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WHY GEROM?

• aim: development of an internationally oriented online gerontological master programme
  - lifelong learning programme of the European Union
  - 6 European countries collaborating

• ageing society – increasing necessity to care for older people
  - low reputation of gerontological nursing

• need for internationally oriented curricula
  - academisation and professionalisation of nursing
  - increased mobility within the European healthcare market
  - growing cultural diversity

(EU Health Policy Forum, 2003; Kada & Brunner, in press; Lindert et al., 2008; Oswald et al., 2008; Scott, 2008; Statistik Austria, 2008; Zabalegui et al., 2006)
SOME FACTS ABOUT GEROM

• Partner organizations:
  - University of Maribor, University of Oulu, Medical University Plovdiv, University College Dublin, University of Surrey, Carinthia University of Applied Sciences, CIMRS University of Maribor

• Project duration: Oct. 2007 - Sept. 2010
• Budget: 364.593 EUR

• Target group: primarily geriatric nurses from Europe
  - Lifelong learning
  - Blended Learning
    - eLearning: Moodle (http://www.moodle.de/)
    - Face-to-face sessions (3 weeks)
    - Flexible learning, using new technologies

(Bahn, 2007; Walter, 2007; Wharrad et al., 2005)
PROJECT MILESTONES

GEROM modules

Module 1. Global Context of Ageing (lead: Slovenia)
Module 2. Theoretical Bases of Ageing (lead: Ireland)
Module 3. Research and Innovations (lead: UK)
Module 4. Informatics (lead: Slovenia)
Module 5. Ethical Issues in the Care of Older People (lead: Ireland)
Module 6. Leadership and Management (lead: Austria)
Module 7. Positive Ageing (lead: Ireland)
Module 8. Ambient Assisted Living (lead: Bulgaria)
Module 9. Dissertation (lead: UK)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>formative and summative</th>
<th>progress</th>
<th>communication</th>
<th>modules</th>
<th>study programme</th>
<th>dissemination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• analysis of project milestones (meeting deadlines)</td>
<td>• analysis of the GEROM google group (use)</td>
<td>• evaluation of the module descriptions by external gerontological experts</td>
<td>• satisfaction of students and teaching staff</td>
<td>• analysis regarding the hits on the GEROM homepage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• survey of project partners (e.g. pitfalls, satisfaction with project progress)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• drop out analysis</td>
<td>• analysis of the dissemination activities of all partners (e.g. conference papers, articles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• analysis of meeting protocols (effectiveness)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• analysis of outcomes (e.g. knowledge gain)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(modified from Brunner & Kada, submitted)

(Plano Clark & Creswell, 2008)
RESULTS - FORMATIVE

- QUAL: According to the project partners \((N = 6)\) the following pitfalls hindered the progress of the project:

  - Partners not meeting deadlines \((n = 2)\)
  - Not all partners participating in the meetings \((n = 1)\)
  - Delayed project start \((n = 1)\)
  - Poor use of google group \((n = 1)\)
  - Lack of face-to-face meetings \((n = 1)\)
  - Changes in timeline \((n = 1)\)
  - Harmonization of all details \((n = 1)\)
  - Many tasks within short terms \((n = 1)\)
  - Too many partners \((n = 1)\)
RESULTS - FORMATIVE

• QUANT: Partners’ views on the project (N = 6)

- I am very satisfied with the quality of our own work packages
- So far, the project is a great success
- I am very satisfied with the planning of the project
- The tasks within the project are realistic
- I am very satisfied with the progress of the project
- I am very satisfied with the work of the leader
- I fear the project will not be completed in time
- The quality of the contributions of all partners is very high
- The progress of the project is transparent
- The aims of the project are clear
- If problems appear within the project adequate solutions are found
- If problems appear within the project they are discussed with all partners
- I am very satisfied with the communication between the partners
- The work packages my country has to complete are clear
DISCUSSION

• multi-methodology approach: broad data basis
• formative evaluation
  ▪ pitfalls could be detected regarding communication
  ▪ need for an additional face-to-face meeting
• different requirements in the partner countries
  ▪ difficulties in transnational collaboration
  ▪ nurse education on different levels
  ▪ accreditation
• innovative project: evidence triangulation
  ▪ integration of formative and summative approaches
  ▪ self-evaluation and external evaluation
  ▪ consideration of multiple perspectives

(Brunner et al., 2009; Keating, 2006; König, 2007; Spitzer & Perrenoud, 2006; Vögele et al., 2005; Weiss, 1998)
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