



Project Mégapoles

Network of European Union Capitals
for Health Promotion and Prevention

Growing Old in Metropolitan Areas

„Mega View“
Questionnaire



Instruments for successful transfer of know-how within the city network: MegaView Tool

MegaView: Main features

Objective: evaluation of projects for health promotion and prevention in cities

Method: peer review using an evaluation structure according to the target definitions of the city network M gapoles and a manual for process design and process management

Outcome: the results of the evaluation can help decision makers in the health care system to judge the effectiveness, sustainability, and transferability of projects and decide about further development. Results can be used by project providers as a tool for quality improvement.

Target group: politicians, decision makers, project managers

The evaluation has been developed by an expert group from the M gapoles network in the course of two workshops and with the expert advice of David Evans, University of Southampton.

The development of the evaluation manual was based on the experiences of the peers who have used the evaluation method for the first time within the sub-network "Growing Old in Metropolitan Areas".

Contact:

Co-ordinator of the Subnetwork:

Dr Hannes Schmidl

City of Vienna, MA L | Health Planning Department
Schottenring 24
AT-1010 Vienna
Phone: + 43 1 53114 76051
Fax: + 43 1 53114 7974
e-mail: sch@mal.magwien.gv.at

Scientific Support & Process Design:

Dr Ursula Trummer

Institute for Interventional Sociology
Kaiserstr. 103/5
AT-1070 Vienna
Phone: + 43 1 5229415
and Ludwig Boltzmann-Institute for the Sociology of Health and Medicine
Phone: +43 1 4277 48280
Fax: +43 1 4277 48290
e-mail: uschi.trummer@univie.ac.at

filled in by:

Date/...../.....

Name

.....

Address

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

Phone

.....

Fax

.....

E-mail

.....

1. Contact information

Project name

.....
.....

Address

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

Phone

.....

Fax

.....

E-mail

.....

Project contact person

.....
.....

Contact person peer-group ("local organiser")

.....
.....

4. Stated project aims and objectives (expected/desired outcomes)

Main aim(s)

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Objective 1

.....

.....

.....

.....

Objective 2

.....

.....

.....

.....

Objective 3

.....

.....

.....

.....

Objective 4

.....

.....

.....

.....

7. Target population/users

Target population

.....
.....

Size and socio-demographic features of population

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

How are the needs of the target group determined?

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

8. Activities

Main activities of the Project

provide examples (peer education, action learning, policy development etc.)

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

8.1. Methods

Methods used in the project

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

9. Organisation

Management arrangements

(who leads the project, e.g. steering committee/membership)

.....
.....

Extent of user/community involvement

.....
.....

Partnerships with other organisations

.....
.....

Staffing

(number of people involved in paid and unpaid staff)

.....
.....

10. Finance

Source, amount and length of time funding provided

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

Part 1

Direct and indirect costs

if hard data are not available try to identify what contributes to indirect costs, e.g. free premises, involvement of volunteers, use of other professionals

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

How are funding priorities within the project decided?

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

11. Sustainability

Is an exit strategy in place?

achieved*

(e.g. are services users being trained to continue the work of the project)

Comment

Is future funding likely to be obtained?

achieved*

Comment

Do stakeholders support the project?

achieved*

(funders, workers, policy makers)

Comment

Is the project going to be incorporated as a regular service?

achieved*

Comment

12. Project evaluation

Is there an evaluation plan?

.....
.....

If yes...

What type of evaluation?

(e.g. monitoring, process, outcome, economic)

.....
.....

Evaluation design and methods

(e.g. qualitative/quantitative; type)

.....
.....

Evaluation/annual reports

(e.g. what is now available and in which languages, authors, publishers?)

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

13. Project evaluation results

What results did the evaluation done so far show?

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

Part 2 Evaluation by Peers

1. Performance in relation to project objectives as identified in dialogue between project and review team

Main aim(s)

achieved*

Evidence

Comment

Objective 1

achieved*

Evidence

Comment

Objective 2

achieved*

Evidence

Comment

Objective 3

achieved*

Evidence

Comment

Objective 4

achieved*

Evidence

Comment

2. Performance against criteria of reducing inequalities in health, sustainability and transferability

Reducing inequalities in health

Does the project have measurable objectives for reducing inequalities in health status? applies*

Comment

.....

.....

.....

.....

Are there processes in place for addressing inequalities - e.g. improving access to services? applies*

Comment

.....

.....

.....

.....

Does it target disadvantaged groups? applies*

Comment

.....

.....

.....

.....

Does the project address wider determinants of health? applies*
(e.g. housing, employment, income, environment)

Comment

.....

.....

.....

.....

* please fill in: mostly (m), partly (p), hardly (h)

Part 2

Transferability to other capital cities

Are the project structures and methods dependent on the particular health care system?

applies*

Comment

.....

.....

.....

Is it relatively cheap to implement?

applies*

Comment

.....

.....

.....

Does it address problems found in other cities?

applies*

Comment

.....

.....

.....

Is the problem well defined/specific?

applies*

Comment

.....

.....

.....

Is the project innovative?

applies*

Comment

.....

.....

.....

Sustainability

Is the project part of future planning?

applies*

Comment

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Is the project already “routine”?

applies*

Comment

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Would project work without the present project leaders?

applies*

Comment

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

* please fill in: mostly (m), partly (p), hardly (h)

3. Unexpected effects

Positive

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Negative

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

4. Enabling factors and obstacles to progress

Enabling factors

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Obstacles to progress

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

5. Feedback

Is there feedback to the project from users, funders, staff, others?

yes:

.....
.....

no

How is such feedback collected by the project?

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

How is this feedback used by the project?

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

6. Overall impressions/observations

(including sustainability)

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

Review Team

Name 1

Address

Phone

Fax

E-mail

Name 2

Address

Phone

Fax

E-mail

Name 3

Address

Phone

Fax

E-mail

„Mega View“ Questionnaire

Impressum:

Homepage

<http://www.megapoles.com>

Co-ordination

DI Dr. Hannes Schmidl
Mag.Dr. Ursula Trummer

Translation

Mag. Eva Hirsch

Design

Alexander Popp
alexander.popp@univie.ac.at

Photos

Projects and Co-ordinators from the Network-Cities
Seniorenhilfe Junge Panther

Printer

REMA-Print

December 2000