sustainable model?

YES   RATHER YES   **NA/not applicable**   RATHER NO   NO

Evaluator's comment/recommendation:
I cannot evaluate this from the proposed model since I am not aware of long-term funding sources. Perhaps it would be appropriate to address this type of education as an interdisciplinary one. Another solution could be that completion of some educational/training moduls would be recommended for prepared or intended specialisations within the Chamber of Civil Engineers and Architects, or for holders of certificates for carrying out historical research.

Any further comments?

• Ad participants of the training:
I would recommend adding the decision-makers (i.e. relevant departments of the Ministry of Culture and members of the cultural committee of the Slovak Parliament to the group of local and regional self-governments.
Despite the fact that restorers and their professional chamber in Slovakia do not respond to this topic, it is not not possible to avoid them.
• Ad modules:
I believe that the proposed system will allow flexible handling of blocks according to the needs of individual groups of participants and makes the system more variable.
• Ad several general topics:
It is a request to lecturers: it is necessary to focus attention on regional aspects in the field of the development of architecture and art, the use of typical materials and techniques
 • In module M7, in parts U9 and U10, I draw attention to important special material for solving urban issues in protected areas - these are the principles of monument protection. Clearly, education in this area is necessary, useful and should be started as soon as possible.

EVALUATION FORM
Evaluation of the international module of life-long learning
in the field of heritage preservation.

The project funded by Erasmus+, entitled: International Cooperation for Professional Training
in Heritage Conservation – Heritage Train

Name of the evaluator: prof. Koenraad Van Balen, University of Leuven, Belgium

---

Question 1 :
Does the outlined training system *correspond to the current needs, possibilities and conditions*? Is it a *suitable tool* for professional training in the field of monument care?

YES   **RATHER YES**   NA/not applicable   RATHER NO   NO

Comments/ recommendations of the evaluator: Rather Yes

I am convinced that there are training needs for the various target groups in the format of lifelong learning allowing for regular updates and to create an environment of mutual understanding between the different target groups mentioned, considering the interdisciplinary nature of the preservation of cultural heritage.
While not explicitly mentioned in the title of the proposed training, the way the survey has been done (as far as I can understand from exchanges, the PowerPoint presentation) is merely targeting the conservation & restoration of historic buildings. This seems justified by the profile of the organisations involved in the implementation and as existing course or educational modules at those organisations are inputted in the implementation of the proposed program. It therefore may overlook the intangible heritage perspective of the craftsmanship involved in the program.

It is advised to be very clear on the scope of the program to avoid misunderstandings. As an overall comment, I should say that various items in the program are ambitious regarding the time allocated for certain topic. It may help to rather join the number of hours for each unit within a module rather than assigning specific hours for each part of a unit. This would give some flexibility in allocation of hours.

For M8: I would only accept participants that went through the previous 7 modules, no other "experienced" people as preliminary jointly shared information is highly contributing to the outcome of group work and seminars.
It could be considered to enlarge the potential outcome of learning efforts to give groups some homework in between sessions, so participants can (digitally) interact with each other meanwhile, seek information by themselves and also maybe identify specific solutions or approaches of their own region, knowledge which can later on be shared with others.

M10 U23-U26: I would suggest to refer in the title as well to restoration aside conservation!

Considering some of the introductions given at each group of modules (e.g. *others are recommended to take modules M3 and M4 firstly*) it may: it would be good to draft a few trajectories for a specific type of audience. It may also help to have a better understanding about the variety in the audience that is targeted at the same time.

I also think that private owners (could be extended to heritage building managers? Could be extended to non-private owners?) should get some more general introductions (theory, legal) but also better understanding of the required interactions with other players/stakeholders.

Involving them in some of the groups' activities of the other courses may also help to bring in their own perspective towards the "professionals" and administrators.

Experience in Flanders has also shown that improving (preventive) conservation benefits from facilitating the interaction and sharing of information between owners/managers (see them as a community) which helps them to find solutions based on shared needs and experiences. So part of the course for owners/managers could focus on that.

Question 2:
Is the outlined system arranged in a *clear and understandable* way?

YES   **RATHER YES**   NA/not applicable   RATHER NO   NO

Comments/ recommendations of the evaluator: RATHER YES
See comments above which could help to improve.
Particularly outlining "learning" paths for different profiles could help; also clarifying clearly which modules or units are compulsory prerequisites for a certain module or unit. This would also strengthen and clarify the lifelong learning nature of the course.

Question 3:
Does the outlined training system *support and satisfy* the professionally oriented training for the specific target groups?

YES   **RATHER YES**   NA/not applicable   RATHER NO   NO

Comments/ recommendations of the evaluator:

YES, seems so, based on the surveys presented. However it may also be interesting after a short time to seek input from less obvious profiles, question more systematically the variety of actors involved, not to forget even the communities that live in the environment or may be involved in keeping the historic buildings alive and well maintained.

Question 4:
Are the modules and units designed in accordance with the *anticipated demands* for life-long learning of the specific target groups? Do they correspond to *the needs and requests* that emerged from the questionnaire survey?

YES   **RATHER YES**   NA/not applicable   RATHER NO   NO

Comments/ recommendations of the evaluator: RATHER YES
(see comments supra)

Question 5:
Do the outlined units in the specific education modules cover the expected needs of professional training in a *corresponding scale and amount*?

| YES | **RATHER YES** | NA/not applicable | RATHER NO | NO |

Comments/ recommendations of the evaluator: RATHER YES
The input from the questionnaires and survey has been taken on board, but it may appear after a certain time that other (related needs) were not covered by the survey and questionnaire. In that

respect a thorough analysis of processes on the ground, identifying challenges, bottle necks, all actors involved could help to have a better response to the ever evolving needs. It may also help to monitor the impact of the course offered and followed.

Question 6:
Is the amount of *theoretical and practical education in balance*?

| YES | **RATHER YES** | NA/not applicable | RATHER NO | NO |

Comments/ recommendations of the evaluator:

YES, I think so but I would suggest strengthening the aspect of making groups, allow them to work together "over" different Units and Modules and include the possibility to do homework which is shared with a larger group. Groups should preferentially include different skills and profiles.

Question 7:
Does the *time allocation* of outlined modules/units correspond to the expected needs and goals of life-long learning?

| YES | **RATHER YES** | NA/not applicable | RATHER NO | NO |

Comments/ recommendations of the evaluator:

YES - in line with expectations of the people involved in the survey

Question 8:
Does the outlined training system make use of corresponding and optimal *education forms*?

| YES | **RATHER YES** | NA/not applicable | RATHER NO | NO |

Comments/ recommendations of the evaluator: RATHER YES
See comments above: homework and self-learning (even in group) could be included.

Question 9:
Is the outlined system *able to respond* to the new topics and needs of the specific target groups in a *flexible way*?

| YES | **<u>RATHER YES</u>** | NA/not applicable | RATHER NO | NO |

Comments/ recommendations of the evaluator: RATHER YES
See suggestions and comments supra

Question 10:
Could the outlined system be considered a sustainable *model*?

| YES | **<u>RATHER YES</u>** | NA/not applicable | RATHER NO | NO |

Comments/ recommendations of the evaluator: RATHER YES
It makes use of existing courses at different institutes which increases the sustainability; all depends also on the "market" which means the number of potential participants which on its turn may depend on the amount of external "pressure" that exist on them to follow training (e.g. training requirements imposed by owners, managers, authorities to be allowed to work)

Any further comments?