

**The Learning Network:
Planning for Outcomes and Evaluating Impact
Dissemination Report for MLA East of England
By Rebecca Linley and Catherine Herman
April 2008**

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank:

- Harriet Foster and Amanda Burke (Renaissance East of England Museum Hub) for sharing an advance copy of Harriet's evaluation toolkit with the Learning Network
- Jon Bradley (Sheffield Galleries and Museums Trust) for providing 'real life' visitor data used in the workshop session on data analysis
- Hazel Courtley, Jenny Duke and Caroline Hack (MLA East of England), for their input and support;
- All the Learning Network participants, for their contributions to the project.

1. Introduction and Aims

The overall aim of the Learning Network project was to increase confidence and expertise in using the Generic Learning Outcomes (GLOs) and Generic Social Outcomes (GSOs), within the context of the Inspiring Learning for All (ILfA) framework, in museums, libraries and archives in the East of England.

The project built on the earlier ILfA East programme, in 2005-6, which aimed to embed ILfA in the region. The project also reflected MLA's web publication of the GSO framework in autumn 2007. The GSO framework expands on the GLOs to address social impact, but was based on small-scale national piloting in 2005-6, with case studies from only three organisations being available. There was therefore a desire to test the GSOs further and expand the evidence base and supporting material available. The wider background for the project was the place of the MLA sector within local agendas and specifically in Local Area Agreements.

Catherine Herman and Rebecca Linley were appointed by MLA East of England in September 2007, to take forward the project.

The key outputs for the project were:

- case studies for dissemination showing evidenced impact in terms of learning and/or social outcomes;
- a bank of tried and tested ideas for gathering evidence from the Learning Network;
- a dissemination report to share the learning of the group in relation to planning for outcomes, gathering evidence of outcomes, analysing evidence and articulating outcomes;
- a report on the effectiveness of the project in regard to the overall aims, including the use of 'action learning' approaches.

The first two outputs have been submitted separately to MLA East of England and are referred to in this report. The latter two outputs are brought together in this report.

2. Project Approach

The project used key features of action learning approaches. Action learning sets normally bring together small groups of participants to:

- work on and through organisational/individual issues;
- work on real problems;
- work together to check individual perceptions, clarify the issue and explore alternatives for action;
- take action in the light of new insight; begin to change the situation
- bring an account of the consequences back to the group for further shared reflection;
- focus on learning, not only about the issue being tackled, but also on what is being learned about oneself;

- be aware of group processes and develop effective ways of working together;
- provide the balance of support and challenge that enables each person to manage themselves and others more effectively.

The project brought together a large group of participants and had an intensive body of work to achieve, which affected the balance for reflection time to action planning. The different stages of the project emphasised joint planning, problem solving and achieving the outcomes of the project. To reflect the project's emphasis on supportive learning – but that, at the same time, it was not an action learning set – it was called the Learning Network. The basic stages of the project are set out below.

The project began by inviting participants, primarily from local authority organisations. Applicants were asked to give details of a project or activity that they wanted to focus on; this could be an existing activity and did not have to be a specific project. Applicants committed to attend Learning Network sessions and provide a case study of their project (see Annex A for further details of the application process). The list of participating staff and organisations is at Annex B, reflecting both different domains and sub-regions within the East of England; the list does not include one participant who was unable to complete the Learning Network process. Annex B also shows the thematic coverage of the different Learning Network outcome projects.

The Learning Network met on four occasions, an initial briefing session and three subsequent workshops. Details of the coverage of these workshops are included at Annex C, but the focus was on supporting participants through the creation of outcome-focused case studies. These were completed using a Template, which is included at Annex D. This report's findings are largely drawn from the completed templates and notes of the workshop discussions.

The workshops were also attended by my MLA East of England and the evaluation officer from the Renaissance East of England Museum Hub. These staff did not submit a case study, but contributed to the workshop discussions and the Hub provided an advance copy of its evaluation toolkit which was an important supporting resource for the Learning Network.

A JISCMAIL mailing list (with associated online 'filestore') was set up and used to support information-sharing across the Learning Network.

3. Discussion

Discussion of Learning Network activity is organised under the following categories:

- planning for outcomes
- gathering evidence of outcomes
- analysing evidence
- articulating outcomes.

These themes reflect the process that the Learning Network worked through both in the workshops and in the participating museums, libraries and archives.

The final part of this section then discusses the overall effectiveness of the project, including the use of action learning approaches.

3.1 Planning for Outcomes

The vast majority of Learning Network participants had experience of using the GLOs. For this reason, much of the first workshop, which covered planning, focussed on using the (less familiar) GSO framework. This was a slightly artificial process in that all the Learning Network case studies covered pre-existing projects or services, so these usually had predetermined aims and objectives. Nonetheless, Learning Network participants were able to identify relevant, measurable outcomes for their projects or activities, using the GLOs and GSOs as reference points. Essex Libraries' case studies (the Ongar Booktalk group and the 'Daddy Cool' early years sessions) also illustrate how the GSO framework can be integrated with local performance management frameworks, in this case the County Council's quality of life strategy. Similarly, the Norfolk Libraries relate to County Council priorities. Suffolk Libraries UK Online case study relates the GSOs to the vision of the local authority's Adult and Community Services directorate.

The discussion at the first workshop showed the importance of being realistic about what outcomes could be achieved, or, perhaps more accurately, were measurable. In particular, there was discussion about the difficulty of measuring outcomes relating to the second tier GSO themes on tackling crime and crime prevention. This 'reality checking' was identified as a key part of the planning process.

During the workshop the following questions were developed as a guide to the different stages in outcomes-based planning:

- what is the key outcome, or outcomes, you are wanting to measure?
- how are you going to measure the extent to which the outcome / outcomes are met?
- who are you going to collect evidence from?
- who is going to collect the evidence?

These key questions were incorporated into the case study template.

The completed templates illustrate how Learning Network participants linked project objectives to both GLOs and the first and second tier outcomes within the GSO framework. In terms of use of the GSO framework, it is interesting that participants were able to identify social outcomes for what might appear to be entirely educational projects, for example the school transport scheme in Luton.

The GSO framework draws on the concept of 'triangulation,' referring to the use of more than one method or source of data in a research study, meaning that data can be cross-checked. In the context of the GSO framework, triangulation tends to refer to getting different perspectives on outcomes, although a mix of methods, such as questionnaires and focus groups, might also be used. Looking at these different perspectives was evidenced in the design of most of the case studies, for example:

- Bedford Museum - the pupils and accompanying staff over the sessions; the parents and other adults on the night of the presentations and tours; the visiting public for the duration of the exhibition over half term; museum education and curatorial colleagues; Extended Schools Team;
- Norfolk Libraries - teenage book group users, library staff, bookshop staff (see section 3 of the completed case study templates for further examples).

In some cases, these multiple perspectives included the viewpoint of the person collecting the data in a formalised way, for example the 'project diary' used in North Hertfordshire Museum Service.

As already suggested, triangulation can also refer to using a mix of data collection methods to provide different perspectives, which can be cross-checked and compared. This was also integrated into the design of many of the case studies. For example, the 'Daddy Cool' evaluation in Essex Libraries used observation, interviews and written questionnaires.

Data collection methods are discussed further in the next section.

3.2 Gathering Evidence of Outcomes

The case studies demonstrate how a wide range of evaluation techniques, especially more qualitative methods, were used. This was particularly important in terms of testing the GSO framework, as the previously available case studies, on the MLA website, mainly focus on the use of more quantitative, survey-based evidence.

One area reflected in the case studies was the importance of establishing as robust a baseline as possible to measure against. This was not always possible, given the nature of services evaluated. In particular, many of the services were pre-existing projects (for example the museums projects in Bury St Edmunds and Luton) or ongoing services (like the teenage book group in Norfolk Libraries). The case study from Bedford Museum provides an example of setting a baseline to measure against:

An initial questionnaire 'First Thoughts' was completed by the pupils before the project began and the same sheet copied and completed as 'Second Thoughts' after the project was finished.

One particularly impressive aspect of the Learning Network activities was the sheer range of data collection methods used. The case study from Bedford Museum provides several examples of the creative approaches to data collection, including:

...[a] scrapbook for each team into which they pasted ideas and pictures; video diary feedback, presentations and displays prepared by pupils; oral observations made by teaching and museum staff during the project; photographs; oral feedback from pupils; feedback sheets from visitors to the displays.

Other examples included the use of letters from a partner organisation by North Hertfordshire Museums and photographs by Hertfordshire Museums.

The case study from Hertfordshire museums also articulated an issue discussed in the Learning Network workshops:

I was pleased and surprised to discover how much evidence we all collect as a matter of course eg photographs, notes of meetings, anecdotes and comments made by those taking part in a project. The Learning Network was a good means of showing how evidence can be 'firmed up' so that it can be presented in a meaningful way to a wider audience, particularly partners and funders.

This is an important observation in terms of transferability to other museums, libraries and archives. In essence, gathering outcomes-based data may not need to be that demanding if it can be combined with the collection of monitoring and management information.

3.3 Analysing evidence

Within the second workshop session, the main focus was on supporting participants in analysing and coding data. The coding of 'soft' qualitative data was especially important in terms of supporting the use of the GSO framework, as the available case studies mainly focus on the use of more quantitative, survey-based evidence. Many of the case studies illustrate the richness and value of this qualitative data, for example:

When I gathered the comments together and began the analysis I was amazed by how much information [the Ongar Booktalk group research] had given me which demonstrated the GSOs
(Essex Libraries)

It was good to address the issue of overusing the evidence. Indeed the group as a whole seemed very conscious of this. I think it is always a risk when talking to those who identify more readily with figures that anything 'soft' can easily be dismissed or discounted.
(Hertfordshire Museums)

The following quotation shows how qualitative data was analysed in the Essex libraries case studies:

I pulled all the quotes and comments into a grid and then matched them against GSOs. Comments and quotes which didn't match a GSO were included but left blank. I also noted where my observations supported the comments and quotes of participants. I then recorded how many quotes supported a particular GSO.

The same case study (the Ongar Booktalk group) refers to how:

I was surprised by how many GSOs I was able to provide evidence for. The triangulation approach (using more than one evaluation technique) was really useful as it enabled me to corroborate or justify evidence gathered.

Whereas the Booktalk group case study refers to the value of using different methods, the Luton transport case illustrates the value of getting different perspectives, saying that:

The responses we gathered from the classroom assistants, dinner ladies and parents who accompanied the visits were really interesting and generated evidence of learning we hadn't anticipated. ... It was the personal responses of the accompanying adults that surprised me; that the visit was a learning experience for them as well as the children.

In contrast to most of the case studies, the Baby Café case study from Suffolk includes a detailed example of using coded Excel data for quantitative analysis, although again there was a mix of qualitative and quantitative analysis.

The case study from Cambridgeshire community archives project showed how the GLOs and GSOs can be used to analyse pre-existing data (in this case, the transcripts of focus group interviews).

3.4 Articulating outcomes

Reflecting the different data collection and analysis techniques used, Learning Network participants articulated project outcomes in different ways. Quantitative representation in charts and graphs were used by some (for example, in the two Suffolk Libraries case studies, where these were used alongside more qualitative material).

Generally, though, what came through much of the reporting of outcomes was the richness and impact of using direct quotations, whether from focus groups, interviews or write-in questionnaire responses. Interestingly, in this context, the Suffolk Baby Café case study, which used mixed quantitative and qualitative methods, found that 'the soft data collected met more GSOs than the hard data.'

To an extent, presentation of findings flowed naturally from the analysis process, with material being organised under the relevant GLO and GSO headings. Learning Network participants used this material in slightly different ways. For example, some reports used percentages for different outcome areas, but most, given the generally small numbers involved, illustrated the outcomes with quotations and other evidence like observation notes. Essex and Suffolk Libraries used a tabular presentation of the GSO framework, using quotations and questionnaire responses to illustrate the different outcome areas.

A further point on articulating outcomes reflected discussions, within the Learning Network, about the validity of the evaluator's own perspective. This is seen, for example, in the narrative interpretation of the data from the Luton Museum volunteers' evaluation report. In this commentary on the findings, the evaluator is discussing the 'activity, behaviour and progression' GLO:

Two of the volunteers felt very strongly that the work we were doing has led them to think differently... "*more hands on – for all ages. Make it an experience rather than pure information*". In terms of what I am trying to achieve with the museums that I am working with this is a very significant

quote. I think that museums have a tendency to uphold the belief that we possess all knowledge. However, it is vital to find ways to engage people of all ages with our collections and make it relevant to them.

So, in this case, the evaluator's own knowledge and experience enhances the points made by the volunteers.

3.5 Project effectiveness

Whereas the earlier discussion covered the different stages of planning and evaluating for outcomes, this section is concerned with the overall effectiveness of the project for those participating in it. The discussion here is primarily drawn from notes of participants' comments within the workshops, although some comments also reflect the completed templates.

The single biggest measure of the success of the Learning Network was the commitment of the participants. As well as being shown in the completed projects, and the further time given to writing up the case studies, there was also the commitment to attending the workshops. Attendance was very high throughout, with the only non-attendance being from the one organisation that dropped out of the Network and organisations represented by two staff. One participant re-prioritised the workshops over a pre-existing meeting to ensure he was able to attend. The two participants from Luton Museums both attended the workshops, when the original intention was that only one would attend after the briefing session.

During the last two workshops, participants were asked about what they had found most valuable about the Learning Network. The most frequent response here was the value of having 'time to think' away from the demands of an overcrowded working day. Other themes mentioned were the value and usefulness of:

- the specific techniques used in the workshops, including paired discussions and critical friends;
- the peer support offered by the Learning Network;
- learning from different organisations and, specifically, bringing museums, libraries and archives together;
- the exploratory nature of the Learning Network, which meant that issues and problems were explored in depth, with time to reflect;
- having a staged approach, as this provided both milestones and time between workshops to develop thinking.

As indicated in the opening discussion, the Learning Network was a 'hybrid' project in that it incorporated elements of action learning set methods, with a more structured and intense project approach. The feedback from participants suggests that this combination of action learning techniques and a real project focus was a successful one.

Finally, the Learning Network offered considerable 'added value,' as the majority of the outputs (the case studies and other materials developed by the participants) were not directly funded by MLA East of England.

4. Conclusions

The Learning Network was a largely successful 'real life' use of the GSOs and GLOs. With just one exception, all Learning Network projects were completed within an intense timescale.

Encouragingly, Learning Network participants successfully used the GLOs and GSOs, with particularly impressive aspects being the diverse range of evidence collected and research methods used. The Learning Network was able to articulate, through the results of the case studies, the social and learning impact of museums, libraries and archives. In the words of some of the participants:

It was good to see that the GLOs and GSOs could be applied realistically to a very wide range of projects and some meaningful evaluation drawn from them.

(Hertfordshire Museums)

I learned that this research does indicate that it is possible to demonstrate social outcomes among groups which use the library service.

I wasn't sure whether I could demonstrate GSOs from a drop in activity, and I was surprised that I could provide evidence using the format I devised

(Essex Libraries)

... developing GSOs and GLOs are an obvious combination, and a valuable tool which does not have to be difficult to set up or facilitate.

(St Edmundsbury Museums)

There are some caveats about these broadly positive conclusions. As one participant commented:

This information is very small scale and more would need to be done to corroborate the evidence and make it robust.

(Essex Libraries)

A further limitation to the findings was about the limited time for the outcome-focused projects. Timescales were undoubtedly a factor in terms of the social impacts identified. The case study from Kings Lynn museums in particular suggested that more longitudinal testing of the GSOs was needed:

I am positive that the real benefit from GSOs is with longer term projects where baseline data is collected before the start of a project. I have tested this out against a project I have worked on with Traveller teenagers who made a film about their family history and experiences. It was very easy to code GSOs against the film, as there were some very defined statements from the young travellers.

The Kings Lynn project was a particularly challenging one in terms of identifying change (sessions with Aspergers children).

There was also some suggestion that GLOs were easier to measure (especially for short-term projects) than GSOs. This was particularly mentioned in the St Edmundsbury Museum Group where 'results were very GLOs led rather than GSOs.'

Despite these comments about scale and timings, the collective Learning Network activity still added to the available case studies and support materials on the use of the GSOs. Particularly significant was the use of more qualitative methods in GSO-based evaluation, building considerably on the existing evidence base. Even more encouragingly, all the participants suggested ways in which their findings would inform future practice.

Finally, the model developed by MLA East of England, with its combination of action learning techniques and a focused project approach, proved to be a highly effective one.

Annexes

A Invitation to join the Learning Network

B List of Participants and projects

C Details of workshops

D Case Study Template for Learning Network

MLA East of England: Learning Network

Introduction

MLA East of England is setting up a regional Learning Network to support the use of *Inspiring Learning for All* (ILfA) by museums, libraries and archives in the region.

Outcomes are central to the emerging performance management framework for local government. The Learning Network offers practical support in using both the generic learning outcomes within ILfA and the recently launched generic social outcomes. A supported programme of briefings and workshops will help you in using outcomes for planning and evaluation.

This document gives more information about the Learning Network and explains how museum, library and archive staff can apply to take part in it.

Aims

MLA East of England wants to develop regional use of ILfA, including the generic learning outcomes (GLOs) and the generic social outcomes (GSOs).

The Learning Network aims to support museums, libraries and archives in:

- planning for outcomes
- gathering evidence of outcomes
- analysing evidence
- and articulating outcomes.

It will do this through:-

- each participant identifying a 'real life' project or activity that reflects planning and evaluation for learning or social outcomes;
- the group working through how to plan and evidence outcomes;
- bringing together regional case studies of the individual projects.

More about the Learning Network

- The Learning Network will include about 15-20 museums, libraries and archives in the region, each represented by one learner.
- The Learning Network will meet four times, firstly for an initial briefing session and then for three workshops. These will be held in a central regional location on the dates below.
- The workshops will be open and participatory, taking a problem-solving approach. They will focus on practice and learning from one another.
- MLA East of England has appointed Catherine Herman and Rebecca Linley to support the Network. As well as facilitating the workshops and briefing session,

they will give support throughout, including providing materials on using outcome-based planning and evaluation.

MLA East Learning Network Meeting Dates	
9 November 2007	Introductory Briefing session
10 December 2007	Workshop One
21 February 2008	Workshop Two
13 March 2008	Workshop Three

Commitment involved

Taking part in the Learning Network is free for learners. The network represents a significant investment from MLA East of England. Learners are asked to 'repay' this investment by committing to:

- Participating in the initial briefing session and actively contributing to the follow-up workshops;
- Identifying a project or activity that reflects planning and evaluation for either learning or social outcomes (or both);
- Submitting a case study of their experience of outcome-based planning and evaluation;
- Disseminating learning within their own organisations and through regional networks.

Who is the Learning Network for?

The Learning Network will use outcome-based approaches within the overall ILfA context. Participants should therefore have existing knowledge and experience of ILfA.

The Learning Network will work with GSOs and GLOs, which are intrinsic to MLA's draft outcomes framework, *Securing excellence; delivering for communities*. The Learning Network is therefore likely to be especially relevant to public libraries and local government museums and archives, or to organisations that work in partnership with local government.

How to apply

Please complete and return the form below by [date].

We are also asking for a manager's support for your application.

Given the limited numbers, we are asking for one applicant per organisation.

For more information

If you would like more information about the Learning Network, or would like to discuss your application, please contact Hazel Courtley (01284 731740 or hazel.courtley@mlaeastofengland.org.uk) or Rebecca Linley (07815 794028).



The Learning Network: Application

If you would like to be part of the Learning Network, please complete the form below and return a hard copy by [xx] October 2007 to:

Hazel Courtley, Development Manager
MLA East of England, 110 Northgate Street, Bury St. Edmunds
Suffolk IP33 1HP
Fax: 01284 701394

SECTION A

To be completed by applicant

1. **Name of your organisation**

2. **Contact information**

First name: _____ Surname: _____

Job Title: _____

Address: _____

Phone: _____

Fax / e-mail: _____

3. Please explain how you have used IIfA and your knowledge of it.

4. Because relatively few organisations will be able to be part of the Learning Network, we are asking that participants act as advocates for it. Please let us know about any relevant networks that you belong to.

5. Please give details of a project or activity that you would like to focus on, and the kind of outcomes you are interested in identifying. (Please note this does not have to be a funded project, it could be a one-off activity or ongoing service).

6. Both the GSOs and GLOs link to outcomes agreed with local partners including health, social services and education. Please explain how your proposed activity relates to these areas.

I agree that:-

- I will attend the briefing session on 9 November and the workshops on 10 December, 21 February and 13 March.
- I will share of my experience of outcome-focused planning and evaluation with other members of the Learning Network.
- At the end of the Learning Network project, I will provide a case study of outcome-based planning and evaluation.
- I will be an advocate for the Learning Network, within my own organisation and wider networks and groups.
- I have the support of my manager, as detailed below.

Name:

Signature:

Date:

SECTION B

To be completed by applicant's manager

Please provide a statement in support of the application above, also covering what your organisation would gain from participation in the Learning Network.

Name:

Job title:

Signature:

Date:

Overview of MLA East Learning Network Projects

Name	Organisation	Theme / activity	Main audience / user focus	Outcome themes
Debbie Radcliffe, Jo Roberts	Cecil Higgins Art Gallery and Bedford Museum	Extended schools, developing exhibition	Selected school children	GLOs – confidence Making a positive contribution
Nyree Scott	Cambridgeshire County Council	Community archiving	Adults	Strengthened community and family ties Raised aspiration GLOs
Mark Curteis	Essex County Council	Reminiscence work with handling collection	Older people	Health and well-being
Sarah Mears	Essex Libraries	Reading group and associated groups	Adults	Reading culture of town Social networks
		Early Years activity	Fathers and their young children	Strengthened family ties
Jane Munns	Hertfordshire Museums	Reminiscence work with handling collection	Older people	Health and well-being
Stuart Hall	Kings Lynn Museums	Traveller heritage, DVD production	Young people from traveller community	Celebrating traveller culture Challenging discrimination
Fatima Choudhury	Luton Museums Service	Education work with volunteers	Volunteers in museums	GLOs Strengthening public life
Eleanor Markland	Luton Museums Service	Museum visits by school groups	School children	GLOs Making a positive contribution
Elaine Simpson	Norfolk Libraries	Teenage book group	Young people	GLOs - enjoyment Supporting relationships Making a positive contribution
Cas Sanders, Ros Allwood	North Hertfordshire Museums Service	Work with handling collection; developing exhibition	Homeless people (at North Herts Sanctuary)	GLOs Skills Health & well-being Community ownership of museum Community cohesion
Peter Jones	St Edmundsbury Borough Council	Community heritage	All	Community cohesion Understanding between groups Inter-generational understanding
		Arts and crafts activities	People with learning and other disabilities	GLOs - skills Health and well-being – independence Challenging stigma
Jo Dixon	Suffolk Libraries	Early Years – Baby Café	Mothers and their young children	Community ownership of library Health and well-being

Name	Organisation	Theme / activity	Main audience / user focus	Outcome themes
Kate Byford	Suffolk Libraries	ICT group and associated groups	Older people	Social Networks Health and well-being – independence

Details of Workshops

Briefing Session, 9 November 2007

This covered the following areas:

- GLOs and GSOs, within the overall ILfA context;
- Planning for outcomes;
- How to gather evidence of outcomes;
- Analysing the evidence;
- Presenting evidence of outcomes.

Workshop One, 10 December 2007

This first workshop covered:

- Identification of the projects that each participant will be focusing on;
- The social and or learning outcomes that they are planning to achieve;
- The kinds of evidence which would demonstrate these outcomes;
- The methods they are going to use to collect the evidence.

There would be a relatively long period between this workshop and the subsequent workshop and during this time the supporting mechanisms of telephone, email, and shared web space will be developed.

Workshop Two, 21 February 2008

The second workshop included:

- Feedback from each participant of progress so far, success and challenges;
- Participants working together to analyse evidence (including 'real life' material provided by Sheffield Museums and Galleries Trust)

Workshop Three, 13 March 2008

This included

- Further feedback from each participant on progress;
- Working together to articulate the outcomes from the individual projects, which would inform the project deliverables (set out in phase four below).

MLA EAST OF ENGLAND LEARNING NETWORK PROJECT

Draft Template for Capturing Project Evidence

Background Information

Service name	
Description of activity / project	
Timescale (or ongoing)	
Main audience / user focus	
Partners	
Project / programme objectives	
GLO and GSO piloting objectives	
Contact details	

1. **What** were the key outcome(s) measured
2. **How** you measured the extent to which the outcome / outcomes were met
(Include any of the following developed for your project: questionnaires; interview or focus group guides; observation schedules)
3. **Who** you collected evidence from
4. **Who** collected the evidence
5. **How** you analysed the evidence
6. **How** you presented the findings
(Include a summary of the findings)
7. **How** you used, or plan to use, the findings
(For example to inform service development or for advocacy)
8. Comments on the piloting process
(Including what you learned, what went well and any challenges or problems)
9. Finally, give details of anything that surprised you about the piloting process.