

IMPACT PROJECT EVALUATION

On November - December 2019, a final study was conducted through an online measure in order to evaluate the whole IMPACT Project. Twenty partners ($n = 20$; 11 males and 9 females) from 6 countries (DE, FR, GR, IT, SP, TR), 6 universities (University of Thessaly, University of Grenoble-Alpes, University of Padova, Free University of Bozen, Autonomous University of Barcelona and Hacettepe University), 3 Ministries of Education (Ankara MEM, Greek Ministry of Education and Religion Affairs, Greek Institute of Educational Policy) and 3 PE associations (DSLTV, CAPDI LSM, EUPEA) took part (Table 1).

Table 1. IMPACT partners' country and Institution

Partners	Country						TOTAL
	FR	DE	GR	IT	SP	TR	
CAPDI & LSM				2			2
DSLTV		1					1
EUPEA	1						1
Ankara MEM						2	2
Greek Institute of Educational Policy			1				1
Greek Ministry of Education & Religion Affairs			1				1
University of Padova				1			1
Free University of Bozen				1			1
Hacettepe University						3	3
Autonomous University of Barcelona					1		1
University Grenoble-Alpes	2						2
University of Thessaly			4				4
TOTAL	3	1	6	4	1	5	20

Note. FR = France; DE = Germany; GR = Greece; IT = Italy; SP = Spain; TR = Turkey

The online questionnaire consisted of 15 items evaluating the following IMPACT activities: 1) Outputs as a whole, 2) Quality of developed measures, 3) Quantity of collected data, 4) Quality of webinars, 5) Website, 6) Importance of the IMPACT Project to promote PA, 7) The potential of the ESTIMATE network, 8) Quality of the discussion during the 6 IMPACT Meetings, 9) Quality of the outputs related to the 6 IMPACT Meetings, 10) Quality of the discussion during the many informal/ online Meetings, 11) Quality of the outputs related to the many informal/ online IMPACT Meetings, 12) Quality of the 2 IMPACT Symposia (AIESEP 2018, Edinburgh, UK; FEPSAC 2019, Muenster, Germany), 13) Satisfaction of the consortium's work as a whole, 14) Satisfaction of the IMPACT Project coordination and 15) Satisfaction of the IMPACT partners in general or specifically. All answers were given in 5-point Likert scales from 1 (Not at All or Very Low or Very Bad) to 5 (A Lot or Very High or Very Good, respectively). More specifically, regarding **IMPACT outputs as a whole** (Table 2), the vast majority reported that they were good or very good (95%).

Table 2. Evaluation of the IMPACT Outputs as a whole

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Moderate	1	5.0	5.0
Good	7	35.0	40.0
Very Good	12	60.0	100.0
Total	20	100.0	

Regarding the **quality of the developed measures** (Table 3), the vast majority reported that they were good or very good (90%).

Table 3. Evaluation of the quality of the IMPACT developed measures

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Moderate	2	10.0	10.0
Good	8	40.0	50.0
Very Good	10	50.0	100.0
Total	20	100.0	

Regarding the **quantity of the collected data** (Table 4), the vast majority reported that they were high or very high (90%).

Table 4. Evaluation of the quantity of the IMPACT collected data

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
High	12	60.0	60.0
Very High	8	40.0	100.0
Total	20	100.0	

Regarding the **quality of the webinars** (Table 5), the vast majority reported that they were high or very high (90%).

Table 5. Evaluation of the quality of the IMPACT webinars

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Fair	2	10.0	10.0
High	8	40.0	50.0
Very High	10	50.0	100.0
Total	20	100.0	

Regarding the **IMPACT website** (Table 6), the vast majority reported that was good or very good (95%).

Table 6. Evaluation of the IMPACT website

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Moderate	1	5.0	5.0
Good	8	40.0	45.0
Very Good	11	55.0	100.0
Total	20	100.0	

Regarding the **importance of the IMPACT Project to promote PA** (Table 7), the vast majority again reported that was good or very good (90%).

Table 7. Evaluation of the importance of the IMPACT Project to promote PA

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Low	1	5.0	5.0
Moderate	1	5.0	10.0
Good	7	35.0	45.0
Very Good	11	55.0	100.0
Total	20	100.0	

Regarding the **potential of the ESTIMATE network** (Table 8), the vast majority reported that it was high or very high (65%).

Table 8. Evaluation of the potential of the ESTIMATE network

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Fair	7	35.0	35.0
High	7	35.0	70.0
Very High	6	30.0	100.0
Total	20	100.0	

Regarding the **quality of discussions during the 6 IMPACT Meetings** (Table 9), the vast majority of the participants reported that it was high or very high (85%).

Table 9. Evaluation of the quality of discussions during the 6 IMPACT Meetings

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Fair	3	15.0	15.0
High	7	35.0	50.0
Very High	10	50.0	100.0
Total	20	100.0	

Regarding the **quality of the outputs related to the 6 IMPACT Meetings** (Table 10), the vast majority reported that it was high or very high (75%).

Table 10. Evaluation of the quality of the outputs related to the 6 IMPACT Meetings

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Fair	5	25.0	25.0
High	5	25.0	50.0
Very High	10	50.0	100.0
Total	20	100.0	

Regarding the **discussions' quality during the many informal/ online IMPACT Meetings** (Table 11), the vast majority of the participants reported that was high or very high (80%).

Table 11. Evaluation of the discussions' quality during the many informal/ online Meetings

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Fair	4	20.0	20.0
High	8	40.0	60.0
Very High	8	40.0	100.0
Total	20	100.0	

Regarding the **outputs' quality related to the many informal/ online IMPACT Meetings** (Table 12), the vast majority of the participants reported that was high or very high (80%).

Table 12. Evaluation of the outputs' quality related to the many informal/ online IMPACT Meetings

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Low	1	5.0	5.0
Fair	3	15.0	20.0
High	7	35.0	55.0
Very High	9	45.0	100.0
Total	20	100.0	

Regarding the **quality of the 2 IMPACT Symposia** (Table 13), the vast majority again reported that it was high or very high (90%).

Table 13. Evaluation of the quality of the 2 IMPACT Symposia (AIESEP 2018; FEPSAC 2019)

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Fair	2	10.0	10.0
High	9	45.0	55.0

Very High	9	45.0	100.0
Total	20	100.0	

Regarding the **satisfaction of the consortium's work as a whole** (Table 14), the vast majority reported that was quite or very satisfied with the group work (85%).

Table 14. Evaluation of the consortium's work as a whole

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Somewhat	3	15.0	15.0
Quite	5	25.0	40.0
A Lot	12	60.0	100.0
Total	20	100.0	

Regarding their **satisfaction with the IMPACT Project coordination** (Table 15), the vast majority reported that it was quite or very satisfied (90%).

Table 15. Evaluation of the IMPACT Project coordination

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Rather no	1	5.0	5.0
Somewhat	1	5.0	10.0
Quite	6	30.0	40.0
A Lot	12	60.0	100.0
Total	20	100.0	

Finally, regarding their **satisfaction with the IMPACT partners in general or specifically** (Table 16), the vast majority reported that it was quite or very satisfied (85%).

Table 16. Evaluation of the IMPACT partners

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Somewhat	3	15.0	15.0
Quite	7	35.0	50.0
A Lot	10	50.0	100.0
Total	20	100.0	